

Hi Everyone,

Having already finished with Prolympian, or so I thought, I didn't anticipate sending you an open letter 8 weeks later. But, a number of you have contacted me with questions since I left, and I feel duty-bound to respond in a format that gives the maximum number of people access to the answers. Feel free to distribute. Whether you're still in Prolympian, or not, the information is pertinent.

My aim here is to finish what I started when I talked about the science of PTS at the Seattle workshop, and set the record straight on some untruths you have been told. *Most* importantly, I hope to help you avoid or stop:

- Violating the most fundamental precepts of research ethics
- Misleading your clients and other members of the public
- Defrauding other coaches, however unintentionally

If you're wondering where I've been for the last 8 weeks, I have NOT been engaging in corporate espionage, or anything of the sort, as Karen Sabourin has claimed. I'm the same person you always knew me to be. No mysteries, no plots. Just ordinary life, building my practice honestly and with integrity. I was silent until now, because after my departure I became very ill. During my recuperation I didn't have energy to deal with anything except getting better and keeping myself afloat. Now that I'm better, I'm giving priority to completing unfinished business, and I look forward to seeing my experience with Prolympian in the rearview mirror. (By which I mean my experience with the company, not you as an individual!)

Setting the record straight, and the final chapter to the Seattle talk

I was never a paid officer of Prolympian. As you probably remember, Karen referred to me as Prolympian's "Science Officer." The position of Science Officer never actually materialized. But, the day after I announced my departure, Karen claimed on Ryver that I had been a paid officer of Prolympian. That is categorically UNTRUE. If you're wondering, take a look at the email Karen sent me the day after that post, in which she herself says, "I also know that you know that had we had access to the large investment money that we have now, it would have been different as I could have offered a salaried position to you." (Attachment 1)

I donated my time to give advice within Prolympian because I wanted science to be utilized responsibly. It wasn't, and apparently isn't. I told Karen early on that there were serious errors in the printed materials coaches were using, and on the website. I told her what needed to be corrected. I spelled it out for her by email, and sent supporting documentation. (For details, see Attachments 2-8.)

Bottom line: Except for the assertion that PTSD is not a mental illness, ALL the statements about science in the Neurokinesis First Session script were/are untrue, and ALL the statements on the website about the "Australian study" were untrue or misleading. (It is also not true that the hand technique has anything to do with static electricity.)

When I saw that Karen did not heed my advice, I sent an email in which I said that Prolympian was in danger of gaining a reputation for misleading the public (Attachment 7). Karen never replied to that email, but she did ream me out on the next Saturday training call. Remember the one with the sarcastic and just plain rude statements about "Miss Science Lady"? (They too were untrue.) This was the Aug 20 call, which I understand is still available on the website.

From that point on, I didn't take the title of Science Officer seriously. I wasn't paid, I didn't see any evidence that Karen listened to anything I said, and for a long while there were no further communications about anything science-related. I did actually hope that Karen would ultimately turn out to be teachable with regard to science. But, I never saw that happen, and I never saw her correct the statements I pointed out as needing correction. In fact she did just the opposite, insisting that the script be read EXACTLY as it was, errors and all, word-for-word, no deviation allowed or possible.

I decided to leave the door open to Prolympian, but I didn't realize until January that many coaches were watching me in order to gauge their own experience with Prolympian. They interpreted my continued association as a sign that things were fundamentally ok. I would have acted differently had I realized it. I am sorry; I didn't know then what I know now. This is something I deeply regret, and if you were one of those people, I sincerely apologize.

Prolympian's approach to science is NOT sound. Nor will it be, unless and until an institutional review board (IRB) is constituted to oversee all study activities; their advice is heeded 100% and in a timely fashion; the approach to science comes from a scientist, not from Karen or any other non-scientist @admin; and no one but a qualified scientist speaks or writes about the science on behalf of @admin, or approves what is

said or written by @admin. Does that sound extreme? I don't think so, based on what I've seen.

Most of what I've heard Karen say about science is inaccurate and misleading, or even downright wrong. Sometimes shockingly so. The idea that "most of what we know...in modern medicine comes from what the Nazis did" is SO appalling, on SO many levels, that it would take me pages and pages to describe how wrong it is. I don't have the energy for that, and I'm sure you already know it anyway.

I understand that it can be hard for a non-scientist to keep science facts straight. Nevertheless, if a person scrambles the facts, they mislead *everyone* - *at best*. Eventually, they'll bring the wrath of the entire science establishment down on their heads. And, hope to God they don't hurt any clients along the way.

What I said in the Seattle talk was true to the best of my knowledge at the time...BUT...I no longer trust in the ability of Prolympian to deliver a sound intervention program for PTS. It's to prevent harm that we scientists follow the rules of ethics: research ethics, publication ethics, human ethics, community ethics, institutional ethics. We study them in grad school. We get them refreshed every few years in our work lives. I have seen no evidence that these rules are being followed within Prolympian - neither with regard to research, nor even, at times, with regard to everyday practices. Thus, I would never trust my personal or professional reputation to this company, let alone the welfare of my clients.

Karen gives an appealing message about how being a "Prolympian Coach" will signify excellence and trustworthiness to the public. In fact, the very opposite has been developing. Please don't lose sight of the fact that many qualified coaches and therapists are already helping sufferers of PTS, with good results.

These folks are watching. To put it mildly, they don't have good things to say about what they're seeing. Don't assume, either, that this can be written off as jealousy, competition, or misinformation. It is not.

No reputable scientist, doctor, therapist, or practitioner - no matter how *expert* in their field - is foolish enough to think they know better about their subject area than everyone else in the world. Science, medicine, and therapeutic practices advance by communication, and by trying out the contributions of others. They are fields of interaction, not isolation. To an outsider, this might not be apparent, because it's true that competition exists in these fields - and quite some ego. But, there is an underlying

code that everyone who is credible follows. You saw some of it on my slides in the Seattle talk. One of the things you'll know if you've spent any time in one of these fields is that without lots of interaction, people can go so off-track it isn't funny (see Ethics, below).

What about the non-science side? Yes, it is true that effective techniques are often discovered before science gets around to testing them. Like I said in Seattle, the fact that the hand technique hasn't been scientifically studied doesn't signify *a priori* that it isn't effective. The question is, effective at what? I would say that we know it defuses emotional charges in the moment for many people, and sometimes the effects are long-lasting. But, I have also seen Neurokinesis induce adverse symptoms that required other approaches to resolve; approaches that were not in the standard Prolympian toolkit when I was there. (There was no evidence of mixing modalities in most of these cases.) Moreover, I do not know to what extent the hand technique and other Prolympian techniques reduce, or end, any of the other symptoms of PTS. Do you? Have you seen data, or had years' worth of experience yourself, as opposed to just being told?

Take a moment and think about it. What can be said, honestly, and with integrity, to your potential clients and colleagues? My sense is that the hand technique, clock, stairs, and laughing technique are helpful tools for resolving emotional upset - at least in the moment. I never used Brainsweep, so I can't speak to that. But, do the techniques as you know them end or reduce the symptoms of PTS? *No one knows yet*. It takes years of focused study to find out something like that, and that's assuming that everything pertaining to the assessments is done ethically, honestly, and above-board. That kind of assessment hasn't yet been done. I mean, it *really* hasn't been done. Not even in Prolympian (see below).

Violating the most fundamental precepts of research ethics

Karen's statements that the data from last summer constitute a study are false and misleading.

You CANNOT ethically conduct research studies with human subjects/participants unless you have first obtained their informed consent. See, e.g. the Nuremberg Code, and DHHS Regulations: 45 CFR Part 46. Did you get your practice clients' informed consent to participate in a research study for Prolympian

before you worked with them? NO, of course you didn't get this, because we weren't doing a study at the time. At least, not to my knowledge, nor that of our clients.

Under certain circumstances, unconsented data can be ethically used to assist in generating hypotheses - but not here, as far as I can see, and not for publication. Post hoc analyses of unconsented data are ethical when the data are properly "de-identified" by qualified researchers, and an institutional review board (IRB) waiver has been obtained. My understanding, from people who sit on and work with IRBs who oversee human trials, is that IRBs only give such waivers to data that was appropriately gathered and/or already within the public domain (birth weights, for example). The practice sessions done last summer do not meet the necessary criteria (more below).

You CANNOT ethically begin a human research study without the PRIOR approval of the study by an Institutional Review Board (IRB). Note the word "institutional." IRBs are composed of research experts affiliated with approved institutions. Not just anyone can fill the bill. The IRB evaluates proposed studies to ensure that the design is valid, the risk to participants is acceptably low, all required components of research studies with human subjects/participants are present (see below), the data will be handled correctly by qualified researchers, and there are no ethics violations. This takes time to set up. Longer than Prolympian has been in existence, as far as I can tell. Also, the IRB monitors the study at all times as it proceeds.

I HAVE SEEN NO EVIDENCE THAT ANY OF THIS WAS EVER DONE.

Bonafide research for the purpose of validating a behavioral intervention requires the following components. They're required for IRB approval, and for acceptance into a peer-reviewed scientific journal. You have to:

- Pre-specify your research hypothesis
- Have a primary end point
- Write a clinical research protocol
- Appropriately consent all participants
- Run the trial according to Good Clinical Practice (GCP) guidelines
- Have the trial overseen by a monitoring body/entity such as an Institutional Review Board (IRB).
- At all times the risks versus the benefits of the study on participants have to be assessed, by the review board.
- Participant confidentiality must be upheld; HIPAA rules apply.□□

TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, NONE OF THIS WAS EVER DONE, EITHER.

It doesn't take a scientist to see how many of the components of a research study were missing from the practice client sessions. Why? Because none of us coaches, including me, were trying to do a study. No one had talked with us about a study. We were just trying to get certified.

Can the data be used at all? I think it is ok for Karen to have a qualified statistician analyze the results of those practice sessions, provided they are given ALL of the raw data, not throwing out any results for any reason (like someone deciding that a coach is "not client centered" and excluding data from that coach). Moreover, the data should be properly de-identified first, and stored in accordance with proper procedures, as laid out by a qualified researcher. In addition, details of how the data were analyzed, and by whom, should be transparent. If the data have been properly analyzed, appropriate statistical indicators of probability and/or variance will be presented, for example, "p" values. You should be able to contact that person and expect an intelligible response. If all that is done, then the results from 2016 can potentially be discussed informally as "internal data." I gave a plug-and-play statement in my departure letter to illustrate a kind of statement that can be made using this kind of data. But, that does NOT mean that Karen, or any non-qualified person can analyze the data properly. Nor can it ethically be published, or presented in any public forum, such as a web site, under the label "study," or "research study." Let me be clear: this type of assessment constitutes "anecdotal evidence," not a research study.

No matter which way you slice it, the data from the practice client sessions and 28 day followups in 2016 is not, and never can be considered, a research study.

Apart from all the above, you may remember that in the Seattle talk I spoke of a proposed 90-day-assessment period during which clients from the military families contract had supposedly agreed to allow their results to be provided to an insurance company. I was repeating what I was told by Karen, and I believed her at the time. I've learned that some coaches are now confused, believing that the practice client data we gathered is actually part of that 90-day assessment plan. It is not. The proposed assessment was to be performed with clients who gave consent for a specific use of their results. Your practice clients did not give such consent. Moreover, even that 90-day assessment, if it were ever performed, was not designed to be a study. Studies require all of the components of ethical research listed above, which your practice client sessions did not include.

I was never involved in the "Study 2017." In December, Karen announced to you all that I was involved in the "Study 2017," even though I had never agreed to any level of

participation, and had no idea what she was planning. When I heard this, I texted her that we should talk or correspond - to see *whether* I could help. She never replied, but on the next training call mentioned my name again in association with the study. If you listened carefully to what she said the second time, you'd have heard that my involvement was a "maybe," not a "for certain." But, plenty of coaches I talked to didn't pick up the subtlety. Therefore, let me reiterate what I said before: I was never involved with the planning or execution of the "Study 2017," or indeed any other "study" or research by Prolympian.

When I left in January, and mentioned on Ryver, for clarification, that I was not involved in the study, Karen posted the following comment: "I can post ongoing communications with Florence re: studies. In December, Florence stated that she 'needed time to decide what her work schedule could tolerate if we proceeded with the scheduled Jan 2017 study start up date.'"Yet another set of misleading statements.

Here are the actual "ongoing communications," ALL 97 words of texting:

- Text KS to FD Mon, Dec 19, 12:32 PM
Hi would you be ok with overseeing a study starting in January if that becomes the final condition to the military group contract? It would be 6 weeks o 5 sessions with client reporting of 1000 clients. [sic]
- Text FD to KS Mon, Dec 19, 1:15 PM
In principle the answer is a great big yes. But, before I can confirm that I would need to meet the other people involved and discuss details about how the study will be done, and who would be doing what. I'd also need to determine the time investment and the impact on my earnings. It's a great idea, however. Kudos!

That is the full extent of communications with me regarding any proposed Prolympian study. The important conditions I mentioned were never addressed. Also notice the leap from what I said to what Karen said. Apart from being a big leap, Karen's statement implies that an actual conversation took place in which actual information was exchanged. That didn't happen.

I can only assume that Karen wanted you all to believe that I was involved because my professional qualifications would lend credence to what she was doing, WITHOUT my knowledge, and WITHOUT my participation. Both Patricia Malanga and Shawn Gourley have asserted that Karen did the same to them. Three times makes a pattern, folks.

If you are or were involved in the “Study 2017,” please don’t let yourself be used to violate research ethics, or to perpetrate a scientific fraud. As I said above, any study involving human subjects/participants requires an institutional review board (IRB), and informed consent from all subjects/participants, not to mention valid scientific design. Speaking of valid design, you know, there’s a reason why it takes 10-20 years of postgraduate training to become an independent investigator who can design valid research studies, and get them approved by the appropriate oversight committees and boards. Just like IRBs, not just anyone fits the bill.

Here’s a checklist to use if you are, or want to be, involved in any research study involving human participants/subjects, including “Study 2017”:

- Has an IRB or other qualified review board approved the study?
- Is the IRB continuing to monitor the study?
- Do you have regular meetings with and/or free access to these people?
- Do the details of the study that is approved by the IRB match what you are being asked to do? That includes the consent forms being used.
- Is all the data going directly to the scientists or credentialed persons overseeing the study, without passing first through company @admin?
- Do the study design and execution include all of the required components for ethical research as listed above?

There should be no concerns about access to the IRB, or to scientists, etc. giving oversight. The IRB exists to help guide the researchers and protect the study participants, and would not refuse to answer inquiries from you. IRBs also know how to handle confidentiality, as do credentialed researchers. Thus, if you are ever told otherwise, or if it is insinuated that you can’t be trusted to talk with them, get more vocal, not less. Chances are, there is something off.

Likewise, if you cannot answer “yes” to ALL of the checklist questions above, you may be involved in a study that is not only invalid, but also UNETHICAL. Find out the details. Don’t take anyone else’s word for it. See the proof with your own eyes.

If you cannot answer “yes” to ALL of these criteria for the “Study 2017,” I implore you to stop and reassess. Ask yourself the following question: How comfortable are you with testing, in the absence of adequate safeguards, a new technique that affects the brains of your clients? And then this one: How comfortable are you with violating the most fundamental codes and regulations governing ethical research? Please learn about the rules so that you don’t do that.

Misleading Clients and the Public

If you cite the misinformation about Neurokinesis, or PTS that you have been given by Prolympian, you will be misleading your clients, the public, and any coaches that you train or recruit. In fact, if you want to use ANY of the statements you've heard about science or research studies in Prolympian, I strongly recommend you check it with an expert first. Upon departing, I gave Karen some last words to help her clean up the science mess as it stood at that point (Attachment 2). Last I heard, it hadn't been done. But, even if it had, I subsequently received the even more disturbing news, from Karen herself, about the "studies." Therefore, I have no reason as yet to believe that Karen *is* cleaning up the mess. That leaves it up to you, if you are still in Prolympian, to get the facts straight.

Defrauding Coaches

We all got recruited into Prolympian by means of a staggeringly large lie. It was such a whopper that I couldn't conceive of anyone lying at that level. That's part of why I kept the door open to Prolympian as long as I did. I just couldn't believe it was a lie - but it was. To clarify, here are the facts (as learned over time):

Karen Sabourin told us all, at San Diego, at Chicago, at Seattle, and afterwards that there were 82,000 clients just waiting for us to get certified and start work, and she had a contract to that effect with the organization that brought this large group of military veterans, and their families, together. You know this already.

Here's the thing that makes the Chicago experience unique: in Chicago, we were given the name of the organization. It was "Military Families With PTSD": yep, Shawn Gourley's group.

Then, at the end of December, Shawn Gourley publicly denied ever signing a contract with Karen or Prolympian, and Karen announced on Ryver that she had never signed a contract with Shawn Gourley. In other words, the contract she'd held up to us as being IN PLACE AT THE BEGINNING had, in fact, NEVER existed.

Whoa! Hold up! That was HUGE.

I want to be sure that everyone understands the significance of that revelation. Back in September/October, when coaches started getting vocal about the apparent lack of a contract, Karen began talking about “other military contracts” in the offing. Remember? EVEN IF Karen sought other contracts, as she claimed, it doesn’t mitigate the original lie - the one that persuaded coaches to quit jobs, and defer or turn down income-generating work. (I wonder how much income that makes total - how many millions in earnings lost to coaches?)

Karen lied, over and over again, to ALL our faces, about the contract with the 82,000 military family clients, the supposed contract with Shawn Gourley’s organization. So, if you didn’t know it before, you do now: every time Karen makes reference to the 82,000 clients she is telling you a lie--whether in person, in a training video, or a YouTube video, the “82,000” is a lie.

Last summer we were told that we needed to do only two things in order to start working. 1) Get ourselves ready as per what we learned at Seattle, and in the Q&A and “training” calls. 2) Help get 1000 coaches certified by Aug 1... then Sep 6, then Sep 18, then...

We believed the lies, and it kicked off a veritable frenzy of recruiting and training. Most of us were truly concerned for the vulnerable, PTS-affected clients supposedly *waiting* for *us*. Of course, along with the recruiting came those \$997 directory fees paid to Prolympian, and the \$100 referral fees, which most eventually received - *eventually*. This is how all the coaches who recruited and/or trained other coaches unwittingly participated in the deception.

Did all of that sink in? If not, please take a moment and let it sink in now. Let go of the details and focus on the core of it:

- You were recruited by a lie.
- You were manipulated to propagate the deception.
- Your CEO continued/continues to lie to you - not only about this, but also about other professionally relevant matters.

Given what you’ve seen, and what you’ve learned, how can you know what, if anything, to trust of what Karen says? Not knowing that, I shudder to think of explaining anything to a new client, or colleague. The best answer to pretty much anything becomes, “I don’t know.”

Yes, it is difficult to let go of a dream. Even so, can a person rationalize all this? and still sleep at night?

Why did we join Prolympian? Because we were going to have a steady flow of clients, while doing good in the world, and getting to work with other phenomenal coaches. For most of us, it all boiled down to that. Also, the money looked good, but I know that for most of you, money was only part of the story. The real promise, which was a lie, was that there were clients who needed our help, lined up and waiting.

I believe that Karen really believes that she is doing good. But, I cannot ignore the harm, and the ends do not justify the means. It just doesn't work that way. Sorry.

Coaches unintentionally defrauding other coaches. Back when we all believed in the original Prolympian vision, scores of coaches recruited hundreds of other coaches by telling them what they had heard from Karen, and had believed. So much of it looked so good. Only problem is that it was all founded on a lie, as just discussed. A fact that I took a very long time to see. It didn't end there.

Many coaches were quite troubled upon realizing they'd unintentionally deceived other, incoming coaches, and I'm concerned that the process may repeat itself. I hope that you won't let it.

I am now hearing there is another push for more coaches to build your territories. Does this push for more coaches sound vaguely familiar?

Distortions, misrepresentations, lies, and threats all serve to sow confusion, and confusion hampers powerful action. Here's a little more clarity. For a long time, I wasn't sure what to believe when Karen got into the drama about people. I was confused. I gave people the benefit of the doubt, and chose to focus on what I could see, which is that the hand technique looked like a good beginning to PTS intervention. Plus, the team structure as proposed in the early days of Prolympian held a lot of potential. That was before I had enough first-hand experience to see behind the curtain. So, here's another one of my behind-the-curtain experiences, with actual data, so that you can see the pattern for yourself.

Before leaving, I noticed that the statements Karen made about those who left Prolympian tended to discredit them, and to create a false impression, in the minds of those who remained, of what the issues really had been. So, I was perturbed, but not surprised at the statements Karen posted on Ryver in response to my farewell wishes to

you all. A notable example was this: “So, I understand her need to move on to what she stated to me in her resignation letter, is her exploration of what BRAINSWEEP taught her.”

Here’s what I ACTUALLY said in my letter: “Naturally, I will not make use of ANY of your intellectual property, including Neurokinesis and Brainsweep. You can count on me for this. I have never misused intellectual property, and I never will. In fact, when I realized after that first Saturday unveiling of Brainsweep how close it comes to a method I already use, I made the conscious decision to step back from it. Thus, I did not listen to the recording, have no exposure to the scripts, and I will not use any of your innovations. I appreciate your insights on teaching and developing it, and wish you well with the tests of its efficacy, and polishing the applications.” (Attachment 2)

You may remember from my Seattle talk that I recovered from PTS, and started helping others recover, years before I ever heard of Prolympian. I’ve now gone back to using only those methods. Methods which, in fact, have already been proven, clinically, to help heal PTS. Yes, heal. They work. They work quickly. They work reliably. They cause abreactions only very rarely. One of them is the technique I mentioned above. It’s been around for a few thousand years.

So - why on EARTH would I explore Brainsweep when I already have such an effective, powerful, and well-tested set of tools? Why would I waste energy trying to rip off someone’s intellectual property that I don’t even need? Maybe you don’t know me well enough to know my outstanding reputation for professional integrity. But, would that make ANY sense, at all, for anybody?

Regarding Brainsweep, I am not in competition with anybody. In fact I’m not in competition with any of you on *any* level. There is plenty of discovery waiting for all of us. And, SO many people have PTS that we may never be able to serve them all in this lifetime. But let’s try.

Wasting time with misdirection and drama impedes all of us who are committed to making a real difference with regard to PTS. Not me, not anymore.

One last word on defamation. As with others who have left Prolympian, I initially received a few messages after departure that were apparently aimed at wooing me back, but also insinuating some kind of legal threat. Then came more overt threats and defamation. (Though never the infamous threat to “break” me.) Those of you who were on the training calls talking about the corporate espionage ring, etc. will recognize what

I'm talking about. It's total baloney. It's not like anybody can prove a negative, but no worries. Time will show you whom to believe.

Meanwhile, just ask yourself whether the behaviors you've seen from me give any credence to those outlandish claims. Ponder the information I've shared with you. Notice the drama whipped up around *each and every* one of Karen's former business associates in Prolympian, not least the multitude of coaches who volunteered hugely of their time and talent, and then left.

Look at how you felt, or what you thought, when you received that ridiculous non disclosure agreement and/or the ersatz cease-and-desist (C&D) orders that went to practically everybody - sent by email, no less. (Real legal documents are sent by snail mail.) Not everybody was affected, but I do know that the C&D generated real fear in people who did not deserve such treatment. Worse, I suspect that engendering fear was the point. What healthy company do you know in which stimulating fear, in-house, is considered an acceptable business strategy? How many healthy companies need that? How many healthy companies grow from those kind of roots? How many real companies fail to pay their bills in a timely fashion? How many companies lose the vast majority of their workforce within just 6 months of their recruitment? Even before their first payday?

Deep down, I believe you know what you're looking at.

My sincerest good wishes for your future

No matter where you are in your journey, I have no judgments here. I hope that if you've moved on from Prolympian, you're doing well and are succeeding in your next steps. I hope you've learned a lot about yourself, as well as others, and that it will accelerate your personal and professional success. If you're still in, I hope that this letter will help you avoid making serious mistakes that could come back and bite you, or your clients, or other coaches.

If you ever want to talk or correspond with me, I'd be more than happy to hear from you. You can contact me at florence@insightment.net. And, even if I don't hear from you, I wish you well, as always.

Namaste,

Florence

ATTACHMENT 1

Gmail - Content 2/10/17, 4:11 PM

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=36f5e29dda&view=pt&q=...qs=true&search=query&msg=159d5b8dcffc88d4&siml=159d5b8dcffc88d4> Page 1 of 1

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Content

Karen Sabourin,CEO <karen@prolympiancoaching.com> Wed, Jan 25, 2017 at 8:02 AM

To: Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>, pasha veres <pashalaoda@gmail.com>

Hi Florence,

Obviously Pasha and others have misunderstood what I posted re you quitting. So, I am making sure that you have not misunderstood.

I will post copies of your correspondence with me re your job and BRAINSWEEP if you think it will help everyone to know that I was respecting your actual statements to me. I had understood from your words that you were concerned about your workload. I understood it was about your day job. So, if you think you need to know anything else, please feel free to ask any question that you need.

I also know that you know that had we had access to the large investment money that we have now, it would have been different as I could have offered a salaried position to you.

Let me know what is best for you.

Hugs,

Karen

Sent from my iPhone

ATTACHMENT 2

Dear Karen,

I am resigning my position as a coach, team leader, and nominal "science officer" with Prolympian. I have found that the required commitments don't allow me to move forward with the commitments I have to my own development and practice. Upon consideration and deep thought, I have realized that this is the correct thing for me to do.

I wish you and everyone in Prolympian the very best of success in all that you dream of, and for. I have nothing but gratitude for the amazing learning experience, and accelerated personal growth, that I've had over the last 8 months. I have learned so much from you. Thank you!!

Naturally, I will not make use of ANY of your intellectual property, including Neurokinesis and Brainsweep. You can count on me for this. I have never misused intellectual property, and I never will. In fact, when I realized after that first Saturday unveiling of Brainsweep how close it comes to a method I already use, I made the conscious decision to step back from it. Thus, I did not listen to the recording, have no exposure to the scripts, and I will not use any of your innovations. I appreciate your insights on teaching and developing it, and wish you well with the tests of its efficacy, and polishing the applications. I can see great potential there. As one curious mind to another, I applaud and congratulate you!

Given the need for me to part ways with Prolympian at this time, it's just as well that I was never involved with the planning or development of the study. That way, you won't miss me now. And, just as well that we didn't waste time discussing possible future roles, which I wouldn't be able to fulfill anyway. I do hope you glean useful information that will enable you to bring even greater benefits to the world. Best of luck to you, and to all who are involved in the study.

Although the position of "science officer" was in name only, I am glad if I was able to be of some service, and grateful for the opportunity to speak for science in a community so focused on transformative healing.

On that note, and for the benefit and well being of yourself and Prolympian, I would like to leave you with the following words concerning the science side: I urge you, as a professional, to make use of the advice I gave you last summer, and change the language about research science on the website, and on the Neurokinesis Level 1 First Session script. The latter is not about improving the

effect of the script. It's about protecting your reputation and that of the coaches. For your convenience, I've summarized that advice below, and attached PDFs of the most pertinent sections of those email conversations for reference.

To recap and expand on the advice regarding the website:

- There is a statement on the website, under client FAQs, that says "The official Australian researchers show out of 2,000 soldiers, 2,000 were fully recovered. Follow up research showed another 1,000 had also had a full recovery." This statement has never been substantiated, and, unless you've come up with a valid citation, proving that those researchers used exactly the same protocol the coaches are using, the statement should be removed immediately. The coaches have been using protocols since at least 15 July 2016 that didn't exist when that statement was written. Therefore, I don't see how the statement can be used. As it stands, it misleads the coaches, and the public, and has the potential to open you up to charges of fraud. The same goes for coaches who use it.
- When I became aware that this statement was still on the website on 4 August 2016, and emailed you about it (attachments 1,2), I assumed you must be either referencing information I did not have, or extrapolating somehow from the 90+% "success rate" claimed in the Australian "study" published by Gary Sinclair in January 2016, for which I sent you a review on 1 July 2016 (attachments 3,4). As you know, that is not scientific research, but rather an anecdotal report. It's also not peer reviewed, no matter what he calls it. That just is. No scientist would tell you otherwise.
- Meanwhile, you now have in your possession a large set of data on the effect of the hand technique, as Prolympian applies it. While the numbers don't constitute an unbiased report unless you include the full data set (even from "non-client-centered" coaches), you do have an impressive number of reports from which you can accurately say that in X number of first session interventions, by Y number of coaches, with Z number of clients, the negative charge of memories went from 3 to 0 (on a scale of 5) in __% of cases. This is more detail than Sinclair reports, and you have a far more impressive sample size. Thus, if you want to cite results, you could use your own numbers instead.
- Bear in mind, however, that if you throw out and do not somehow reference the data from the coaches you decided were "non-client-centered", you would again leave yourself open to charges of misleading the public.
- For the same reason, you cannot say anything about "full recovery", which would imply full recovery from PTSD, unless and until that has been

established by an unbiased third party, using data that has not been seen by Prolympian admin.

To recap the advice regarding the First Session Script:

- Yes, it IS well accepted now that PTSD is not a mental illness.
- Shoshanna Garfield sent these references to study in support of "the new paradigm of PTS being an injury to the nervous system and not a psychological weakness or illness": "<http://www.traumasoma.com/> - Robert Scaer's site. The Body Bears the Burden - an energy psychology classic. Anything by Stephen Porges and Polyvagal Nerve Theory, and the book with that name - he has loads of stuff on YouTube. Ecker's book on memory reconsolidation, Unlocking the Emotional Brain, is also a must-read."
- The one thing I heard that gave me hope during my own journey of recovery was that "PTSD is a normal response of a normal person to abnormal circumstances". If you'd like more stuff to say that fits the science, this sentence would fit the bill, and it can definitely help the client normalize/release shame about their experience.
- However...
- I urge you again to strike the sentence about nanotechnology science and PTSD, because it is not the case that nanotechnology science has shown anything about PTSD. That sentence will trigger mistrust, at best, in anyone with a scientific or medical background. It could also lead to public denouncements from people who are trusted authorities in the field of PTS, which would not be in the best interests of Prolympian, or its coaches. (FYI there are nanotech studies of TBI in mice, but nanotech studies in humans are currently deemed unsafe and thus remain theoretical, except for using Nano scale particles for drug and vitamin delivery. I made reference to this in the Seattle talk in July 2016, which is on the training video)
- Moreover...
- I advise you again (attachment 5), to strike *all* the other statements about science in that script except possibly for the line about PTSD being a survival choice. That is, unless you have citations that I have been unable to find, and of which the PTS experts I've consulted are unaware. For reasons and alternatives, please see the email from Shoshanna Garfield that I brought to your attention on 5 August 2016 (attachment 6). Shoshanna is an internationally recognized expert in the field of PTS. She's worked for 20 years with torture survivors, and has been an invited speaker at the Royal College of Surgeons (which you only get from being

at the top level of your field). She's also helpful, and kind. I suggest taking her considerably worded suggestions seriously.

I hope you will take these words of advice in the spirit with which they are intended – to promote your genuine success, and that of all Prolympian's coaches.

Good scientists respect the words "I don't know" and "we're still learning." In everyday life, I let most statements made about science by non-scientists slide; it's rarely important. But, citing science incorrectly is the kiss of death in the science and medical communities. These are people with whom I know you will want to cultivate relationships if Prolympian studies go forward, and they will not let it slide. Nor will they give you the time of day if they hear inaccuracies like those above. Better to say nothing than to make inaccurate statements.

In conclusion, please remove my name and likeness from the website, and from any and all Prolympian materials and publications. This includes the talk I gave at Seattle that appears in the training videos.

As you know, the fact that I was never paid in any capacity means that the talk is my own intellectual property. My chief concern, and in fact my responsibility, is that my name, likeness, and professional reputation not be used by Prolympian in any way. Knowing how busy you have been, I allowed plenty of time for you to correct the problems cited above. But, recently, you've announced publicly that I am involved in the study. You never even consulted with me about it! I realize that I can no longer try to help you.

I hope that this parting advice will help you to clean things up, and that you will do that - for your own sake, and the sake of the coaches.

Wishing you the daily strength to do what needs doing, and the good fortune to see all your contributions recognized and rewarded.

Respectfully yours,
Florence

ATTACHMENT 3

Gmail - Australian "study" off website? 1/23/17, 12:54 PM

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=36f5e29dda&view=pt&q=...qs=true&search=query&msg=15658b2c46197f72&siml=15658b2c46197f72> Page 1 of 1

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Australian "study" off website?

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com> Thu, Aug 4, 2016 at 11:15 PM

To: "Karen Sabourin, CEO" <karen@prolympiancoaching.com>

In case you haven't already thought of it...

On the new website, there won't be anything about that Australian "study", right?

My perspective: we don't need it, and we can't defend it.

--

Florence F. Davidson, Ph.D.

ATTACHMENT 4

Gmail - Australian "study" off website? 1/23/17, 12:56 PM

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=36f5e29dda&view=pt&q=...qs=true&search=query&msg=15658dabe7fc3e60&siml=15658dabe7fc3e60> Page 1 of 1

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Australian "study" off website?

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com> Thu, Aug 4, 2016 at 11:59 PM

To: "Karen Sabourin,CEO" <karen@prolympiancoaching.com>

Ok. You have more info than I do. All I have is the article.

If it would be helpful, I can draft a statement that will be factually accurate, yet do as much of what you're looking for as I can manage. You can use or discard it as you see fit. I would just need to know what info to draw from (article alone, or that plus other info).

[Quoted text hidden]

ATTACHMENT 5

Gmail - Synopsis is on the way 1/23/17, 1:07 PM

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=36f5e29dda&view=pt&q=...s=true&search=query&msg=155a946e99ea5b8b&siml=155a946e99ea5b8b> Page 1 of 1

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Synopsis is on the way

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com> Fri, Jul 1, 2016 at 9:44 PM

To: "Karen Sabourin,CEO" <karen@prolympiancoaching.com>

Here it is!

My apologies for the delay. I had some interruptions last night and today that I gave time to, which have resulted in recruiting two more coaches who want to join my team. I think they'll be good. They're both looking into money to register with.

Looking forward to tomorrow. Exciting results as my team begins to coalesce, and I get further with my own practice!

Best wishes,

F

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

Review of IJCAM 3(1) 2016 Article.docx

134K

Florence's take on IJCAM 3(1) 2016 article.docx

155K

ATTACHMENT 6

Review of the article "Negative Memory Healing in Seconds", Sinclair, G.,
Int J Complement Alt Med 2016, 3(1): 00058

Synopsis: This article describes how to do the technique that Gary Sinclair calls Soul Link. It includes a philosophical framework Sinclair uses to "explain" the efficacy of the method. And, it gives anecdotal evidence of a large number of people (2200), who report "success" when using the technique to discharge the negative feelings associated with selected memories.

Important points:

- This is not a scientific report, or research study. Although called a "research study" in the article itself, it is important, first and foremost, to understand that this text is NOT, in fact, a scientific research report, or study. The same goes for the so-called "research chart".
 - Although a large number of people were sampled, there is insufficient description of what "success" means for anyone to reproduce the "experiment".
 - There are no controls.
 - The author himself must realize that this is not a scientific report when he writes "Gary feels strongly that it is time for proper research and documentation that will allow for a scientific analysis of this..." and "The partial work as presented here is only to help you understand the potential use of Soul Link".
- The large number of people reporting what is presumably a lessening of negative feelings associated with particular memories is encouraging and strongly suggestive of the general applicability of the technique for rapidly discharging troublesome emotions connected with many memories. At present, however, we cannot say that the claims made for the applications of Soul Link are "evidence based" or "scientifically proven".
- Soul Link is related, but distinct from, Neurokinesis, inasmuch as each method activates overlapping, yet non-identical, sets of acupressure points/meridians. Thus, overlapping, but distinct, energetic results are produced.
 - Soul Link explicitly instructs the user to move the wrist of one hand over the side and wrist of the other hand, whereas Neurokinesis explicitly instructs the user not to involve the wrists. This creates non-identical changes in the sensory experience of the user, presumably originating in non-identical changes in the electromagnetic field of the body. According to acupuncture charts,

contact with the wrists activates meridians associated with sexual energy. Moreover, having tried both methods, this reviewer and an associate both perceived activation of the root chakra area (floor of the pelvis) with Soul Link that was not experienced with Neurokinesis. It occurs to this reviewer that this might pose a problem when working with individuals with a history of sexual trauma – at the very least.

- Soul Link instructs the user to make maximum contact between the palm of the top hand and the back of the bottom hand. Neurokinesis instructs the user to maintain a small pocket or cup of non-contact at the center of the top palm. This also changes the sensory experience, and presumably energetic field, in perceptible ways.
- Soul Link is claimed to have positive effects in a wide range of applications, including:
 - “Resolution” of fears, upsets, anger, guilt, self-sabotage, blocks to success, and “PTSD-level” memories,
 - “Improvement” of academic and athletic performance, self-confidence, self-esteem, health, and wellness.

Bottom Line: The article is strongly encouraging with regard to using a hand technique for effective and rapid intervention in PTSD. At the same time, it does not in and of itself prove effectiveness for that application.

ATTACHMENT 7



Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Fw: Questions - Certification next steps & marketing suggestions

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:10 PM

To: "Karen Sabourin, CEO" <karen@prolympiancoaching.com>

Please see embedded comments in red

On Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 4:18 PM, Karen Sabourin, CEO <karen@prolympiancoaching.com> wrote:

Please see below from ques-ans

From: Info-CFR**Sent:** Monday, August 08, 2016 1:11 PM**To:** Katie Sabourin ; karen@prolympiancoaching.com**Subject:** Questions - Certification next steps & marketing suggestions

Karen & Katie,

One question and 2 suggestions I hope you will find helpful in moving this project forward.

Suggestions:

1) Authoritative sources/documentation/marketing materials

More and more, we are being asked to provide supporting documentation that states PTSD is not a mental illness. Several of us are researching, but have not found what we seek. In order for us to maintain our credibility among professional organizations (including military groups), it will be extremely helpful if we can provide some materials to help back up our statements. Word travels fast from one group to the next and we only get 1 chance for best impressions.

I now have some authoritative sources that are purported to provide evidence that "PTSD is not a mental illness" (the wording I'm encountering is actually more like "PTS is not a psychosocial disease"). It's very basic, deep research with more specific titles, which is why it wasn't showing up on regular word searches. It'll take me a few days to check them out, but I expect they'll do the job.

However, I still haven't found evidence for any of the other statements in the intervention script regarding scientific studies, I recommend striking all of them, unless you have and can send me some references. The client doesn't need them, and unless we can back them up, we run the very real danger of gaining a reputation for misinforming the public.

I'm happy to help in providing a consistent, scientifically-backed-up message.

Along those lines, a "slick" (a tri-fold type product) on the PTSD Project, some factual data,

your background, your vision etc, could really be powerful as you continue to grow this group. Now that we are getting momentum, it will be important to provide the massive team some tools to help ensure you are getting a consistent message out. It could be something that is in PDF format, and we would download and print ourselves, to minimize your costs.

2) Crisis line.

You have likely already thought of this and have a plan but I have not seen any mention of it . . . As more and more of us come on board, what is a manageable process for everyone to be able to get to the expert help when needed? Posting a request for help on FB does not seem to me to be a reliable way.

I agree that the time has come to have a smoothly running system. We've managed a few crises in the last week through ad hoc reaching out, and I felt we were lucky we could reach people to help when needed.

Could a crisis hotline # be established (maybe 1 for US and Canada, 1 for other Internationals? I don't know). The company manning the hotline 24x7 would have a roster of your crisis team members and know the schedule of who would be on call and on backup for that particular day.

Another backup is a so-called blast system, through something like GoogleVoice. Same principle as a hotline, but it's automated to send text, email, and automated calls to whoever's on the contact/on-call list. I don't know the implementation specifics - just that it exists.

ATTACHMENT 8



Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Fwd: PTSD treatment

Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 5, 2016 at 10:53 AM

To: "Karen Sabourin, CEO" <karen@prolympiancoaching.com>

Oops. Trying again. Reply from Shoshana Garfield

On Fri, Aug 5, 2016 at 6:34 AM, Shoshana Garfield <shoshana@shoshanagarfield.com> wrote:

Dear Sebastian, Florence and Hazel-

Thank you for your detailed response. I have been working with torture victims for over twenty years and I have indeed been keeping up with the latest theories. Neuroplasticity and Ecker's presentation of the differences between reconsolidation and extinguishing, Dr Bob Scaer's medical/integrative approach, poly vagal nerve theory and attachment (particularly as discussed by Peter Hobson), etc. all point, as you say, to PTS being an injury and not a psychological condition. I am not aware of nano tech research, so I would be thrilled to be pointed at some sources there. If you are curious about anything I've pointed at in this paragraph I can happily give you fuller citations. I also recently presented at the Royal Society of Medicine on the research base of the work I do, so I've got that too.

You've not sent any research paper citations for the modality... are there indeed any?

You said -

it's about a stressor triggering the survival based hyper reaction of the brain to initiate the instantaneous TOTALITY BASED effort of implementing a replay of every detail of the PREVIOUS sequence of actions that achieved survival. Prolympian is the operational leading edge of a paradigm shift in addressing 'Trauma'.

However, this seems to me to be quite inaccurate. Not every detail of former strategy replays at all- someone may have passed out in an attack and 'merely' dissociate at another trigger. It's on the continuum but rarely at full blast. In fact, people tend to adopt body postures, with attendant musculature, skeletal and fascia adaptations to the preferred fight, flight, freeze flop array. They are therefore slightly triggered all day (and night).

If, by strategy, you mean, for instance, a particular sequence of a successful attack/defence, that is obviously incorrect - even with sequences of moves, every fight is different.

So, we don't have complete congruence in our understanding, and I still would like to talk. I am very protective of my clients, and will not dive into a training before I have established some base for it being worth it. Frankly, It was a little inappropriate for you to start there when I was asking for an evidence base. I also wonder what you are comparing Prolympian to in order to claim such a paradigm shift. I say this collegially and gently - I suspect others have already blazed this trail before you and you are innocently reinventing the paradigm. I've come across this before too. As I am not sure yet what paradigm you are shifting from or to, I suspect from calling PTS a disorder to an injury, I can't be entirely sure yet. I can be wrong - it happens often - which is why I want more information before I make an assessment.

Florence, I am sure that you can handle a caring, committed, open-minded sceptic, and I hope you are one too. :) I look forward to the video later today and to reading/hearing/talking more. I also understand, from my perspective as someone who does energy psychology - about a dozen energy-based modalities, some of which have no research at all but have come to me through people I trust and after I have experienced the modality myself - I understand that robust clinical trials can take awhile to get together. I'm open to being convinced. I am on holiday next week but would be delighted to have a conversation with you. Please send me some material to read and then we can meet

in a few weeks?

Also, FYI, ACEP (Association for Comprehensive Energy Psychologies) runs the biggest energy psychology conference in the world that I know of, and you may wish to present at it next year - the call for proposals comes out in October. I am sure many people would be interested in hearing about this if your intervention for PTS is as effective as you imply, and ACEP gives CE credits to appropriate workshops as an extra draw. From experience, yours would qualify.

Jane, thank you for keeping tabs.

Best wishes to all,

-Shoshana.

On Thu, Aug 4, 2016 at 12:14 PM, Sebastian Lenain <slenain@btinternet.com> wrote:

Hi Shoshana,

Thank you for getting in touch, my name is Sebastian Lenain. I am on a team in the UK getting our heads together to make sure we have the most supportive environment possible for coaches and clients using the technique in the UK. Hazel Moore is on that team cc'd and will connect with you further if there is anything she feels.

Also Florence Davidson who is Prolympian's Science Officer and based in the US can respond to your request re research and material. (Please cc us all Florence, thanks.)

Prolympian is pioneering the use of a proven reliable & effective neurokinesis intervention technique which closes the door to suicide and cleans up PTSD - dealing with the symptoms by clearing up the charge on 'memories' fast (breaking the synaptic loop stuck in the brain). The technique is delivered via coaches and does not come under medical protocol. We have a contract with a network of 82000 veterans and their families primarily US and the next 3 months or so a pilot working with them. Global insurers are involved collecting data so it gets included in medical insurers as first point of call.

Nanotechnology is changing the medical view of PTSD - it's not a mental illness - it's about a stressor triggering the survival based hyper reaction of the brain to initiate the instantaneous TOTALITY BASED effort of implementing a replay of every detail of the PREVIOUS sequence of actions that achieved survival. Prolympian is the operational leading edge of a paradigm shift in addressing 'Trauma'.

On Fri, Aug 5, 2016 at 10:48 AM, Florence Davidson <davidson.florence.f@gmail.com> wrote:

Note this reply from Shoshana Garfield