



DELTA LIFE SKILLS



EMOTIONAL FREEDOM IS IN YOUR HANDS with EFP
Integral Energy Psychology

Phillip W. Warren, B.A., Ph.C., Professor Emeritis, A.P.O.E.C., Cert.Edu-K.,CC-EFT

4459 52A St., Delta, B.C., V4K 2Y3 Canada

Home Phone: (604) 946-4963. Toll free: 1-866-946-4963

E-Mail: <phillip_warren@telus.net>

Website: <www.rebprotocol.net>

U.S. mailing address: P.O. Box 1595, Point Roberts, WA 98281-1595

Δ∞x

SIN AND INSANITY: A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEW©

published in Theoria to Theory, 1970, v. 4, Third Quarter, pp. 39- 54

ABSTRACT

The paper briefly traces the origins of the concept of sin and insanity in a religious framework, mainly Buddhism and Christianity, and describes the present state of the "socially patterned defect" (hell). "Heaven" is presented as a state of being defined by certain abilities. The manner in which we build our own personal hells by our actions and inactions is described. The path out of hell is presented which can be used in a quasi-therapeutic setting by people who are non-professional but who are aware, sensitive and concerned.

I. GOLDEN TEXTS

Any paper which has the title "Sin and Insanity" should, by the logic inherent in the title, also begin with words of wisdom. I begin with words attributed to two of the wisest men in history; two spiritual giants. The first quote is from Guthama Siddharta, the Buddha:

"He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me"-- in those who harbor such thoughts hatred will never cease....in those who do not harbor such thoughts, hatred will cease. For hatred does not cease by hatred at any time; hatred ceases by love--this is an eternal law.

The second quote is from Jesus, the Christ:

Judge not, that you be not judged; for with the judgment you pronounce you will be judged, and the measure you give will be the measure you get. Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eye? Or how can you say to your brother, "Let me take the speck out of your eye, " when there is a log in your own eye? You hypocrite; first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother's eye.

The key to insanity and the key to optimum spiritual health is contained in these passages. The direction we must do is given here. The direction has been clear for centuries and the message has

been repeated again and again. The problem is that too few take heed in action, although most would agree with the essential validity of these statements if asked their opinion on the matter.

However, when it gets tough, when things get down to the nitty gritty of everyday life we fall short and we hate, kill, blame, judge, complain, snarl, seek revenge, seek pity, become victims, victimize etc. etc. etc.

The reason so few take heed in action is that they are unable. Christianity has failed because it does not know how to train people to take the logs out of their eyes so that they may see clearly. In the history of Christianity or Buddhism there has been no effective training program to teach their followers how to carry out these simple requests. Any effective religion must develop these programs. Don't tell a man what he should do. He already knows what he should do. Show him how to do it --if he can't then keep refining your ways of training until you do reach him. Saying "Your hatred is foolish and self-destructive. Look to your own sins, be responsible for them, and then your life will be filled with love and beauty." will do no good. All will agree but no one will be able to do anything about it. Never expect someone to have an ability unless you know how to teach that ability to him. Ability goes with a training program and not with a lecture or a sermon or a paper on how to do it.

Each of the great religions founded to uplift man has so far failed because its training program has failed. No religion can survive unless each of its churches is a powerhouse of activity, unless its ministers can see what abilities his parishioners lack and then set up a program to teach them these abilities. It has ceased to be fashionable to live the Christian virtues. The Sunday sermon certainly has very little to do with improving moral and ethical behavior. A passive audience of parishioners never learned anything. We have created the riches of kings but can not create spiritually healthy people. Bodies are healthy while miss-sharpen souls live within. We are a civilization of wealthy paupers, dying of spiritual bankruptcy. We need able people or we will perish by our inability. We are a civilization of giant weaklings living in the excrement of our consumer goods.

Man is now capable of seeing a war and hating all its aspects. Modern communications have permitted, as never before, man to judge for himself the morality of the act of war but they have not provided him with a means of affecting a change. He is frustrated by his inability to act and affect change although he may still be making the same kinds of moral augments that he has always made. Modern man's hellish existence is exaggerated when he recognizes his Own impotence in the face of the Viet Nam's, racism, poverty much less his immediate problems. And thus we arrive at Hell and Heaven.

II. HEAVEN AND HELL

A. IS HELL OTHER PEOPLE?

Jean Paul Sartre said in his play No Exit:

"You remember all we were told about the torture-chambers, the fire and brimstone, the "burning marl." Old wive's tales" There is no need for red-hot poker. Hell is other people."

and later in an interview in Playboy (1965)

"Other people are hell insofar as you are plunged from birth into a situation to which you are obliged to submit....Then you have a cut-and-dried future mapped out, a future made for you by others. They haven't created it directly, but they are part of a social order that makes you what you are. If you're a peasant's son, the social order obliges you to move to the city where machines await you, machines that need fellows like you to keep them going. So it's your fate to be a certain type of worker, a country kid who has been driven away from the country by a certain type of capitalist pressure. Now the factory is a function of your being. And that being is the job you're doing, a job that masters you completely because it wears you down--along with your pay, which classifies you exactly by your standard of living. All this has been thrust on you by other people. Hell is the proper description of that kind of existence. And the exit from this destiny is the action you can take against what people have made of YOU and transform Yourself."

Erich Fromm suggests:

"Contemporary man feels powerless not only because he does not understand the revolutionary changes that have occurred, but most of all because he, as an individual, is dealing with giant bureaucracies-- those of business, government, the armed forces--which are impersonal, and for which the individual is merely a cipher to be used for the growth and smooth functioning of the whole. It is not that the individual is badly treated. On the contrary. He is treated as a valuable piece of the machinery."

Man's opportunity to observe his environment has vastly increased by television, films, radio and the rest of the mass media; his ability to affect his environment hasn't increased proportionately. To affect this increasingly complicated world with which we are faced, we need greater and vaster methods of coping with it. Though the problems have become more complicated man's answer to them have remained on the same simplistic level. (Solberg)

Indeed, because man is increasingly faced with a world he can not confront he is driven more and more to denial: of the problem, of the world, of the humanness of his fellow beings, of life and death, of his own worth and dignity. Anything would be better than this agony of soul, this pain that gnaws but never hurts quite enough to say enough!

And so it is that the citizens of hell walk about on earth. They are the complainers, the righteously indignant, the snarlers, the blamers, the ones who cannot forgive because they never did anything wrong, the ones who tell you endlessly how badly they have been wronged. Someone who can not take responsibility for anything bad that happens sees the source of all that is bad in other people's actions. Since he sees himself as having no part in the evils of the world, he cannot do anything about them. And thus the wrongs, hurts and sins persist, multiplying. And there he sits in the middle of it all, in his living room viewing it on color TV. Suffering but unable to stop anything and having no hope that he can or ever could.

Donald Kingsbury put the mentality of these people in the form of "Hell's own catechism": (A goal for man, p.7)

- | | |
|--|---|
| Q. What did you do? | A. Nothing. |
| Q. What did he do? | A. Everything. |
| Q. Who created your sorrows? | A. Them. |
| Q. How can your pain be lifted? | A. When they lift it. |
| Q How can pain be avoided? | A. Don't see it, hear it, feel it; be invisible, speak not and touch not. |
| Q. What are your powers to turn bad to good, foul to fair, hate to love, sorrow to joy, misunderstanding to understanding, insanity to sanity? | A. I have no legs to walk with and no arms to hold the fallen and no breasts to nurture love and no tongue to speak forgiveness |
| Q. What can you do? | A. I can attract but cannot control: I can respond but cannot cause. |
| Q For what do you wait? | A. A savior, someone to live for me. |
| Q. How do you call upon him? | A. By crying out against those who have wronged me and by remembering my innocence. |

These half-crazed creatures who are more or less adjusted to a mad world are normal average men. Under the banner of mutual loyalty and concern, men become non thinking tools of the group. All those who belong to the group are WE and merit its protection and privileges; those who stand outside the chosen few are THEM and deemed the enemy. This "demonic group mysticism of WE-THEM" can evolve into a "brotherhood unto death" as is true in any society at war. "Induce people all to want the same thing, hate the same thing, feel the same threat, then their behavior is already captive - You have acquired your consumers or your cannon-fodder. " (Laing, p. 95) This WE-THEM ethic has the cataclysmic credo: "to remain true, one for all and all for one, as we plunge in brotherhood to our destruction." (Laing ch.4)

To live in a world with unprecedented problems and potential we need unprecedented people, religion, science, business, government. Instead we have normal, adjusted people, religion, science, business, government. Normal includes every kind of disability known to man. Apathy in the face of limitations, acceptance of the unacceptable, inability to act when action is essential, satisfaction with minimal accomplishment. The normal man only survives during periods of quiescence. He is a weakling who lives only because nothing is testing his strength. Unable to stop war the normal man builds intercontinental ballistic missiles armed with civilization destroying warheads and waits in an underground bunker muttering statistics about "over-kill" and "mega-deaths." This man has been chosen for his normality. He is alert, intelligent, conscientious and probably cares a great deal about mankind; he loves his family. But, he is defeated or he wouldn't be in the bunker. There he sits with this vast electronic sensorium and world destroying machines, calm, efficient, orderly, performing this desperate mockery of peace. (Kingsbury, 1965).

Take another normal man. He has a well-adjusted family; his business goes well, He has a routine and the abilities to go with this routine. He is happy because whatever he can not handle he refuses to speak to and see. The disasters in his immediate environment he notes in the most un-reactive and intellectualized way. He only sees his faults in others. He is defeated. The goal of a full life has eluded him. One Sunday in September, 1967, some normal people had just gotten out of church in downtown Minnesota and they were confronted with an atypical sight. There was a National Guard riot control exercise taking place. Most did not realize that it was a simulated exercise and this is what they said: "Why don't the soldiers get out of the way and let the trucks get in there and run over the demonstrators?" Another indignant church-goer said "No one made them come to State College. If they don't like our town they can leave." And still another said "Open fire on the_; teach them a lesson." (St. Cloud Daily Times)

Normality can be dangerous. Normal Jews went about their routine of life in Europe as the German armies and the "Solution of the Jewish Problem" marched in on them. Eichman was judged to be sane by the psychiatrists in the testimony of his trial.

Normality can be pitiful. Three dozen normal people went to bed one night in Queens, New York after leading their adjusted normal lives. Several screams pierced the night air. Curious, these normal people went to their windows to see what was happening. There they saw a man killing a young girl with a knife. Just like on TV. A hero had fantasies of helping the girl and yelled out. The attacker ran away and Kitty Genovese crumpled to the street. Wounded she got up and tried to escape. The action was no longer enough to keep the viewers interested so they closed their windows and went back to bed; just like the late late show. The attacker returned. Kitty screamed in terror as he tore at her clothing and stabbed the knife into her. Up went the windows. Our normal people found vantage points from which to watch the drama. It was horrifying and they felt horror. For awhile it looked like she would escape and there was hope, and they felt hope. But he caught her again and used the knife again and again and again. That was sad and tragic. Some couldn't watch anymore and went back to bed. These people wanted to help but they were normal and did not have the ability to burst out of their houses and control a mad man. They couldn't even call the police because that might upset their routine and make them unhappy for awhile. Kitty died, stabbed, bleeding after crawling into a neighbor's entrance where her normal watchers, seeing that she had reached safety, closed their windows and left her. (Darley and Latane; Rosenthal)

In Kansas City, Missouri, Primitivo Garcia was studying to become a naturalized citizen. One evening in late 1967 after class two young hoods accosted his teacher, who was five and one half months pregnant at the time, as she stood on the school steps waiting for her ride home. When the

hoods got no reaction to some random obscenities, one grabbed her purse and ran with it to the opposite side of the street where Primitivo and others were gathered. She followed. With so many normal respectable people around, she could not believe that she was in danger. The two hoods were joined by others and they all danced around her. One pulled her legs from under her; the others lifted up her skirt and fondled her. Primitivo was outraged. Plunging into the group, he knocked down the one with the purse and punched another in the face. "Shoot him! Shoot him!" they yelled. The purse snatcher did just that. A bullet ripped into Primitivo's stomach. He staggered to the school where his teacher called an ambulance and took him to the hospital. Not one of the normal people around the school bothered to call the police or interfere in any way during the ten minutes it took for the scene to play. Primitivo died but the normal people lived to be normal for another day. (Time)

Another illustration of the level of functioning of normal people comes from experimental social psychology. (Milgrim) Since science is modern rational man's religion this description must therefore be the most valid. The research involved the study of the limits of the power of obedience to cause someone to inflict pain on an innocent victim. The subjects were mostly normal American college students and adults. A subject, call him John, arrives at the appropriate building on that holy of holies, the campus of Yale University. He is told the experiment he has been requested to participate in involves learning theory. John is introduced to another person whom he is told is a fellow subject. They draw straws to determine who will be teacher and who pupil. Because the other "subject" is actually part of the experiment and the drawing is rigged, John invariably becomes the teacher. The two are led into a room containing a large chair equipped with straps and electrodes. John's companion is strapped to the chair and the electrodes attached. John is then led into another room. An intercom connects John's room with the room with the chair. Every detail of the setting is arranged so that John is completely convinced that he is administering shocks. The shocks are administered by a machine on which the voltage level is plainly marked starting with 15 volts and increasing by 15-volt steps to 450 volts. The levels are also labeled; at one end "barely perceptible" through "strong tingling" on to 300 volts "intense shock," 420 volts "danger, severe shock" with the two highest levels simply labeled "XXX." John is given a 45 volt shock so he has some idea of what will be going on. John is told to read a prepared series of questions into the intercom. The accomplice makes frequent errors in accordance with a prearranged schedule, and since John has been told to increase the shock by 15 volts after each error, he has to keep increasing the severity of the shock. The replies become more filled with protest as the shock level goes up: "I didn't realize it would be like this", "Let me out " I have a bad heart I did not tell them about" At 300 volts the accomplice pounds the wall and thereafter stops signaling answers. At this point John is told to regard failure to respond as an error and to continue to administer shocks. The accomplice pounds the wall once more at 315 volts and then is not heard from again. Whenever John demurs, the experimenter tells him to continue, with increasing urgency. The most forceful command is "You have no other choice, you must go on." The intent of the study is to see at what point John will refuse to inflict shock.

What were the results? All subjects administered shocks up to 300 volts ("painful shock") and 62% went to the maximum--450 volts (two levels beyond "Danger, severe shock"). Even when a struggling, screaming victim's hand had to be held on the shock plate in full view of the subjects, 30% went on to give the maximum shock. The main determinant of how far John will go in inflicting pain seems to be determined by how much the experimenter brings into play the habits of obedience that are ingrained in us all. John feels absolved of guilt since the responsibility rests with the experimenter. A person who submits to authority of another hands over his conscience. Since the authority decides what is right and wrong, the subordinate's own conscience is suspended.

(Frank, pp. 83-4) People in our society live out their lives in authoritarian situations--in schools, jobs, politics and religion. When they must confront unknown situations, they can only conceive of them in models they have for their own lives. We must create people who can act on their own without orders from the top. We desperately need a new model of life and of man if we are to survive. Unfortunately the normal man is the goal of much of the mental health profession. I wish to consider now the idea of a super-normal, optimum, fully-functioning, self-actualizing human being.

B. HEAVEN AS ABILITY: THE SUPERNORMAL HUMAN BEING

The philosophy of adjustment is a philosophy of apathy. It is to want to be happily defeated and weak and make the best of it; to be happy and adjusted and content in the knowledge that due to the limitations of our existence we can do nothing. The Nazi guards in the concentration camps were not disturbed and neither were the people in the nearby towns.

The concept of the super-normal person is very ancient. Modern humanistic psychology has revived the idea and referred to it using a number of terms; optimum (Warren 1964, 1967-8, 1969a) fully-functioning (Rogers), self-actualizing (Maslow, Goldstein), life adept (Kingsbury, 1965) high level wellness (Dunn, Jourard). The method of attaining this state was thought to be quite simple to begin with. If you pleased the gods, the gods lent you their strength. The *Iliad* is full of such events. Everywhere in the ancient world it was the same with variations. If you gave him enough grain, or flattered him with song, or obeyed his commandments the god blessed you. To be blessed is to have the strength of a god, his serenity, intelligence, courage and joy (Kingsbury, 1965) Listen to Psalm 3:

Thou, O Lord, are a shield about me,
my glory, and the lifter of my head.
I cry- aloud to the Lord,
and he answers me from his holy hill.
I lie down and sleep;
I wake again, for the Lord sustains me.
I am not afraid of ten thousands of people
who have set themselves against me round about.

When Buddha and Christ spoke they were offering us a god's strength in exchange for obedience to a higher will or law. The obedience desired was far more sophisticated and effective than the earlier propitiative rituals. The actions were themselves the essence of a strong man; one who is in contact with his own God-like inner self. Christ said:

So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift.

This action of reconciliation builds strong super-normal men. Christ has been grossly misinterpreted by his followers and by the church. The god referred to is the God-like higher self which is a potential in everyone; the kingdom of God is within you. The great mistake of Christianity was when God was externalized instead of internalized. The external God is dead. But God is not dead; He resides within and the task is to recognize this truth and actualize this Godly potential in us all. Thus, regardless of whether external gods exist or not, the person who can reconcile his differences with his fellows has one of the abilities of the super-normal person. Such a person can end the

cycles of hate and revenge and heal the wounds of old hates. He can produce love where there was once hate. This person is love and is loved. His strength is his own, its source is an ability which resides within. (Kingsbury, 1965) Again Christ defined an ability of the supernormal person when he said:

You have heard that it was said, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." But I say to you, Do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any one would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well; and if any one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles.

This is a skill that any super-normal person must possess if he is to stop action with which he disagrees.

Non-violent resistance looks easy. Turning the other cheek looks like an easy act that any normal person can do; but it isn't -- it is one of the most difficult skills that a super-normal person can master. First you must have a cheek tough enough so that you can take the blow without being hurt. If you do get hurt, you defeat yourself. It won't work if you are hurt and pretend not to be. In the game of slaps the slapper's intention is to put you into apathy, where you will avoid pain through non-action; or to put you into propitiation, where you will do what he wants you to do in order to avoid pain. If you can completely absorb his force harmlessly--and are willing to acknowledge and totally confront his act--you win. Through your acknowledgment he sees that his intention has failed this time. If you don't acknowledge, you lose, because muteness is taken as a sign of pain and defeat. The acknowledgment must carry the information that no damage was done. It must come out serene and with intention. Controlling a situation like this is the skill of a super-normal person. It has to be learned. If someone slaps you and your stuffings come out, you are not super-normal and you shouldn't try to act like one without training; nor should you be ashamed of your fragility. You are what you are and you start from there. (Kingsbury, 1965)

Another skill of the super-normal person is that he can remember what he caused and can differentiate his acts from what other men have caused. Someone has sinned against another and cannot confront what he has done. He denies and represses this and puts his attention on what the other has done to him. He puts his own self hatred into his condemnation of the other. With his voice of judgment he judges himself. "I hate him because I hate myself." Listen to him and you will know how he feels about his own sins. Once you repress and deny the memories of what you did and replace them with exaggerated memories of the wrongs others did to you; once you see everything bad that has happened to you as the effect of someone else's cause, you forfeit your free-will and in so doing damn yourself to your own brand of hell. The only way out of this hell is through your own action and once you deny that you can initiate action you seal yourself in. If you cannot remember what you did, you cease to be responsible for it and your action becomes the effect of some external cause. If you falsify what you have done, to yourself or others, you can never reap the joy of having done it or make amends for some mistake or even change your ways of behavior. "I did that!" is the key to freedom. Causing events--good or bad--and knowing it, is free will, is creation and being a god of sorts. (Kingsbury, 1965)

How do we, the normal people, get out of hell, become super-normal and in contact with the God-like potential in us?

III. THEORY AND TECHNOLOGY OF HELL

In order to escape our own private hell it is necessary to find out how we got there. The fundamental idea is that it is only your own sins which drive you crazy. What others do to you doesn't really matter.

A. DEFINITION OF SIN

When the word "sin" is used it does not refer to most of the types of actions that the Christian church refers to with the word "sin" Indeed, many of the actions which the church defines as sin were so defined for the purposes of control over their members. Certain very human actions were defined as sinful and the church was the only place where one could obtain absolution. Thus, since most people performed these acts and felt guilty they kept coming back to the church to be forgiven. The cycle was endless and by changing the definition of what was considered sinful, the church could tighten or loosen its hold over members. This is rather standard procedure of social control for any group. However, the potential for corruption and enslavement is very great as even the most cursory examination of the history of religion, east or west, will reveal.

The definition of sin used in this paper is primarily social-psychological or interpersonal. A sin is a harmful act performed by me against another person based on an error of judgment or perception. This is the fundamental sin. Along with sins there are also justifiers. A justification for my sin is the harmful things done to me by another person which I use or magnify to defend and make my own harmful act appear reasonable.

B. THE PROCESS OF SIN AND INSANITY

This is how we build our own custom made hells. First, there is a misunderstanding, misperception, error of judgment, mistake. On the basis of this I commit a harmful act against someone. Harmfulness has both an objective and subjective definition. Kingsbury (1963) defines it as "an act you do to someone that you would be unwilling to have anyone do to you." Christ said "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." The objective definition depends on a set of ethical principles and values (Glasser, Warren, 1969a) and if I accept these principles as my own then the objective and subjective definitions of harmfulness coincide.

Because this act was based on a misunderstanding the act will be felt by me, at some level of awareness to be unwarranted or inappropriate; that is, the other person did not really deserve the harm I did to him.

Now, unless I take responsibility for my own act and recognize that it was unwarranted, I will try to justify my harmful act. The way in which I justify it is to seek some "reasons" in the other person. These are usually the harmful acts that he did to me. These reasons must be of comparable magnitude to the harmful act I committed in order to fully justify and make reasonable my act.

If the other person is not sinful, that is if he is relatively clean and pure of harmful acts to me or if he is relatively clean of unfavorable traits, then I must distort and magnify the other person's faults. Thus you get statements of the form "Joe hasn't really done anything to me but the reason I did him dirt is that HE is sneaky." If there is very little in the other person to pick as a reason for my harmful act then I have to become more and more out of touch with reality. I have to blow up little things or invent nasty traits and deeds of the other in order to justify my behavior. One interesting

implication of this process is that if you are going to sin pick a sinful person to do it against because the purer the person against whom you sin the crazier you will become trying to explain why you did it (assuming that you do not accept responsibility for your act.) The tactic of non-violent resistance provides a good example. By being comparatively pure, the resister is not giving the aggressor any good reasons for his brutality and aggression. Thus the aggressor goes progressively more insane as the process continues. This is typical of any case of persecution of a relatively benign minority by an aggressive majority. The majority must go insane and distort reality and develop a form of social schizophrenia. Illustrations of this are the Nazi treatment of Jews, the use of non-violent resistance in the civil rights movement, the Viet Nam. war. The only way out is to assume responsibility for our own bad deeds and quit blaming others. In diagrammatic form we have:

Misunderstanding, misperception, etc.⇒ Harmful act, SIN	Path 1-----→	Justification: Seek reasons (the harmful acts of the other) of comparable magnitude to my harmful act to justify or make reasonable my act. If the other is not very sinful then I have to magnify the other's harmful act or invent some so that they are comparable. This process of distortion and magnification is insanity. Hell
	Path 2-----→	Recognition, confession, restitution, undoing, clean hands, sanity, serenity, ability. Heaven

Where path:

1 = withhold, hide, non-action, not assume responsibility.

2 = not withhold, reveal, confess, constructive action, assume responsibility for act.

Any person who listens to someone's justifiers will be driving that person insane. If you wish to send a person to hell just keep asking him "What did someone do to you?" This is the way to kill with kindness because he will be delighted to tell you all about what they did to him. The problem is that, unless he is already super-normal on responsibility, in which case he will not be interested in playing the game, he will tell you in terms of his justifiers. Every time he gives you a justification for his behavior the associated harmful act (sin) which he is hiding will turn on and become active. However, you most likely will miss this sin and so he will have to put more effort into denial and repression. The more he plays this game (in some cases it is called psychotherapy) the worse he will feel. If he keeps it up long enough he will be certain that life is not worth living, that he is useless, that he can not help but only harm, that he is evil and down and down he goes, faster and faster until he has reached his own private hell. (Kingsbury, 1963)

IV. THE THEORY AND TECHNOLOGY OF SALVATION

A. THE VICIOUS CIRCLE

Unfortunately, sending persons to hell is much easier than saving them.

How can you drive people sane? Or at least how can you prevent them from becoming more insane? Suppose John has sinned, in his own eyes, against you. What can you do? If you already know you are on your way to being super-normal. The very first thing you must do is simply be totally and completely aware of what you have done to them and be totally willing to assume responsibility for this. The reason this is necessary is that if you are not totally aware and responsible they will find this out and they will use your sins on them as their justifications. Then you will be forced to justify your acts and you will be throwing your own justifications back at them. This will eventually result in the exchange of accusations which will eventually result in mutual destruction if you continue to interact. More likely, it will result in a break of communication and total lack of ability to confront each other (Newcomb). This is the result in any situation where you are not being responsible for what you have done. It will not happen to a person who is being responsible, for the responsible person does not need to justify what he is doing. He just acts and he acts in the best interests of all.

B. TWO SIMPLE QUESTIONS AND AN ACTION

The way out of this trap is theoretically quite simple. Technically it is very tricky since most of us are normal and thus do not have clean hands.

The way out is basically a two step process. First you have to answer two simple little questions with total honesty.

1. "What have you done to___?" (You are especially interested in things you disapprove of and are thus hiding and withholding from others.)
2. "What have you withheld from___?"

These two questions are asked and answered alternating, first 1. and then 2. and so on until everything has been revealed. To be effective nothing must be held back, denied, suppressed, hidden. At first, you will only be able to remember the good things you did and withheld from the other. You will remember the favors you have done, the gifts given, the complements made, etc. or remember that you withheld telling the other about a favor, gift, or complement. When you become sufficiently able and aware you will start remembering the bad and shameful things done or hidden. This is the pay dirt and the digging must be total--unearth it all. It helps a great deal for the "digger-helper" to have clean hands when he is digging after your dirt. There is going to be a great deal of resistance on your part to having all these nasty little deeds exposed and it takes a very astute digger to notice when you have become aware of a memory of sin and should disclose it but do not quite have the courage to do so. The gentle nudging, probing, encouraging persistence of the helper is crucial at this time and the real skill of a helper is tested. He must know when pay dirt has been hit and must have the certainty and courage of his ability so that he will persist and not let you slip anything by which must be disclosed for your health. A super-normal helper can do this since there are no distortions in his perception of you and he can observe and listen with total awareness of your beingness (this, by the way, can be a rather unnerving experience for you.)

If these two questions have been properly worked then the action necessary will be relatively simple for the person to perform. It is necessary however to perform this action since confession is not sufficient in itself, although it is a necessary first step. The person must make amends, restitution, undo the damage done, and restore the communication lines that have been cut.

What can you do to either bring people closer to the heaven of super normality and contact with their God-like potential or at least prevent their sinking further into hell and insanity? You can, if you have the skill and if they are willing, unearth their sins. At least you can be able to communicate and to help them. (Warren, 1969b) If you have clean hands then this will be easy. If you are living your life on justifications this simple act will be next to impossible. The reason for this is that the very first thing that will happen to you when you communicate and help and grant beingness to a person who has sinned against you, will be his response of fear, hostility or hatred. (Newcomb) Only a person with clean hands can handle that serenely. By being nice to the other person you are creating a shortage of justifications for his own sins against you. The way a person hides his sins from himself is by keeping his attention on his justifications. If he does not have enough of these justifiers to occupy his attention, his sins keep coming into his awareness. His sin is precisely what he can not face and so the spiral of hate begins. He has to hate you with a passion just to find in you enough justifications to keep his sins buried and repressed in his subconscious.

If you are clever enough to find out exactly what this sin is which he committed and calmly acknowledge it, his hate will evaporate and turn into love. It is vital that you do not tell him what this sin is even if you know. He must discover it and reveal it himself. You can lose more friends by telling them about their sins, especially if you have hit real sin.

Thus, all you have to do is handle people who have sinned against you with serenity. Do not play the game of being their victim since being hurt is a justification for you and indicates that you are not clean and thus are vulnerable. Be able, be effective, be patient and always be able and willing to communicate and to help. Avoid violating the moral-ethical code you have chosen, but when you do violate it, be willing to take the responsibility for it and undo any harm that may have occurred. (Kingsbury, 1963)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Assagioli, R. Psychosynthesis: A Manual of Principles and Techniques, Hobbs, Dorman

Darley, J.M. and Latane, B. (1968) "When will people help in a crises?", Psychology Today, 2 (No. 7, December), pp. 54-57, 70-71

Dunn, H L (1961) High Level Wellness, R.W. Beatty Co., Arlington, VA

Frank, J.D. (1967) Sanity and Survival: Psychological Aspects of War and Peace, Random House

Fromm, E. (1968) "Man is driving 'nowhere' - and at increasing speed" Minneapolis Tribune 14 January

Glasser, W. (1965) Reality Therapy, Harper and Row

- Goldstein, K.(1939) The Organism, American Book Co.
- Goldstein, K. (1940) Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology, Schocken Books
- Huxley, L.A. (1963) You are Not the Target, Farrar, Straus and Co.
- Jourard, S.M. (1964) The Transparent Self, Van Nostrand
- Kingsbury, D. (1963) "Your sins and insanity" McGill Daily, McGill Univ., Montreal 2, P.Q., Canada, 13 Feb
- Kingsbury, D. (1965) "A goal for man" mimeographed
- Laing, R. (1967) The Politics of Experience, Ballantine Books
- McNeill, J.T. (1951) A History of the Cure of Souls, Harper and Row
- Maslow, A.H. (ed) (1959) New Knowledge in Human Values, Harper and Row,
- Maslow, A.H. (1969) Toward a Psychology of Being, VanNostrand
- Milgram S. (1965) "Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority" Human Relations, 18, 57-76
- Mowrer, O.H. (1960) "'Sin', the lesser of two evils", American Psychologist, 15, 301-304
- Mowrer, O.H. (1961) The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion, VanNostrand
- Mowrer, O.H. (1964) The New Group Therapy, VanNostrand
- Mowrer, O.H. (ed) (1967) Morality and Mental Health, Rand McNally and Co.
- Newcomb, T.M. (1959) "Autistic Hostility and Social Reality" M. Kuenzli (ed) The Phenomenological Problem, Harper, pp. 199-229
- Rogers, C.R. (1963) "The concept of the fully functioning person", Psychotherapy, Theory, Research and Practice, 1, 17 - 26
- Rogers, C.R. Stevens, B. et al (1967) Person to person: The Problem of Being Human; A new Trend in Psychology, Real People Press; Walnut Creek, CA.
- Rosenthal, A.M. (1964) Thirty-Eight Witnesses, McGraw-Hill
- St. Cloud Daily Times (1967) "Riot Drill 'surprises massgoers" St. Cloud Daily Times, St. Cloud, MN, 25 Sep.
- Sartre, J.P. No Exit and Three Other Plays, Random House, Vintage
- Sartre, J.P. (1965) "Playboy interview" Playboy

- Schofield, W. (1964) Psychotherapy: The Purchase of Friendship, Prentice-Hall (Sprectrum)
- Solberg, R. (1968) "Hell is other people" Speech to the St. Cloud Unitarian Fellowship, St. Cloud MN, 18 Feb.
- Szasz, T.S. (1961) The Myth of Mental Illness, Paul B. Hoeber
- Time Magazine (1967) "Citizen Primitivo" Time, 8 Dec. p.28
- Warren, P.W. (ed) (1964) An Introduction to the Philosophy of L.R. Hubbard, mimeographed
- Warren P.W. "The scientific study of experiences called religious"; Darshana International, 1967, 7, (July, #3) pp. 74-97; 1967, 7, (Oct., #4) pp. 67-79; 1968, 8, (Jan., #1) pp. 46-57; 1968, 8, (Apr., #2) pp. 10-18.
- Warren, P.W. (1969a) "A conceptual Framework for designing an Ethical Value System" unpublished
- Warren, P.W. (1969b) "Listening: How to win Friends and save People" unpublished
- Zavalloni, R. (1955) Self Determination: The Psychology of Personal Freedom, Forum Books, Chicago IL