Journey to Self

A Psychological Roadmap

And

A Model of Emotional Development

By

Hugh McGovern

Model

				Emotions	Preferences	Feelings	Model of relatedness			
Child Phase		Childhood Self Concept	*Defined by*	Emotions	Preferences	Feelings	Model of relatedness			
			Parents							
			Older Siblings							
			Trauma							
			Neurotic Beliefs							
		Results in								
Adult Phase		Known Self-Concept		*Emotional Seperation*						
		With Ego defences		the ability see ones self-concept as distinct from other people - usually parents						
		Reality applies pressure	*Responses*	*Failure to separate emotionally*						
Vulnerable	Stable A	Very Unhealthy	*Loss/Regain of known self concept vs. reality*	*I, Matt, Fergal Padraig, John etc failed to find emotional seperation on parents*						
Self			Depression/Breakdowns	*which led to a loss of known self-concept almost a rebound or a boomerang effect*						
concepts										
	Stable B	Unhealthy	*Otherwise*	*Mark (Tom), Dad (Mum), Mum (Children), Claire (Daniel)*						
			Neurotic Adult	*found emotional seperation on parents but reach impasse on growth. They stay neuroti*						
				or uses medication to prevent loss of known self-concept						
	Stable C	Healthy Development	*Normal Development of Adult Self-Concept*							
			they have a stable worldview based on their self-concept							
			stable but resistant to further self-development							
			Completely unwind ego defenses							
Enlightened		Actual Self-concept = Reality = Self								
		Works up to								
		Aggregated self-concepts								

Introduction

As humans we undergo a developmental journey as we grow and develop through life. Our self-concept goes through a variety of stages. There is the childhood self-concept where parents and siblings form the framework of that self-concept. As we move into teen years the need for differentiation grows and becomes gradually more apparent. This is kicked off by puberty and results in ever increasing needs for independence and freedom. The young adult self-concept begins when the individual leaves the family home and makes his or her own way in life. This stage of the self-concept can continue for much of the individual's life. The final stage therefore is the developed, self-concept which takes account of all developmental experience and is a stable, long-term, and steady self-concept.

Along the way there are many pitfalls. Trauma has a profound impact on the developing self-concept. The two principal forms of trauma are bereavement and abuse.

Given the right conditions anyone could experience any of the major depressive disorders. These circumstances can arise potentially in any developing self-concept.

To reveal and actualize the self-concept is the journey we are all embarked upon. The self-revelation of the self-concept we would hope to accomplish as early in life as possible and then the rest of our lives would be spent continually actualizing our self-concept. It is the struggle that defines so many lives. They are lives of unnecessary confusion and disillusionment. It is possible to end this internal struggle. It is the fact that they struggle internally that conflicts them with the people around them. People want to get on with other people.

Everyone is engaged in the struggle to know themselves. It is as a natural and fundamental a desire as it is to be human. Our lives are a series of victories and defeats in this regard as we uncover more of our self-concept and learn and gain more insight. Contrary to our belief the world does not stand in

opposition to our progress to self nor is it opposed in any way to that eventuality. It is we who are guilty of misinterpretation and we who choose to believe things that are inimical to our own progress.

That said the suffering is plain to see and many struggle under the burden of misapprehension and false belief. There are therapies, interventions, elixirs, places people can go, but there is no doubt that the world can be a sad and lonely place to those struggling to find themselves. The options are often unpalatable and unlikely to be permanent solutions.

So we struggle on and that is what we are advised, cajoled and encouraged. So for those of us with a surfeit of pain isolation and separation seems the only possible strategy. We take our pain and we go elsewhere. Elsewhere can be the bar it can be on top of a mountain it can be alone and eschewing human contact. We avoid relationships not wanting to hurt or offend and the world shrinks and becomes very dark and dreary.

And yet these are some of the feelings we have all had at some time regardless of how well adjusted we feel or consider ourselves to be. This is because they are human feelings and though the intensity may vary from person to person we have all felt that at some time or other.

And yet suppose we came to the awareness that all people regardless of circumstance are trying to get to the same place and through a myriad of different philosophies and religions and popular psychology and therapies and so on they are all travelling to the same place. And that place is to them to themselves. And to get there they must take the breath that is true, they must to thine ownselves be true. Irrespective of how hard or difficult or challenging that may be.

That is the Journey to Self. And that is the road we all travel.

There was a time in the distant past when the world was a very different place for humans. It was dangerous and full of predators. Food was scarce and lifespans were brutally short. Humans lived miserable lives and their perceptions were determined by instinct and their conscious brains were not as developed as ours. Even a casual visit to the zoo reminds us of how much we have in common with our closest relatives the apes.

A woman simply is, but a man must become. Masculinity is risky and elusive. It is achieved by a revolt from woman, and it is confirmed only by other men.

It is probable all humans now living could claim to be related if their ancestry was traced back far enough. Whereas it is unlikely that all living humans had a common mother however far back in history we must travel to find her is at least plausible that we all have a common psychic heritage. It not reasonable to assume that

Further we are only now beginning to appreciate the reality of our similarities. One global culture suggests the uniformity of one human psyche and yet we have a deeper appreciation and respect for our individualism than we ever did which means a greater sense of self than ever before. So it would appear that the national psyche was a tool for human development that only got us so far and now may even be in the way of that ongoing development. Where the individual psyche competes so too did the

national psyche and those competitions frequently led to war and other deep disagreements. If we look further back into history the discord is even more profound.

The Self-Concept – Stages of Development

I think now there is a known self-concept and on the borders of the known self-concept are ego defenses. So deconstructing ones ego defenses allows the self-concept to grow and eventually one gets to the point where one no longer needs a self-concept. The self-concept is a mental construct based on interaction and experience. It is a developmental tool. I don't believe children have any particular sense of a self-concept which is why they are so natural and delightful but they start to develop one as they grow. By the time they are young adults they have a self-concept and they structure their lives accordingly.

If I think about my self-concept I can see it was idealized. There is only one self-concept. As child this self-concept is idealized. And as one grows and experiences more of reality the self-concept becomes more realistic.

Is self-concept innate or is it nurtured? Is the development of self-concept the struggle to divest oneself of the neuroticism of parents and trauma? The known self-concept is fundamentally self-righteous. What we see and perceive and how we make sense of it seems like the greatest of good sense to us.

The self-concept is made up of everything an individual knows, everything they have been told, every person they have interacted with and everything they have ever read or learned. The self-concept is dynamic not static and is constantly absorbing new information and computing new scenarios as we experience, live life and go through life.

How this information is classified and stored in the self-concept is dependent on the individual's perception of the self-concept. This however can become fixated and inaccurate due to trauma and neurotic beliefs. In effect the individual sees themselves not as they are but as they think they are.

For self-knowledge and self-awareness harmonizing the individual's perception of their self-concept with their actual self-concept is the key to self-realization. This is the journey to self we are all embarked upon, a journey which has profound implications for our lives and for the lives of those around us.

The construct is very obvious from a biological point of view. We are all separate, unique and individual human beings. There is no collectivity that we don't choose for ourselves and the notion of coerced collectivity we find reprehensible and offensive to our liberties and dignity.

From an emotional standpoint the construct is not obvious. We are told from an early age and we believe that we need certain things, that we need certain people as though our biological survival was contingent on these externalities.

The fact is that our survival is not contingent on our relationships we only believe that it is.

Confusion arises therefore as a matter of perception. We perceive ourselves to be less than distinct. This is an assumption we make ourselves, alone. It is also a perception that we can correct in ourselves.

Correcting this misapprehension brings self into greater focus and clarity. We are not alone but we are distinct. Our culture rarely acknowledges this distinction. It is not to be feared to be who we are. In fact it is a realization greatly to be celebrated.

Because in truth the divorce or schism that can develop within the psyche can be vast indeed and it is possible and many of us do become lost in ourselves – trapped in our own trauma unresolved and confused and befuddled by a myriad of unresolved needs and impulses, all of which are pressing by times.

Life is a confusing place. It might be truer to say that life is obtuse because from our earliest years we are encouraged to look outside when in truth we should be looking within. The world makes impressions on our psyche – rather like an old camera places an image on a photographic plate. That which is stored and remembered has significance and only the individual can assess what that significance is - the more vivid the image the deeper the impression.

What profoundly affects one individual might be a passing inconvenience to another. It is in this realization of distinctness that true self emerges and the individual reveals their true colors. In this state the individual has the capacity to be happy because they realize that happiness is an internal matter and they no longer externalize it. In short they are looking in the right place.

According to the I Ching, your primary obligation in life is to work on your relationship to yourself. Get that relationship right and your relationship to other people, to the creative process, to sex, time, money, body, career, collective, cosmos will be as good as they possibly can be. But neglect or reject any part of that relationship and your relation to all those things will be accordingly diminished and distorted.

Self is defined in the arena of mother, father, brother, sister, lover, wife, husband, son, daughter. There is nothing else. The vision is to help all around. Now I see the link between the past and the present. It is a living organic link. It is how past trauma comes into the present. So yes there is an inherited baggage but it is environmentally schooled. At least I account for it that way.

It seems to be the case that unwinding the ideation cycle – the cycle of repressed/rationalized emotions leads to the revealing of the emotional self. The emotional self is therefore the self-concept congruent with reality having taken on board all experience and resolved it emotionally. The process has been releasing trapped emotions. Allowing and experiencing each rationalized feeling which has become ideation. Each permission leads to that ideation being resolved.

Innate self-concept – Nature/Genetic

I was creative child – I was born creative. Going through the development cycle I struggled to be creative and was more often practical than creative and didn't realize that I was fundamentally and innately creative. Realizing that became my developmental struggle – in part. I see also that creative realism is my stable, mature brand of creativity and that pure creativity such as pure fiction would not be something I was strongly gifted in. The creative realism is stronger, such as psychological models and so on. So this is realization of self.

Creative realism allows for the deductive, reductive, analytical side of nature and applies this creatively. Fiction is highly subjective and there not too many rules save only are you a good story teller.

Again on an emotional level I was always for fair play, no drama, placid, let's work it out, meet you half way. Those are my innate keynotes. In my emotional relationship with my mother I struggled with these keynotes. This led to emotional realization.

Trauma again imposed a profound conflict on my innate self-concept, one I really struggled to resolve. This led ultimately to trauma resolution.

People are born with their innate self-concept. These are their defining attributes. It is a legacy from their parents, genetic or otherwise. The point is this is who the individual is, and in their developmental stage who they strive to be whether in futility or ultimately effectively. It can be regarded as an individual's key notes – their defining attributes and characteristics. Really development is the process of unveiling/affirming the innate self-concept to the world. And in the developmental stage that innate self-concept will be neurotically/episodically on display. To see an innate self-concept fully actualized is always a beautiful thing.

It seems to be laid down very early on in life. We set out in life to prove our innate self-concept and this really is what characterizes the challenges, success and failures we experience. This is the fundamental metric by which we judge ourselves. We respond to situations and people based on our innate self-concept. Even when we don't know what our innate self-concept is we still respond in this way. Emotions also guide us to our innate self-concept. Things that upset or anger us are usually caused by violations of this innate self-concept.

Who looks outside, dreams; who looks inside, awakes. Carl Jung

Innate self is ones true profile and it is defined and delineated by self. The best environment one can offer a child is one in which they can be themselves and develop those areas of themselves that they find most interesting and appealing. The type of parenting and educational environment that supports this will be the most effective. Children need be encouraged in developing areas they possess a natural adeptness in. This will allow them to be happy in what they do and to have developed a skill and capacity in that area.

This natural adeptness that all children possess in their respective areas is a preference for doing certain things. In other words it makes the child happy to do that which they are good at doing. And conversely they become upset and frustrated when they are given a task they don't possess a natural competency in. For a parent to push their child into an area in which they have no natural competency is a recipe for inner conflict and unhappiness.

Everyone has talents and unfortunately the current developmental process often does not bring those talents to the fore. People are miscast in the wrong roles. People are ignoring or suppressing their talents. This leads to tremendous frustration and disillusionment for people. The current system of parenting and education does not take this into account. If it were possible to identify true preferences

in students earlier than the educational system could be restructured to streamline at an earlier age. This would have the advantage of not exposing students to areas that are not of interest to them nor which they are likely to take any further interest in.

There is no rational solution to loss, abuse or any of the other traumas that deeply affect people. That is not to say there is no solution. The solution is emotional and that involves yielding to the feelings that have so deeply marked the individual. These feelings cannot be rationalized away. They cannot be pushed out of awareness forever. However to force someone to confront deeply traumatic feelings is a mistake. The true emotional landscape can often only be revealed gradually and over time. The OK state needs to grow gently and stably.

Yielding to long repressed feelings is not something one can do overnight. It can only really be done gradually and in a safe way. There is danger here with such powerful feelings, danger that the feelings will overtake and swamp the individual.

Nature versus Nurture – Link document

The innate self-concept is nature and the developmental self-concept is defined by nurture/experience. The discrepancy between the two causes stress and anxiety and leads to the self-concept struggle.

Everyone is unique but the things people experience are not unique and affect them in predictable ways. It is possible to classify experience into categories and infer what impact that has on an individual's behavior and outlook. It is not possible however to replicate the unique set of experiences and timing of those experiences that determines the known concept.

However we can clearly see in aggregate self-concepts such as nationalism how shared events have a common impact on all members of a national grouping.

Developing self-concept/Nurture & Experience/Representing self

The known self-concept is dynamic and grows and goes through a developmental cycle. It grows towards the innate self-concept. In this regard the developing individual has to divest themselves of beliefs and associations that do not facilitate this growth.

It is defined by trauma and defended by ego defenses. The known self-concept is only a partial understanding of the innate self-concept. Hence the known self-concept can be quite different from the innate self-concept and consequently fragile and vulnerable to pressure and stress. The known self-concept is determined by trauma and associated neurotic beliefs.

The known self-concept is the idealized self. What else can it be? And the developmental process of journey to self is to unwind self-idealization in favor of reality. And that people who are quite advanced in terms of self-knowledge can still be very self-idealizing.

The development journey is then the experience of the inevitable collusion between reality and the idealized self and the outcome is self-awareness.

This is the means by which the individual perceives reality. This is the part of our psyche with which we are comfortable. It is our known self. We display this side of ourselves to the people around us – to our world. It is however not the complete story of who we are. There is more – much more. Who can say exactly how much? The revealing or gradual unveiling of self is the greatest mystery that we are all engaged in.

We fear threats to the stability of the known self and yet it is precisely these threats that allow us to grow. Fear therefore defines the known self. And change or growth of self involves a confrontation with fear and avoiding that confrontation ensures that self remains at its current level of development.

My self-concept includes everyone who has passed through my life to date. I can't change that. Nor do I need to. So I do wish to respond to their issues as much as I can. That's my world - the world conceived by my self-concept. And it will change as time goes on and as long as I live. This is the reason in my belief why Jung takes about the necessity of responding to the world. It's my self-concept but I have struggled to integrate it all together. I have known for a very long time then when I did I would be free. So there it is.

The mistake I made was trying to understand other people. That never mattered. I only ever needed to understand myself and when I made progress in this area things started to change. I already have the knowledge of how I feel about other people. They are already part of my self-concept. So I only need to consult my own feelings. I don't need to follow them around. They don't even need to be alive. I don't ever struggle against external forces. I struggle against myself.

I have formed impressions of other people as I have interacted with them. But other people are not knowable to me. And don't need to be. I need to know only how I feel about them. A child may well be a solipsist but an adult cannot afford to be.

Childhood
Children idealize their parents. Children have a sense of self. Children perceive the world through the lens of their parents.

It seems likely that any kind of major instability or unpredictability in a child's environment when they are growing up will cause them problems. But principally that has to come from the parents - and or the externality of trauma. It's difficult to quantify things like emotional abuse - failure to identify with either parent - must be pretty catastrophic. Things like divorce, parents fighting all the time, money instability, lots of moving, changing address, changing schools. All these things make growing up difficult and enshrine uncertainty at the heart of the formative self-concept.

But in the main these things are all an index of the stability of the parents. One person on their own can create a realm of stability around them. It's easy to see how.

Children tend to idealize older people in their environment these can be parents, an older siblings or a guardian or even a teacher or authority figure. It is important that this relationship is stable for as long

as it takes the child to grow and develop their self-concept. Should anything happen to this older person severe trauma will result.

This idealization is focused on adults who create or offer the conditions the child needs to grow in. So the child will always have a stronger preference for adult who facilitate their ongoing development. The child needs and wants to grow. The child wants to grow and develop their innate self-concept.

A severe incompatible between the child's innate self-concept and that of his parents will severely complicate the process of development.

…a severe psycho-spiritual incompatibility between the labeled patient and one or both parents…P Breggin

Children idealize life and other people. They find meaning in everything and fascination in the smallest things. Their world is full of color and excitement and meaning. Children are in touch with their feelings. That is immediately obvious. They openly express how they feel and they are unashamed in so doing. Children are much happier than adults in general. Of course children can become unhappy but it is usually in response to some particular event or situation. They are much more egalitarian in their approach to living. They accept the implications of their gregarious nature and seek out the company of their fellows naturally. They accept how they feel. And they don't externalize their feelings and seek external confirmation for those feelings. They just accept the way they feel. This acceptance allows them to express openly and freely their own feelings in a way that their parents never would. Where their parents repress they express. They cry openly in public. The throw tantrums when they don't get what they want.

Children are happier than adults because their innate self-concept more closely matches their known self-concept. Of course this all starts to change as they grow up.

Scenario – "What-if" Based Reasoning

Children like stories and identify and relate to story/scenario based messages. Children personify fears and then place those personalities into scenarios where they interact and struggle. This is the nature of childish reasoning.

Childhood Idealization

Children have an idealized view of reality one that is naturally, over time replaced with a more realistic adult-like view. When this process of idealization to realization is impeded by trauma the result is a neurotic adult, an adult who struggles with reality.

Every child idealizes their parents and the revelation of self is the deconstruction of that idealism. Children who have a severe incompatibility with their parents tend to idealize the relationship even more. Its paradise lost and paradise must be regained.

Mimicry

Children mimic their parents as they grow. Children observe their parents and the dynamic of their parent's relationship and seek to replicate something similar in their own life. This is in part because the child's self-concept is attuned to their parents and relating to their parents. The child learns early on acceptable and desirable behavior from his parents.

However neurotic beliefs inherited from parents are not innate to children so the developing self-concept ultimately rejects their inherited neurotic beliefs and often replaces them with their own set of neurotic beliefs based on their own struggle to achieve a stable self-concept.

So the children of a neurotic marriage could end up avoiding marriage rather than risk another relationship like the one they were born into.

Idealization to realization

The natural process is that a childish idealization should give way to a more adult-like realism reflective of the individual's experience and of their growing and ever changing self-concept. Unfortunately the road to realization can be severely interrupted by trauma and if this happens the child can grow to be an adult with very many idealizations about themselves. Unfortunately these idealizations are not going to find any basis in reality and become an ongoing frustration and irritation to the idealizing adult. Simply their self-concept does not sync with reality.

Such idealizations as may occur or remain as a result of trauma are usually impervious to change and time. The ego defends the self-concept.

Key to self-awareness is of course acceptance of the reality of one's own experience. Unquestioned childhood idealizations become neurotic beliefs. The individual struggles with the belief because it doesn't tally with reality but his self-concept will not admit the difference.

Since an adult's perception of reality is far deeper childhood idealization becomes problematic in adult. These idealizations become neurotic beliefs - beliefs that don't find resonance in reality and yet are too vital to the adult's self-concept to be surrendered. These adults find themselves in the unhappy place of struggling with life. Life to them is characterized by struggle. But it is an internal struggle. They battle the evidence of their own eyes every day. There is a species to the adult neurotic that finds himself defeated by reality time and again. And yet his ego always defends and he struggles on.

Teenage - Puberty - Eroticism of the self-concept

Puberty kicks off the self-concept development process. Teenagers begin to question and struggle with their childhood idealizations. They are becoming aware of the world outside their parents remit. The world their parents cannot control and have no influence over.

It's a growing sense of differentiation between the child/teenager and the people around him – primarily parents. The child is growing up and seeks ever more independence and freedom to determine his own life. Puberty is the beginning of the development of self cycle. Sexuality drives the differentiation. And it is the child's desire to sexually define them that motivates them to change and develop their self-concept. In terms of the development of the self-concept therefore the relationship between the child

and the parent of the opposite gender becomes the motivating and defining force in terms of self-development.

Puberty leads to a sense of alienation from family, and a desire for individualization. The newly sexual teenager wants to grow and develop in his own space and in his own way.

This is where the need for differentiation from parents becomes first apparent. Teenagers rebel against their parental templates. Their motivation or involvement in the lives of their parents comes about as a desire to constructively intervene, assist and help.

With puberty comes the first desire to externalize and the conviction that the individual needs to seek someone outside of himself or herself. It is the fundamental driver of externalization and of course it has a biological origin.

Eroticism of the self-concept

Self is our first and only love. Dreams of self - What self should be? With puberty the self-concept becomes sexualized.

Young Adult
The young adult leaves the familial/parental background with his/her ego defenses and sets off to make his way in the world and interact with other people not from his familial background. His success or failure in this will depend on the extent to which his/her self-concept approximates to reality.

Developed Self-Concept - Composed of three parts – Necessitates
In the stable developed stage of self-concept trauma has been resolved, the emotional self is fully realized and the self is realized also.

Trauma Resolution
For loss and abuse this entails emotional acceptance.

Emotional Realization (Opp. Gender Parent)
This leads on to a realization of one's emotional self. This determines one's model of relatedness and the quality and character of one's relatedness to the opposite sex. There is a necessity for Emotional Differentiation from Parent Opp. Gender

Models of relatedness are universally consistent from what I can see. So the first guy was probably emotionally abusive like Mary's Joe with his drinking, or Jane's Steven. The relationship failed obviously which was no doubt quite depressing. D would never do that. D is okay because he can be controlled. Anto/Thomas/Father - impossible - no time for them.

So that's the development for MF and Mary and Jane and my mum likewise. It strikes me that development of emotional self requires differentiation. Otherwise how am I different from the parental relationship of the opposite sex - I am not.

I think we all start out in matters relatedness with the idealized template based on the parental relationship and then based on our interactions with the opposite sex we start to develop a sense of emotional self, which ultimately should grow to maturity and stability but may not. So therefore we approach relatedness with the opposite sex initially on the basis of

So model of relatedness needs to grow and differentiate.

Emotional bargaining is always with the parent of the opposite gender.

Emotional abusive relationship –conflicted/unstable/reactionary -– based on paternal template

This is the pivotal relationship that spurs emotional growth. This is a growth relationship. That's what makes it interesting and attractive. The individual is learning about themselves. This type of relationship challenges the developing self-concept quite severely. The relationship forces the developing self-concept to grow by challenge. It's an abusive and unstable relationship because it is offensive to the innate self-concept. But it does at least teach the individual something concerning who they are and what they preferences are in matters of relatedness.

This relationship is key emotional learning relationship. Herein the emotional self is stretched to the max and the developing self-concept put under intense pressure. This relationship is the transformative emotional relationship which shifts the individual's sense of self into an accelerated growth phase.

This can also be a cyclical recurrent relationship if there is no emotional growth potential.

Emotionally stable relationship –stable - long term

The stable long term relationship therefore will be the partner unlike the emotional parent model. This partner will be differentiated from the maternal/paternal template and that allows for emotional stability of relatedness in the developing self.

Self Realization (Same Gender Parent)

Self-realization involves taking the struggle of the same sex parent and resolving that struggle whatever that struggle may be. If the parent struggles with their creativity then self-realization for the child will entail resolving that struggle. Mary's Mum struggles with her assertiveness and normal gives way to other people. Mary's mum is very sensitive and takes things quite personally and so do her two daughters. That to me is the limiting factor because that prevents growth of self that kind of sensitivity and shyness.

In my case this entailed the realization of my creative self and resulted in creative realism. In the development phase this is evidenced by my struggles in the office and my struggle to express my creativity.

In Mary's case the Mum struggles with assertiveness and objectivity and Mary does too. Mary undersells herself consistently. MF would be shy too. Could that be MFs regret that domesticity will prevent her self-realization? Jane/Claire stable creative is required for their self-realization. For Hughie M stable

creativity would be self-realization. He asked Jane about making a record. Mark and John creative but on the paternal side obviously.

Emotions – Pointers to self

Emotions are feelings. When feelings or emotions are repressed ideation results.

What we like takes us closer to ourselves or offers that possibility and what we dislike takes us further from ourselves or prevents us from progressing to ourselves. Emotions are pointers – a road map on the direction of self.

Emotions determine preference. They determine like and dislike. They determine where we live, what we do, who we form relationships with and how happy we are likely to be in those lifestyles. They are fundamental to our well-being and our

An important watershed in an individual's emotional development is the realization of the role he or she plays in their own problems. Up to this point the individual assumes that their emotional state is beyond their control. Beyond this point lies the potential for empowerment.

Of course for some individuals they may opt for using medication to control their depression and their emotions. When they have a problem or are worried about losing control they contact their doctor and ask for the medication to be increased or adjusted. They don't seriously engage in the task of understanding their own psychology and would find such an effort unrewarding, risky and stressful.

This is of course a safe place. It can be a holding place. It can be permanent. Or it can be a place from which to explore disordered emotions and a place from which to start this process.

The best treatment for clinical depression is probably an initial period of medication followed by a psychological investigation into the root causes of emotional disorder. This is also rendered more difficult by medication since many medications used to treat depression suppress emotions. It may be that exploring these disordered emotions requires a certain level of emotional awareness, a level of awareness that may not be possible for a heavily medicated individual. Also given the polarized state of the clinical approach to depression

If the individual is willing to undertake the journey to greater emotional order in their life then the process can begin. Often the individual will clear idea in their rational mind as to what is bothering them. However there is a separation between the rational mind and the emotive mind. So knowing something rationally does not in any way address the emotions that are the cause of that rational observation.

For example an individual may be aware that their mother's death when they were ten had a huge impact on them. This would be a rational truth. But the feelings of loss and bereavement and rage and separation that the individual suppressed are still buried and are still causing that individual problems. He has rationally dismissed these feelings many times as feelings he does not want to deal with or cope

with and so they have remained. Again that these feelings have been suppressed and remain latent is because they could not be processed at the time the event that sparked them occurred.

Again the methodology of depression is that the individual cannot cope with feelings. To reverse and unwind the buried feelings they need to separated and classified and comprehended and processed. To do this the individual usually in conjunction at least some of the time with a therapist needs to break down and deconstruct the block of undifferentiated and terrifying feelings.

It is helpful therefore to recognize that the individual whose mother died aged 10 is in part suffering from trapped and unprocessed feelings of loss. The loss of his mother has not been emotionally released and integrated. As a child he could not cope with the fact of his mother's death so emotionally he didn't accept that she was dead. Rationally of course he knew she was dead. But emotionally the feeling of her death was trapped and suppressed.

Any approach to this feeling is usually accompanied by extreme stress and agitation. It is rarely therefore in the conscious mind of the individual but always influencing behavior and outlook. To have an unprocessed loss usually results in a bi polar emotional response. Not one that necessarily would result in a diagnosis of bi polar but an episodic emotional response to situations, events and so on. The methodology of such a response is positive cycles of energy and enthusiasm when the individual believes they are approaching the truth of their emotional dysfunction and then followed by negative cycles of depression, disillusionment and sadness when the individual realizes emotionally that they cannot resolve the loss in any way.

Plausibly then as time goes on and the cycle is reenacted without resolution a long term depression is a more likely result as the individual realizes or believes that they cannot resolve their emotional disorder and nothing they do is going to result in a difference. This would be very different in character to the more youthful optimism that they can find the answers they seek and resolve their emotional disorder.

Of course depression comes in many varieties and not all of them follow an episodic cycle.

Emotional Self is the Ego
Is the emotional self the ego? Then ego defenses are a heart wall and a wall that people build around their emotional self. Children build heart walls against their parents and trauma.

Link Between Emotions and Ideation
Behind the ideation there is always an emotion.

The desirable state of emotional congruence is that we act on something when we feel it. However in the developmental state this is not possible often so the feeling the emotion becomes rationalized and as a result becomes part of the ideation cycle. As the ideation cycle grows this gives rise to an ever increasing divorce between self – the emotional self and the rational self – the self-concept. To find ones way back to emotional congruence – emotional harmony requires deconstructing the cycle of ideation – the cycle of repressed and unexpressed emotions that have been rationalized. This is the link between emotions and ideation. It is the mind's attempt to rationalize feelings. Perhaps in this sense I can appreciate that

although other people did not experience the kind of divorce I experienced between self-concept the emotional self. They may however still have trouble understanding their own feelings.

Can ideation really hold back emotion denied? Ideation strives to work out feelings. Rationalizes them. So ideation acts to protect against extreme emotional outrage abuse and loss. An ideation wall is constructed against the traumatic experience. This is composed of many ideas, beliefs, and impressions.

The idea is not that abuse or loss didn't happen – the lie perpetrated on self is I didn't feel it. As self well knows one did feel it but deeply repressed it, necessarily so.

Rationally I always knew my brother had died. Rationally my mother always knew her father abused her and hit her mother. But <u>emotionally</u> that I did not know, nor did my mother or does my mother.

In both instances with abuse and loss the individual in order to cope to survive denies the feelings associated with that experience. This sets up a cycle of ideation concerning the experience. In order to cope with this cycle as the individual goes through life they accumulate more and more justifications for the ideation cycle. This then becomes their stable self – loss/regain model, neurotic.

The trauma ideation cycle prevents emotional growth. The cycle must be resolved or reduced before there can be more emotional growth. Progress on the ideation cycle liberates more of the emotional self for growth.

If the Universe doesn't make mistakes, why do seemingly bad things happen to good people? The answer is they don't. We label them as bad. Many people view death as bad and label it that way when someone close to them dies. They become depressed and use it as a reason to drink. I remember when my mother died I celebrated her death by having a beautiful dinner, knowing that she had left her old, tired body and gone home. P306

Between Trauma and Ideation

Between Emotional Self-Development and Ideation – Defined in opposition to parent of opp. gender
Emotional self is determined by how one related to the parent of the opposite gender. The evolution of this realization or its inertia or apathy determines the development of the emotional self. The emotional self determines relatedness with the opposite sex and forms the basis for the individual's model of relatedness. As the individual's self-concept develops so too does the emotional self which should grow to be more self-reliant and independent and become a vindication of childhood self-concept.

Between Self-Realization and Ideation

Emotions are Repressed/Consequences
Repressed emotions lead to ideation about those repressed feelings. These are simply feelings the individual does not communicate to anyone else. What if it is this simple – if you don't talk about it – it becomes ideation? So if you grow up in an environment where feelings are not shared and discussed then you will have a lot of ideation about feelings. I remember now I never talked about how I felt. I

always talked about how other people felt or listened to them. Essentially the cure is to talk about the feelings to someone who critically understands.

"Certainly yours was not a household where feelings were readily shared." Clare Regan

One of the major obstacles on the road to self is emotional repression. This is very simply the process of suppressing how one feels. Emotions are seen as problematic, embarrassing, something to be hidden, and certainly not for public consumption. Children internalize these messages and from early on repress their own emotions. Emotions are not viewed as constructive things to be had. It's not hard to appreciate how people have trouble with their own emotions. But these emotions are an indication of the true self. Repressing these emotions for whatever reason will impede progress on the road to self. Further repressing emotions does not lead to an integrated life where self is comfortably established at the center of a hub of family, friends and community. Often due to internalizations – a policy of repression develops – perhaps the parents are in the habit to emotional repression – then this policy will be adopted by the child. Unfortunately emotions are our only guide to us. They are the messengers of true preference and so they cannot be ignored.

Emotions repressed and not processed become ideation

Cycle of repressed emotions => Cycle of ideation
This cycle for me was trauma driven. It was the constant mania and depression of utopia followed by apocalypse and the struggle of ideation I imposed on myself by resisting the emotional reality of Brian's death.

Dreams/Nightmares/ Projection
Dreams and nightmares are really challenges to the self-concept.

Dreams are scenarios or parables which work out the issues of the moment. When people are asleep the conscious brain is switched off and dreams create pictorial/storyboard scenarios related to current issues. Dreams should be interpreted for what insights they offer towards fulfillment of the self-concept. Dreams are messages from the sub-conscious. They are signposts on the road to self and vivid dreams should be pondered for their meaning. The sub-conscious is guiding the individual to a closeness with self and acts as an encouragement on that journey.

Dreams are the projection of what self can become.

Dreams are clearly emotional expression in its allegorical form. Losing self is emotional overwhelm. It happens to people who don't know how they feel.

Nightmares are an allegorical representation of fears about fulfilling self. And nightmares normally highlight scenarios, situations, people and behaviors that are not conducive to the task of knowing self. It is a message to say that this is a barrier or an obstacle to self. This is an obstacle that needs to be overcome before the individual can proceed on their journey to self.

Nightmares are the projection of what self can but should not become or remain.

The priest at Mass today said that a dream therapist stated the dreams concerned "health & wholeness" and that they are implications for an individual and the world.

That being the case then in time my dreams, which were global and apocryphal, will impact the world. The best view I can place on all this is it is the magnet drawing me forward. Beyond that I cannot say at this point. I had visions and dreams of the total destruction of all life on this world, of the death and corruption of everything. And that nothing escaped. That there was no redeeming spirituality amongst people that I could discern and the question was posed to me why should humanity be spared and I begged and asked for more time.

In this context I can see why I would be apprehensive about anything that would suggest that this dreams and visions had implication beyond my personal life. If they did then I would be committed to another crusade or mission almost immediately upon freeing myself from the last.

It is a very natural human tendency to project fears onto an unknowable world and an unknowable universe. The fact is that we have always had this tendency and so a rich baggage of ideas and concepts has grown up attendant on this inclination. The problem for us is that many of these ideas simply no longer make sense and what might have spurred on human development in times past now creates tension, illogicality and

Emotional Problems

Intensity

Unfortunately it is very difficult to interpret emotions or emotional reactions that are very intense. The intensity is problematic and is not usually caused by the immediate trigger. There is some baggage of trapped emotion that is intensifying the emotional reaction. Usually with intense and inexplicable emotional reactions the individual ends up repressing the event after it has happened. This of course is unfortunate because major clues to the individual's emotional well-being are contained in such outbursts. On the scale of emotional intensity the intensity is determined by how deeply the individual has internalized their own fears, traumas etc.

Also I realize that I can't really blame my parents for my strenuous desire to relate to them. They didn't intend for that so that portion of the intensity of anger/rage I need to put my hand up and take that as mine. The emotional intensity of course is the frustration – the failed effort.

I understand now that the frustration I feel in trying to relate to other people is my own fault and I can control it and I can stop doing it. Before it would have been beyond my control - incompetent parenting was the latest. Does incompetent parenting led to an incompetent son?

It is clearer to me now that being caught in cycle of recrimination with my parents is the best explanation and justification for my inertia and rage because it's my life not anyone else's and the best explanation for emotional intensity.

"The process of being brought up however well done - never fails to offend." Lewis

I see now that manic confidence is disconnected from emotional reality. So too are feelings of culpability which become overwhelming and terrible. When really the matters at hand are quite trivial. Is this sense the depressed individual cannot be expected to take on any real responsibility because their emotional reactions to even the slightest ambiguity are intense and overwhelming. As a result a lot of depressed individuals are unemployed, single and living on the charity of other family members. In practice therefore they contrive to avoid any scenario which triggers such feelings of vulnerability. Their ego defenses are extremely heightened. The unresolved ideation and associated physiological responses therefore are response for the intense emotional reactions to minor inconveniences.

It's clear to me now that my emotional reactions are highly intensified. I feel excessively bad about the trivial things. Clearly I could either blame myself a lot or not at all. So I was inclined to blunder into situations without any feeling of blame but later feel terribly badly about it. In fact in terms of personal culpability people pray to be absolved from their own capacity to commit transgressions, self-forgiveness is apparently no kind of forgiveness. And yet a man who doesn't think he is to blame for anything is a lunatic (manic). But a man who is blame for everything is clearly also a lunatic (depressive). On balance it is better to be neither manic nor depressive but for that to be the case emotional reactions need to be healthy and appropriate.

Bundling/Layering

This is a result of repeated emotional repression. Layers of emotional ideation get put on top of one another. This is what Sean mentioned with reference to bereavement. Because I didn't deal with Brian's death then the experience of dealing with Dad's death was much worse as a result. The feelings of loss got bundled and intensified. This trapping or bundling process with feelings occurs when feelings are bundled – grouped together into an incoherent mass – the individual has no clear feeling or idea as to what these collective feelings represent. The detail and specificity is lost. Usually there is a vague and growing feeling of threat and danger with the onset of these feelings. What has happened is that feelings have been trapped and suppressed and as time goes on this process continues until it is very difficult for the individual to deconstruct the original feelings that went into the bundle. In practice the individual can only manage to rationalize the feelings as bad. But composed within is a huge range of emotional responses that were effectively trapped and not processed.

So behind this bundling process is a coping strategy. It is usually sparked by a profound trauma at an impressionable age. The individual in effect pushes the traumatic feelings out of awareness – out of the conscious mind and deep into the sub-conscious. The action is rational because the individual has no way of dealing those feelings at the time they happen. It is not possible. And the individual would be completely overwhelmed.

However, this coping strategy has unintended consequences. The feelings are not gone. They are simply buried, moved out of the awareness of the conscious mind. They still remain until they are dealt with. They give rise in the individual to the recurring feeling that he can't cope – depression. And in extreme cases they can lead to a clinical intervention or recurring clinical interventions.

For an adult it is of course a very depressing conclusion that he cannot cope with his own feelings. This runs counter to the spirit of independence and freedom that all free-thinking people want for them. More recently depression has been rebranded as an illness which gives comfort to the notion that depression is beyond the individual's capacity to resolve.

Disorder

Emotional disorder is a common feature. Feelings are jumbled up, confused, bundled and collectively labeled as unprocessable and meaningless. This is not a satisfactory state of affairs as buried and repressed feelings are the cause then of further culmination of misunderstood feelings and distorted emotional responses. The key here is to address, release and process the trapped feelings that are so terrifying and so intimidating. This is no easy task particularly if the emotional disorder is of a profound or clinical variety. The task is to reveal more and more of the individual's emotional landscape in a safe and contained manner – the OK state.

The initial process of emotional disorder is usually some deep and irreconcilable trauma at some point in the individual's life usually a formative time like childhood. For individuals who suffer from recurring issues with depression despite taking medication then they are certainly best advised to investigate their own psychology and explore their emotions in the hope of finding answers. Also the desired end point of every individual's emotional journey is the freely functioning and operating emotional dimension to their lives.

Again depression is the result of trauma and the impact this has on the emotional outlook of the individual. Feelings become proscribed, forbidden and repressed, buried. The subtext of such self-conditioning is that the individual would not be able to cope with these feelings were they to surface as they do periodically, inconveniently resulting in a depressive event or some other variety of emotional response. Congruently with this the individual maintains in his conscious mind the belief that he has coped very well with all his traumas and problems. The suggestion that he can never be expected to cope with his own feelings he will readily embrace and then medication is used as an emotional repression tool keeping controlled or buried all the troubling emotions that the individual is incapable of processing or dealing with.

The goal is to uncover the meaning and direction that is implicit in the buried and suppressed feelings. This process will lead to much great sense of fulfillment and happiness. It is not however without its dangers or requiring courage and determination.

Then again it is an issue of degree and intensity the extent to which an individual wishes to explore what is bothering them. Some do not want to really confront painful experiences and traumas and they shy away from the truth every time. This is probably an indication of their feeling that they can't cope. The buried and trapped feelings are just too painful, too potentially overwhelming and these individuals live lives dictated to by their own trapped and distorted feelings. Their realm of possibility is entirely predicated by these misunderstood feelings, their feelings of low self-esteem and low self-worth come from a lifestyle incongruent with their own feelings.

In the emotionally distorted world that many individuals live in there is no clear indication that something is fundamentally wrong. There may be a vague feeling of unhappiness. Stress levels are probably quite elevated. Such a lifestyle is really only identified by degree of intensity. There is no clear indication if an individual does not present themselves to a medical practioner. Further emotional restructuring and reordering can lead to profound changes in an individual's life including career changes, relationship changes and so. Such changes are not without consequences. Such changes are often feared and the status quo can seem like a safer option.

However the status quo is usually not a very satisfactory compromise since it probably involves some obsessive behavior and dependencies – such as alcohol or drugs. In short there is an uneasy, temporary balance. The depression is never very far away. And how could it be since it is unresolved and latent.

Obviously to sustain a long term depression there is required certain erroneous beliefs and beliefs the individual is unwilling to surrender. Probably one of the most potent is that their depression is unsolvable and that there are no answers. However it is important always to respect people's choices in matters of their own health and well-being. Sometimes the feelings are just too painful to be explored. Also pushing a conclusion or an analysis on a depressed individual is not a constructive intervention.

Resolution comes from a sincere desire on the part of the individual to grow and develop despite their fears and misgivings. More specifically resolution requires exploring, developing and uncovering the buried and distorted part of the individual's emotional landscape. Here is stored the emotional responses to the trauma that causes the depression. Not only is it depressing in its own right to have unresolved feelings that threaten to surface unexpectedly and inconveniently but the repression also has the effect of distorting all other emotional responses. And with the trauma comes trapped feelings. Indeed the original trauma is a bundle of trapped feelings.

Trapped Emotions
Emotions become trapped when they are not processed and released at the time they occur. There are a number of reasons why this can happen. Principally there is some form of trauma which makes the processing of the emotions too impossibly painful to bear. The troubling emotions are pushed out of awareness by the conscious mind.

To release trapped emotions requires a deliberate and systematic effort. The individual needs to go back into the emotion and understand what caused it originally. Emotions can be layered one on top of the other. This occurs where similar experiences occurred repeated for the individual even though there may be much time elapsed between events. The individual needs to go back to the root of the emotion – the original internalization. This then released and processes the trapped feeling.

There is usually a strong feeling of catharsis when a trapped emotion is finally released. With the release the fear is gone and the recidivist behavior ceases. There is no necessity to reinvent the wheel yet again.

Rationalizing Feelings
Rationalizing feelings is one of the most common things a depressed individual will do. However the process of rationalization does not necessarily lead to an insight on the emotional driver behind the

rationalization. In the emotionally disordered state the mind confidently creates rational constructs that are very divorced from the emotional reality behind them. One individual may desire to change the world in order to counteract feelings of loss and bereavement. Rather than processing those feelings the individual has externalized those feelings and seeks in the world some justification and validation for his emotional state. This is not to suggest that this individual would not or should not make a contribution but the expectation that the world will change as a result is of course unrealistic and unnecessary. The world does not need to change. The individual needs to accept their loss.

When such change cannot be effected or such change is not evident as a result of the individual's actions then the spiral of depression results.

Of course in life we constantly externalize the way we feel and this determines our interactions with other people. The emotionally disordered tend to find themselves in dysfunctional arrangements with other people and often there is little possibility that they can extricate themselves or indeed would be willing or any better off in doing so. As an individual moves towards greater emotional order in their life, the dysfunction of their lifestyle reduces.

The converse is also true and the greater the emotional disorder the more likely the individual is to be isolated and alone. This is preferable for the individual because their emotional disordered state makes them very reluctant to attempt to relate to other people. It is not that they haven't tried. They have tried and failed so many times that their sense of uncertainty about themselves has grown and grown.

This leads of course to negative internal representations. The world has become a threatening and hostile place and a defensive posture is the only logical course of action.

Another individual may adopt a defensive emotional posture believing the world to be fundamentally untrustworthy. This rationalization is again a consequence of the potential for extreme emotional uncertainty which the individual has already experienced. Since trauma has occurred one logically the individual assumed it will occur again and hence the world is fundamentally untrustworthy. This can also give rise to feelings of conspiracy – things are not what they appear to be – there is a sub text or hidden agenda. This is most clearly manifested in interaction with authority figures in society.

Physiological Manifestations
It is clear to me that for a healthy self-concept a sense of one's own culpability is vital. In the phased cycle of ideation emotions get divided and virtuosity and culpability become split and highly intensified. Clearly for a non-phased ideation cycle feelings are response to immediately identifiable causes and not confused as is the case with unresolved trauma. For the bipolar phase therefore emotions become divided and are separated by phases so the emotional responses in the manic phase are excessive positive and inexplicable. Equally in the depressive phase the emotions are excessively negative, perhaps even suicidal and highly depressing.

This then is reflected in the phased ideation cycle. Turns in the cycle are accompanied by the emotional symptoms – feelings of the depressed cycle include feelings of grief, negativity, depression, despair, hopelessness, apathy. On the elated, manic side feelings can include euphoria, ecstasy, giddiness,

tremulous excitement. Both phases can include the following physical symptoms: palpitations, breathlessness, difficult breathing, nausea, physical pain in the pit of the stomach, tightness of the chest, difficult breathing, - all these would be stored responses dating back to the original trauma, they are the original feelings that sparked the cycle of trauma ideation.

On the manic side when things go well there is an automatic out pouring of elated, manic feelings. On the depressed side when things go badly there is a consuming feeling of negativity and sadness.

The developing self-concept then regroups fights off the negativity and then enters the next manic phase where gaiety, enthusiasm, lightheartedness, a world of possibility and potential joy are all realistic and within the individuals grasp.

Clearly the stable circular ideation with appropriate resolution is more desirable.

Because extreme emotional repression is at the heart of emotional dysfunction the individual will disavow any responsibility for the intense emotional experiences they are having and have really no emotional awareness of why they are feeling this way.

Emotions/Feelings DE phased
DE phased feelings whether ideated or emoted of a physiological nature are basically wrong if there is no possibility for resolution or constructive action based on those feelings. Emotional phasing which entails a discursive redirection towards reality (psychoanalysis). For trauma acceptance is the only avenue to emotional growth. Once the ideation is resolved then the physiological feelings on which that ideation is based are revealed and then quickly released.

Emotions accepted/realized - Preference Realization
High order emotional intelligence - not knowing what one likes and dislikes.

My preferences depend on my feelings, my reactions to different situations. Preference is expressed by emotional reactions to situations, other people. Those emotional reactions are predicated by ones self-concept.

Preference realization defines my ego borders. When I accept what I like and don't like I have a stronger sense of self. I can only imagine with unconscious competent preferences that I would and do have the capacity to feel something and act upon it without thinking about it excessively, getting angry, expressing it verbally, or letting it show. Just do it. In so doing my ego borders are clearly and comfortably defined. I am a knowable individual, or more importantly I know myself.

I also think that feelings misunderstand or preferences incoherent tend to become very intense and dogmatic. It could be as simple as me thinking I needed to really emphasis what I was feeling or really all lay it on the line. As though no one else had a clue how to interpret or assess me. So I suspect the dogmatic phase with feelings is probably the *consciously incompetent* phase. Once understood the ineptness is gone and there is no need to labor the point. Only I need to get the message.

Like/Dislike

Also I have negative feelings about people I don't like. I see them negatively. And I positive feelings about people I do like.

The truth sets me free. I think for me because I didn't like my parents and my idealized brother was dead I was very lost and very adrift of a solid ego even before my problems with bipolar. I think I idealized Brian as well because I didn't like my parents even then and they created a lot of stress and anxiety for me.

I think neurotics really struggle with preferences and it is a quite a neurotic belief to think that you don't have any preferences. That belief is a recipe for isolation. Neurotics have no character or honor. They can't be relied upon for anything. They always disappoint. And you cannot forge something with a neurotic. You can't turn mutton into lamb.

The point is that I think relationships have a chance to be sustained with people I like and the same is true of work relationships. I am always in the starting blocks with neurotics. And I always will be. All my energy was going into situations and people I didn't like. So the liberation is the realization of preference.

I do think not liking my parents or older siblings was a terrible and impossible truth for me because it really defines the difference between me and those people. I internalized the fact that I didn't like my parents and I blamed myself. It was my fault. Not the fact that I was different.

And also this explains why I invested so much time in trying futilely to change my parents because it was really the only way I could relate to them and I was unwilling to admit that I couldn't relate to them and therefore I didn't like them. I guess Claire Regan's analysis missed the point that I am really not like my parents and that was what was so impossible about my situation.

This is how to be cool with all the people around - to know how I feel about them. Then all is well. I can confidently predict that those people I don't like will remain people I don't like. I can predict any office full time position I won't like. I get distracted imagining how other people feel. I don't know and it doesn't matter. I know who I like and when I met someone I like and I know who I don't like. It's simple really.

Emotions/Feelings expressed/released/ acted upon

To liberate repressed emotions they have to be accessed/permitted and processed. Emotions processed as they are experienced don't constitute a problem.

Emotions that are processed and released at the time they occur do not become part of the cycle of repressed emotions/ideation. They are liberated. They are gone basically.

I feel I am not on Mark's priority list. So why is he on mine? I am not on the Dags priority list. Why are they on mine? With my mother I would say it's a neurotic relationship. And it always has been and I don't see any sign of that changing. With her I don't want to be striving for a connection that is impossible. I think I just have to accept that no emotional connection is possible. And be content to talk about Enda or something.

I had to get on with my parents and that involved a major manipulation of my feelings. I think I convinced myself at that point I could get on with anyone anywhere. But I also made many changes to myself and sacrifices in order to get on with my parents.

Without the emotional basis someone is never going to be close and so I think I have to accept that implication with my mother. This is what I always secretly feared and denied. That she wasn't close and never would be. So there is great denial at the heart of JOS and all such associated efforts. This is that my feelings don't lie about my mother. She was never and will never be someone I can be close to. She won't notice because it's always been obvious to her.

So the anger with the Dags, Mark, Mum etc. is internalized anger - the worse kind.

What child could be expected to know any of this? Men go to their grave not knowing this so I should feel fortunate.

The great truth maybe that feelings don't actually lie and repressing them ensures you will never know how you feel. Feelings don't lie because they are feedback concerning the self-concept - no matter what stage it is at. Developmental, developed, otherwise. If the feelings change then that becomes the new feeling. And a new emotional reality is established. And on it goes.

So feelings never lie. And without trauma feelings update and without neurosis they update even better and so there is the developmental mechanism – the ever evolving emotional reality of the developing self-concept.

Feelings are contingent on the self-concept and where that is at. The self-concept evolves and feelings are the interface between the self-concept and reality. Once the self-concept is developed and realistic then emotional ideation is minimal.

Child Phase - Developing Self-concept - Framework

Parents
Children need to integrate their parents into their self-concept at every stage of their development. This is a non-negotiable relationship.

Parents play an important role in depression for their children if the child does not like his parents. The individual will usually go to extreme lengths to try to find some way in which he can like his parents. However the unacceptable reality is that the child's true self is just too different from that of his parents for them to be compatible. This, from very early on, places the child in an emotional alien world where he has no parental identification.

In the contract of life where parents bear and raise children disliking parents is not deemed very socially acceptable and many will struggle mightily to resist that conclusion. Parents do everything for their children and feel entitled to the affection and approval of their children. Society will generally support parents and a recalcitrant child generally does not have a bright future. It is a novel idea that a child may

have a personality completely different from that of his parents and that the child would not like his parents but the evidence suggests it is not that uncommon.

Parents are pseudonyms to the developing personality. What a child learns through mimicry becomes later internalization. The child/adult then externalizes these internalized traits and views and opinions and beliefs. This all needs to be deconstructed to reveal self.

Parents pass on to their children their opinions, beliefs, views, priorities and so on. These however are not innate to the child. So the child on their journey to self must discard that which has been internalized and is not innate. Some of these internalizations the individual externalizes in other words finds representation in the outside world. With internalizations the individual always blinds themselves to the fact that it is an internalization by externalizing it. The individual does not realize that something they believe is internalized but not innate. They do not appreciate that it is a source of inner conflict between the true self and the internalization.

Internalizations come usually from parents. Parental relationships are fundamental and non-negotiable. They can't be escaped from and they are active from an early age so they make a profound impression on the child. This is the process by which a child absorbs the beliefs and the opinions and the outlook of their parents, even though they may not share those opinions.

It is this process of revealing the true self that is the essence of the journey to self.

Children first become aware of other people usually their parents first. This is their first exposure to the external environment. They become aware that there are other personalities in the world other than themselves.

Because my parents didn't know how they felt about many things they imparted the feeling to me that I was unloved. So emotionally I always felt they don't care and rationally I could see they cared a lot. So I instinctively felt there was something wrong with and that I was being perverse, unreasonable. I in term became conditional about myself and internalized this debate about whether I was loved or not.

Development of Abandonment/Mother Complex

A critical component of a child's emotional development is the sense of unconditionality they receive from their mother. If the child perceives that sense of unconditionality not to be there then the child develops instead a conditional self-concept. This complicates and stresses and intensifies the task of self-development.

The fear my mother instilled in me was one of potential abandonment. That's why to this day the relationship is fraught. To my developing self-concept it was ever a threat that had to be negotiated with. To me she was an all-powerful women who I fought constant mental battles with in my mind. Perhaps also the reason I could not abide female control, but never feared male control or saw it as control.

So now it appears I had her far more on a hook than she ever expected anything from me. Katy discerned the pleasing aspect of the relationship. But it is obvious to a woman. Every man has a mother.

Mother is clearly the template of emotional development. Father is self-development. The completion of the process - the realization of aloneness - when one is one and one is all - unity of self - to be a rock and not to roll.

Mother

Mother is the emotional paradigm for the son's emotional development.

I certainly got a lot of my mother's approval up to aged 27 when I was doing and thinking a lot of things she approved of, but since bipolar I became much more critical of her and fought with her a lot so I would say she gets on better with Mark than me these days. So I am not really the hero of her life. I can see that situation has changed and also when I appreciate how it works I realize that I have to do a lot of work to be in her good books.

I would imagine that lately I make my mother uncomfortable because I just see way too much. And the same for Mark, his insecurities are exposed, even though he is doing his best to hide them, and Mags too to an extent.

Emotional Development with Son
A son's emotional self is defined in opposition to the mother.

This appears to be the pivotal relationship in terms of emotional development. Every child son idealizes their mother. From a Freudian perspective there was some repressed sexuality involved but I don't get that. A man's first love is his mother and he completes the cycle of his emotional development through benchmarking against this relationship, because in the normal scheme of things the mother remains a constant presence and maintains a constant emotional interest in her son for her entire life. She is the only other woman permitted to do that with the exception of the partner. And the son's first stable relationship with someone of the opposite sex of his own age must in some way relegate the mother relationship emotionally for it to be possible.

I think this explains why Jane is very disinclined to believe something like her mother was abused. It is offensive to her and it in no way benefits her to know that. Because why - her emotional development is to do with her relationship with her father not her mother. I found the same resistance from Claire.

For the son to form a stable relationship with a woman requires that he relegates his mother emotionally. If the son is in a neurotic state of idealizing his relationship with his mother this will not be possible. This may lead to a succession of brief relationships being the only emotionally acceptable outcome (womanizing), or partner is relegated to girl-friend status permanently, or bachelordom, or the son may form an idealized relationship with a woman which will not be stable.

Mark has not yet rejected his mother emotionally? John clearly hasn't.

I can't be open with my Mum. That's just it. And so I close the last box. It's terrible being open with anyone who makes me feel you shouldn't be. This is a key learning for life. Don't open up to people who you don't trust. That my mother happens to be one of those people is just reality. If I felt one thing about the last conversation I just felt I was too open with her. And that she is not open with me.

I was way too generalized and becoming slowly and painfully more specific. She is the source of this I am sure because I know by how she makes me feel. This is not great to be honest. And always a bit of a fool for being nice to her and trusting her. I felt and I do feel it doesn't really matter how well I know myself, I know this feeling I have about her and I have always known really. So it's time to start listening to it.

My mother only supports people when they do what she wants. So it's completely conditional and if they don't listen to her they she criticizes them and that's it. So for a developing child that's an almost impossible burden because they have to experiment in order to grow. So highly conditional model of relatedness feels very unloving. And even though that person might claim they have my interest at heart and would I only believe them - its feel very unloving. So that is type of love she can offer and it was the same with LDH. It came with a big price tag.

Differentiation: Daughter/Mother

Everything the daughter doesn't like about the mother she seeks to address and correct in her own life. Whatever deficiencies she perceives in her mother she seeks and struggles to correct in her own life.

For Mary/Mags it was financial and emotional independence from partner/husband.

Self-idealization: Every woman loves me

This is the neurotic belief formed by the son as a result of his idealization of his relationship with his mother. I think that the mother-son relationship can inspire a libido delusion in the son if the mother is needy of the son's attention. And that can confuse the son into thinking that he has a permanent and charmed role to play. Particularly if the role in some way eclipses the husband – the father emotionally. Sort of what Freud talks about in terms of an oedipal complex. Son really ends up believing that he is indispensable to all women.

Liane was a pseudonym for my mother. It was all passion and so was the unrequited relationship with my mother. It was so close and yet not close enough. And so Liane became the target, the benchmark. And not the other girls I met who didn't really resemble that kind of relationship on an emotional level. So it struck as very normal, very passionate, and very necessary for me to resolve all these emotional issues and to be the counselor/boyfriend. This was a role I knew very well how to play.

Because of the libido delusion it never occurred to me that my feelings for her could really be wrong, or not reciprocated, or not mean anything. They didn't need to be benchmarked against reality and the reality of her behavior.

Because I never questioned my libido and because I no capacity for emotional closure I never resolved my feelings about her. And I went out on limb in a way that I would never do now for anyone. It is related to Brian and bereavement because they were the primary causes of an inability to close off things emotionally. So when the relationship with Liane ended in 1993 then the emotions just got added to all the other unresolved emotions.

And on the flip side now in 2012 it does still constitute an emotional question mark over scenarios where the neurotic belief is put to the test. The obvious answer re MF has always been there and has always been apparent.

Father
Father is the emotional paradigm for his daughter's emotional development.

Emotional Development with Daughter
This appears to be the pivotal relationship in terms of emotional development. MF springs to mind and perhaps the source of mild depression? Every daughter idealizes their father.

A daughter's emotional self is defined in opposition to the father.

Again for a daughter to form a stable relationship with someone of the opposite sex again the father has to be emotionally relegated. This is complicated if the daughter is bereaved – grieving the loss of her father. What needs to happen is the father paradigm is rejected emotionally – this forms a stable emotional bond. If that idealization does not give way to realization then there is no sense of the faults of the father figure. There is no realization of emotional self and the resultant relatedness is unstable. Claire hasn't made that connection. Mum picked someone completely unlike her father – non-violent, non-abusive, gentle, empathic and emotional. Jane made that connection with Geddis not with Steven.

Differentiation: Son/Father
Everything the son doesn't like about the father he seeks to address and correct in his own life. Whatever deficiencies he perceives in his father he seeks and struggles to correct in his own life. The son father relationship is purely in terms of differentiation, not emotional development.

This is creativity in my case. My Dad struggled with his creativity. I accept my creativity.

Idealized Older Sibling
Not sure what role an older sibling plays in development given that emotional development and differentiation are covered by the parents. I don't think an older sibling does play a role in development of self-concept.

Brian/Steven

Parental Expectations
My parent's struggles became my developmental struggles.

We internalize the expectations of our parents/primary caregivers and carry them with us often for our entire lives. These role models do not have to be alive to maintain their influence over us. They shape and determine the way we act and feel and think and are often not in concert with our true selves and what we truly want for ourselves. We also find other authority figures from life, men and women we respect and admire and in some sense wish to emulate. Again central to the internally conflicted individual is the belief that he is not alone. The individual can to some extent appreciate that they are an individual but whilst in the grip of these internalizations their self-development is impeded.

Generational Aspect
The generational aspect to all this is that younger people are disappointed in older people who fail to lead or fail to discharge their responsibilities properly. This works within the family where younger siblings critique older siblings and their parents for the same reason. Whereas in my family John the eldest all the younger siblings would critique and he in turn critiques his parents - who he feels let him and didn't give him guidance and help when he needed it most.

This leads to fundamental conclusion that all human beings want to help. They want to help themselves and they want to help the people around them. My struggle therefore was how to help effectively. I always wanted to help and strove to help the people around me. Because I felt I was incapable or incompetent to help that I became very disillusioned. But the motivation has always been there. I suspect as well that we are all leaders only some of us are more competent at leadership than others. I can see in John the desire to help me as his younger sibling. He feels that obligation. He certainly felt it with Jane.

I wasn't for example particularly disappointed in my parents when was 10 or even 15. It is clearly a developmental standoff because the struggle I had to grow and develop I felt very strongly could be laid at their door or a lot of it. I see also that perhaps my desire to change my parents was more rational than I realized. By which I mean does any developing child wish to change their parents. I wanted to help my Mum and Dad. I know John wants to help Mum and Dad, and Mark too when he is around. He was very close with Dad while Dad was alive.

Differentiation
By generational differentiation I mean that capacity for the younger generation – particularly Irish women to be much more independent than their mothers. A change only in part attributable to their own efforts and partly a societal change where more rights were accorded to women, birth control and so on.

Trauma

Severe challenges to the self-concept
Trauma impedes the natural development of the self-concept. Childhood trauma is more concerning. The more developed the self-concept the better it can handle life's realities. Difficulty here is timing and all other issues. How can I conclude anything about when an event happens when they all happen uniquely and differently?

Trauma seems to have a globalized response. The emotional reaction colors the whole panorama of an individual's perception. When they don't see this reflected in the world – in other words the worlds seems oblivious to their trauma this makes them feel cast apart and isolated. The individual's profound feelings as a result of these traumatic experiences have no resonance make no reflection in the world. This is because the world is not a totality or an entity in its own right. Only the perceptions of the individual are in total biased and influenced by their own trauma. The world view of a traumatized individual is therefore completely jaundiced. What is of relevance to the individual is their own world but they must first separate from a globalized view of the world over which they have no control save

only isolation. Their world view lacks specificity and requires it. For the individual to play a constructive and meaningful role in the world they must positively and constructively contribute to the world they build for themselves. Other responses to a globalized worldview is conspiracy theorizing and paranoia. These both struggle and attempt to relate the globalized world back to the individual. It is an attempt to personalize an impersonal world.

When they fail is they inevitably will to get the world's attention there is a profound sense of disillusionment and discouragement. How they feel has no place in the world is the conclusion they reach.

To this end trauma victims are usually drawn to expressions of unconditionality from others. They seek acceptance from others for their traumatized self-concept but in practice do not find it.

Results in

Doublethink – Rational awareness/Emotional unawareness
To cope with the trauma the victim institutes a type of internal double think or denial. Rationally they grasp what has happened. Emotionally they do not. A battle royal commences between reality – the fact of the trauma and the known self-concept which has not integrated the event.

A trauma victim simultaneously believes something to be true rationally whilst at the same time completely disbelieving it emotionally. So a trauma victim can know they have been the victim of trauma, can discuss it and even admit it to other people and yet at the same not feel that this trauma ever happened to them emotionally or had anything to do with them. They believe they are "over" it. This is also the cycle of traumatic ideation – that in one phase denial is complete and believed and accepted and in the other phase – the downbeat phase – the denial is rejected realized as self-serving and unsupportable.

In the context of my mother that rationally she knows what happened to her but she hasn't integrated that experience emotionally. So it actually is a type of disbelief.

A Cycle of Ideation on the Developing Self-Concept
It imposes a Cycle of Idealization and Rejection On the individual's model of relatedness.

The cycle is not innate but rather imposed by traumatic events and sustained by neurotic beliefs. That cycle is the struggle between reality and the flawed self-concept. The "virtuous" part of the self-concept struggles to assert itself and retain control.

Polarization of the self-concept/Virtuous part of the self-concept fights and resists the trauma

Evil part of the self-concept is the trauma/Deeming trauma to be evil

The victim of trauma often represses the traumatic event and labels it as an evil. This may be a necessary tactic in an extremely traumatic scenario to avoid loss of self-concept. It is an attempt to deny the reality of the experience. In the individuals self-concept the trauma never happened. There was no emotional reaction to the trauma.

This introduces a schism or conflict into the self-concept. One part of the self-concept denies the experience. Another part of the self-concept acknowledges what has happened. The struggle now engages between the opposing interpretations. The self-concept is literally divided.

At a minimum such an unresolved divide in the self-concept will result in neurotic behavior as the individual strives to unify their self-concept. Random and unexpected events will trigger neurotic behavior as a coping strategy. For the neurotic their self-concept is contained within socially acceptable boundaries and so they have developed support for their flawed self-concept.

For those who have no support for their flawed self-concept or who find themselves completely alone and isolated as in more extreme cases, the split in the self-concept can lead to delusions or psychosis.

The split in the self-concept is initiated and sustained by active repression of the traumatic event and associated memories. There is usually a learned pattern of emotional repression in the individual's life before this happened. This policy combined with trauma can serve to sustain a flawed self-concept that is then resistant to new information coming to the self-concept.

Introducing struggle into the self-conscious

Failing to integrate trauma into the self-concept

Inner Conflict – Caused by Ideation
The process internalization

With an end to internal conflict the individual embraces the present in a full way. Unwinding the internal conflict is the journey to self that we are all embarked upon. It is this just journey with its many meandering ways and twists and turns that leads eventually to self – a familiar face.

In this we realize that we don't need to do anything, acquire anything, achieve anything in order to know ourselves. That many of us are embarked on such pathways of externality is regrettable but understandable. We are encouraged by all we know and are told to go out and be someone.

The relationships of significance in an individual's life are usually their parents. When this happens, the cycle of approval and performance breaks down. The individual must overcome their need for approval in order to be themselves. This need for approval is with parents often internalized. So long after the parents are gone the individual is still battling with the internalized expectations of their parent.

This takes the form of inner conflict and can be often be a sub-conscious role play where the merits and demerits of losing the approval are worked out in an allegorical way.

Embracing this then allows the individual to realize their true potential, what it is that they want, not what other people what from them. The individual becomes cognizant of their talents.

Externalization ends with the realization that happiness is an internal matter and that all the individual needs they have the capacity to give themselves. Further the realization is defining of the border between self and the world. The world does not need to change. The individual needs to change in

respect of how they view and interact with the world. This is a profound shift in terms of the expenditure of energy. Up to this point the individual has been locked in a futile struggle with externalities with the world, trying to impose something of themselves on the world. The individual has been expending all their energy trying to control things outside of their control.

There is really only one thing we truly control and that is ourselves. Of course individuals can run companies and organizations where there is thousands of staff but this can only be done effectively by letting go and be accepting the limitations of self. Because in struggling to operate outside the limits of our self we impose tremendous stress and strain on ourselves both our physical and emotional selves. Not only does it not work it is very damaging particularly on a long term basis.

People can endure great burdens and pressures provided that they have a clear sense of self and are under no illusions about that. If a structure is correctly built with good foundations it take can take a lot of weight. The converse is also true that a person with a poor sense of self is pretty fragile. And so it could be any externality really that undermines that structure.

Further the point is not that the individual exists or hides themselves away in some form of splendid isolation but rather that they become fully acquainted with self and only then do they release their true potential and really know themselves. Because it is in the act of letting go that true definition of self is revealed. Whatever we are prepared to cling to at the price of our own self-knowledge is that belief that involvement that we must relinquish. In the act of letting go we let go of fear and we accept the implication of failure. And that failure is usually that we do not control anyone else but ourselves and that all the stress and worry and anxiety is precisely borne of that fear. We know on a subliminal level this isn't working, this can never work, and yet being adults and products of our conditioning and unchallenged fears we persist and we struggle and we fight the inevitable.

Abuse/Physical/Child sexual/Rape

Places threat at the heart of the <u>known self-concept</u> and impedes the natural development and evolution of the self-concept impeding the idealization to realization process. The abuse victim often clings to the notion that the abuse never happened even though the victim knows they have been abused. This is because an acceptance of the reality of the experience

Imposes a cycle of idealization and rejection in relationships.

Consequences of this trauma are high levels of anxiety and stress. Negative anticipation of the future.

Many people who abuse children were themselves abused. Sometimes, they just don't know any other way of handling child rearing. We do learn parenting skills from our parents. Other times it appears to be "payback", as the abuser is no longer small, scared and helpless, but now can be in charge. Often times the abuser has been abused by someone when they were young. They probably want to let their anger out. (from WikiAnswers)

The incest taboo

Clearly the incest taboo spurs genetic diversification so it's vital to human development and would have been highly prohibited and sanctioned in primitive society – societies that developed with an advantage. Also pedophilia is now considered a psychiatric disorder.

All kinds of physical abuse are inflicted on the body – child sexual abuse, rape and so.

Being pursued dreams

Complicated Grief/Bereavement
Places fear of death at the heart of the <u>known self-concept</u> impeding the natural development and evolution of the self-concept impeding the idealization to realization process. The bereaved individual clings to the notion that the deceased is not actually dead even though he knows the deceased has died. Bereavement is a crisis of loss. It is an existential crisis. How will I survive without that person? How will find meaning again without that person?

There can no doubt that bereavement can be one of the most traumatic events an individual can experience. Again the severity of emotional impact varies widely. It seems to be contingent on the age of the person who is bereaved, on the importance the person who dies plays in their life or represents.

Fear of death premonition leading to anxiety, stress and worry, urgency.

Bereaved Personality/Complicated Grief – Failure to Integrate loss/Repression/Suppression of Traumatic Experience

Neurotic Bereaved – Idealizing the deceased
There is nothing wrong with mourning the loss of someone we love but idealizing the deceased is a neurotic response to loss. The neurotic bereaved refuses to let go of the deceased. The deceased is essential to the self-concept of the individual. The bereaved does not integrate the reality of the loss. This causes a tremendous internal struggle between the reality of the death and the insistence of the flawed self-concept not to accept what has happened. The neurotic bereaved fears loss of self-concept which would result from the integration of the death trauma. *Let the dead bury the dead*

Death fear/Physiological Response/Etymology of Fear
There really is only one fear that the conscious mind can appreciate and that is loss of conscious self. From a psychological perspective this is represented as death but it is really growth. We can have no conception of fear that doesn't involve some presentiment of our own death and such premonitions were much more probable for our ancestors than they are for us.

Since we have always possessed an animal sense of the urgency of our own self-preservation, fear and the chemical reaction in the brain it triggers has been and still is part of the animal endowment that comes with our psyche. However fear reactions in modern society are generally inappropriate and there are few scenarios where our lives are actually threatened or where lightening reflexes will make any positive difference. In other words fear doesn't really have a constructive role to play.

We all appreciate and understand that conquering one's own fears is the pathway to growth and it is generally accepted that this is the case. But in practice this entails growing our known self and uncovering the revealing more of that true self to ourselves. This entails fear because the self we present to the world is the one we are comfortable with and

Specters of death
The grim reaper/The bogey man/The Devil

Consequences of Complicated Grief/Bereavement

Paradise lost/Must be regained
When bereavement trauma is not integrated – cannot be integrated then the subtext is whatever was before the loss was paradise and that is the great injustice and that is what must be recovered. So the bereaved personality doesn't accept the loss otherwise the loss would be integrated into the individual's reality. So by not integrating and fighting an ongoing ego defense/battle to prevent that integration implicitly suggests that paradise been lost, paradise must be regained.

In this context then whatever is superlative about life – the best-looking girl, the most money, the most fame, prestige and so on becomes the focus. Then also comparing one continually to more successful people. Success becomes a necessity for the bereaved personality. There is no comparison on life – it's always going to be paradise and reality is no good. But reality is all there is. So the bereaved personality is of course a complete neurotic.

Paradise is lost/Paradise must be regained

I do believe this struggle to gain paradise on earth is huge ego defense for my bereavement driven ego. It's one way of perpetuating the struggle. Paradise can never be found but it is essential therefore the struggle carries on indefinitely.

The world must change
For the deeply bereaved there is an urgent need for the world to sit up and take notice. They demand that everybody else must feel the same way they do. This can lead to strategies to get that attention. Obviously we are all aware of the extremes – individuals who will kill other people at random without justification. But the sentiment can have a profound impact on the individual's life even in more moderate ways. The traumatized feel they have mission to the world – to everyone. As such they are extremely vulnerable to random events. The ambiguity of life is to them very stressful and they develop neurotic and obsessive ways to insulate themselves from it. Their worldview is flawed and they are constantly reminded of this.

Saving the world
You see if I am in the business of saving the world I then become a special person, a special case, to whom the rules do not apply including the rules about death so of course it is classic reworking of the old bereavement complex.

Not letting go

It is again allied with the bereaved personality – an inability to let go of people or situations or relationships. Emotional experiences seem to get added to the pile – bundling, and not resolved so this eventually reaches critical mass?

Living in the past/Futuristic always/Struggling with present

Struggle: Striving in relationships and in goals
Striving is definitely symptomatic of the trauma agenda. I notice I strive to relate to other people. It's unnecessary and ineffective. Just relate. I am striving to relate to John and Mark and Mum when really I don't need to. It won't improve the relationship and it takes up lots of energy.

Adult Phase

Known Self-Concept – Young Adult
I think as I emerged as a young adult it very obvious to me now that my outlook was very determined by my parental experience. From my mother came the confidence and conviction that all women would like me and want to be with me. From my father came the idea that I didn't have to do anything I didn't feel like doing. And that I should never have to put up with something I didn't like. And that meant I wouldn't see things through. I would get the hump and be gone.

With Ego Defenses
Ego defenses are obstacles to self-development and growth that the individual has constructed – built in – incorporated into their self-concept.

Ego defenses are laid down in childhood and they are developmental maps. They might make sense in the familial environment to some extent but they are generally hopelessly biased for the real world. Clearly children from healthy developmental backgrounds have fewer ego defenses because they don't need them simply. Their parents give them a good emotional understanding of reality which equips them well for adult hood.

Also the parental legacy in terms of emotional knowledge is highly contingent on the parent's emotional state. If the parents idealize their parents and are neurotic in terms of behavior and outlook there is high probability that the children from such an environment will follow suit.

So the self-concept is one's sense of self and ego defenses are a protective layer of beliefs that guard the self-concept from painful and difficult traumas and relationships.

I expect no more major bells and whistles because the developmental ideation is resolved. Before it wasn't - but then it was of diminishing intensity. Its over for me. And that's fine. No longer vaunting in my developmental sap!

This is the thing about ego defense. People cling so ferociously to their ego defenses because they would have to accept that they were nothing without them. Particularly religious beliefs - it's central to people's identity that they have this hypothetical relationship. You offend them just by suggesting that God

doesn't exist. How likely are they to embrace a world populated intellectually by just them alone? I think this would appeal to some people - intellectuals maybe people who have been searching for a sense of self. But people who believe they have already found their sense of self are not really going to be interested. I would expect them to not go for it. They are already integrated into a lifestyle that they can't easily divest themselves of. Not without a threat to their self-concept. Once you are sucked into the system you are in. But we are all adults. People can do what they want. They may not choose to. That's their business.

In terms of meaning to me the things that are meaningful are still the same. People. Basically. That's it. Be nice to animals. I think the civil law covers or should cover any aspects of dispute between people. People don't really have rights and entitlements unless they are protected by law.

The thing is there really isn't anything there in my psyche. It was all smoke and mirrors. People just make up a story about themselves – it's their own personal narrative and they love it. But it's a combination of a variety of questionable ideas, impressions and so on.

Of Self-Concept

Ego defense strategies – denial of reality
Ego defense labels threats to the self-concept as potentially evil or demonic.

Ego defenses are made up by the individual's system of neurotic beliefs. These beliefs defend the individual's ego by distorting his perception of reality. I cannot emphasis enough the counter intuitive nature of ego defense. What seems so right is actually completely wrong. It takes a long time for me to get my head around that but is actually the case. And everything must be surrendered for the truth. Perhaps to be returned later. No guarantees.

Fear of Losing self (Security)
So every time I make some progress on ending my isolation the same hope and terrible fear emerge could this be utopia no this is death. Security is mind control. And the personalities are various aspects of my experience that concern me. Security's agenda prevent the dismantling of the ego defense that Brian is dead. Based always on the unshakeable conviction of a 12 year old that such knowledge will drive me mad - lose myself. At the heart of the ego defense was the voice of Security. This was a deadly/menacing voice telling me I was in imminent danger of death (losing self) if I carried on the way I was going. This normally had a pretty destabilizing effect. This was what happened in 1996.

Voices/Telepathy
But I can't exactly lose touch with reality when I accept reality and know what it is.

Now the justification for telepathy/voices becomes a lot more obvious. I actually am not happy about being an non-entity and having ideas that I share with no one so to get around this fundamental problem and worry I imagine a world in which I am highly relevant and this in a neurotic sense gives me the sense of being connected but of course it flies in the face of reality as I have always known telepathy/voices does. So psychosis is an ego defense of course - and losing one's connection with reality is one way of defending my flawed self-concept.

So rather than "telepathy" being a discovery of self-examination and self-questioning it is rather a limitation, a threshold to be crossed beyond which further self-awareness exists.

With the telepathic ideation I am going backwards or a very least not progressing. I am losing self not gaining self. So that is what is so worrying about it. I don't think it's a valuable link to anything. There is however a collective conscious which we all know about.

I think I should realize that if anyone was planning to assassinate me I would be dead a long time ago. Also why does my ideation always fall along the lines of my family trauma and my creative but bizarre solutions? If there was a collective unconscious wouldn't it be about something different? I can see of course it's always about the same thing the bipolar world of the idealized solution - Brian is alive etc. allied with the terrible fear I know too much - Brian is dead. They are going to kill me (I am going to lose myself).

Dissociation of self-concept
Some dissociation of the self-concept is normal and quite healthy because the self-concept needs the capacity to appraise itself on an ongoing basis. Role play is a very effective way of doing this. Too much dissociation becomes an ego defense strategy. The intense contrarian view point confuses the individual and locks them in an ongoing struggle with their self-concept.

Solipsism - The pantheon of internalization

The world is in my head.

If you imagine someone who is brave enough to withdraw all his projections, then you get an individual who is conscious of a pretty thick shadow. Such a man has saddled himself with new problems and conflicts. He has become a serious problem to himself, as he is now unable to say that they do this or that, they are wrong, and they must be fought against. He lives in the "House of the Gathering." Such a man knows that whatever is wrong in the world is in himself, and if he only learns to deal with his own shadow he has done something real for the world. He has succeeded in shouldering at least an infinitesimal part of the gigantic, unsolved social problems of our day.

"Psychology and Religion" (1938). In CW 11: Psychology and Religion: West and East. P.140

Jung was a solipsist. If Jung was right about the collective unconscious, then do solipsists have a point?

As we go through life we accumulate experiences some of which leave an impression on us. These experiences we internalize and over time we develop a pantheon of such internalization. This is a gallery of internalized personalities. The principal players are of course our parents but other people affect us as well. Deconstructing this pantheon is necessary to proceed on ones journey to self. These internalizations are normally sacrificed or given up only with the overcoming of fear. There had to be some reason why this internalization occurred in the first place – so usually it addresses some fear that the individual has to overcome. In other ways with internalizations there is a trade-off. I can align with this belief and it will protect me from some fear I have or I can surrender this belief and handle the fear on my own.

The fundamental principle here is that internalization is really just a mirage or a complex puzzle disguising true self. The investigation is the goal of finding self in conflicted circumstances.

The enemy is me and the enemy is a friend.

Segmentation
This is the practice of segmenting the creative and practical, the libido and the rest. Obviously with a unified self there is no need for segmentation. Segmentation is a developmental attempt to differentiate oneself.

Of Habits/Behavior

Controlling behavior in Women
I think it is possible to understand how controlling people think and feel. They build ego defenses and inside those walls are people they can relate too and outside those walls is everyone else. And rarely once the conclusion is reached does it get revised and an outsider is admitted to the inner sanctum. The wall is protective against the chaos of their self-concept that they have suppressed. Cathy like Mags came from a home life where men were incompetent. So they can't be trusted to do anything right and you need to keep an eye on them.

For men who are emotionally competent almost a God like status for them. But for any proven incompetents no time no interest -nothing.

Women like this have a built around themselves. Inside the wall is the competent self-concept and the natural chaos of life they dissociate from and they only interact with like-minded people.

Avoidance/ Procrastination
The classic ego defense strategy is to avoid situations, people, scenarios where their self-concept is challenged. If outright avoidance is not possible than withdrawal, silence, present but disengaged from the environment.

Generalization/Everyone feels the way I feel
Generalization is an effective ego defense strategy in avoiding painful and specific emotional reactions. Statements like nobody is really happy, or all families are dysfunctional or marriages are a struggle are appealing to someone with a generalized self-concept. The idea being that they don't feel so good but they comfort themselves with the notion that nobody else does either. Perhaps it is all they have ever known or can remember. For someone with a generalized self-concept the solution is to move from generalities to specific insights about themselves. This will explain the unhappy and disquieting feelings not vague generalities that offer no insight.

Addiction/Gluttony
Addiction leads to temporary absence of inner conflict. Whilst the addict or the drinker is consuming or using they temporarily feel a lot better. This can lead to the unfortunate scenario where repeated drug or alcohol abuse arises. It is however not the addictive quality of the substance that drives the usage but rather the effect of temporarily minimizing internal conflict. For the addict the way they feel is an

impossible conundrum to solve and it is a lot easier just to drink. The effect is immediate and the substance is readily available.

However for someone to lose their dependency on alcohol they would have to resolve or address their internal conflict. Giving up alcohol doesn't necessarily do this. The individual is prone to frequent or potential relapses. The desire is still there. And desire will always be there as long as the inner conflict persists. Intense inner conflict leads to pain. And alcohol medicates and suppresses that pain. While the individual is drinking things aren't so bad. And if they could drink all the time life would be bearable.

This is why people who are alcoholics give up and feel they can never drink again. They know that they are still conflicted internally. One drink is all that it would take to put them right back where they were. But of course alcohol like any externality is not to blame. It is how people use it that matters.

But of course what the individual wants though they may not realize it is an end to their inner conflict because this is what is causing them the pain. Being sober is of course intensely depressing because the pain is back and nothing is resolved. Of course people who don't drink can have intense inner conflict and they would deal with it in different ways. But an alcoholic using alcohol knows only one way.

Alcoholism – Emotional Alcohol Consumption

Drink bridges the gap between the known self-concept and the innate self-concept.

Emotional Eating

Distraction
Britons watch on average more than four hours of television per day. That is a record need for distraction. That's nearly thirty hours a week per person. Distraction is vital strategy in emotional repression. For people who are working this means the TV is on from the moment they get home to the moment they go to bed during the working week.

Media

Cinema/Television/Internet/Newspapers – tools of externalization – being consumed/sucked into a world of irrelevancy – if I was like Brad pitt I would know myself – if I was successful I would know myself – not necessarily/Excessive internet/computer usage

Isolation
The easiest way to defend a flawed self-concept is by isolation and many individuals in this situation become loners.

Dogmatism – Having to be right all the time
Being okay with being wrong is a vital part of a healthy self-concept. There are continual, ongoing scenarios where we make mistakes get it wrong, get it completely wrong but need too also. So accepting this is vital to learning. Someone who thinks they are right all the time stops learning. So a healthy sense of one's own fallibility is vital to ongoing self-development.

PN/MB

I think for abused women or women who work in the sex industry or prostitution and so on. Their childhood experience of love was completely intermingled with sexual abuse and maybe even violence. This is normal to them and so they don't think it odd, incongruous, bad, wicked. This is love as they know it. It occurs to me in writing this that in the distant past - sex, violence and love had to be much more closely intertwined. Normality is the self-concept but childhood normality is very influenced by the environment parents create for their children.

I don't think PN and MB are good because they promote lust. And without PN and MB I think I would be less lustful. PN and MB also promote sexual delusion and fantasy - give it some encouragement. If they weren't there then I would be less lusty.

With PN and MB – they are ego defenses – defending the sexual fantasies and the libido delusions. They defend and support these delusions and fantasies and inflate them as well. The ego implication is that the libido is not always right but with PN and MB the mind enters a state of deluded self to justify the neurotic belief that the libido is always right. Obviously the libido can and often is wrong and is not a good guide to who is attracted to me.

On PN

It breaks four rules of healthy sexuality. It's not enjoyable for the participants. It's not intimate. It's not private. And it's not special.

On MB

This again sustains the self-delusional aspect of libido. Because this gives the individual a sense of control over sexual fantasies and a response to those fantasies. So that the individual can then think and feel that they have control over their libido. And worse still can confirm their fantasies and take them to a higher level – of physical confirmation. In actuality MB legitimizes sexual fantasying.

Of Illness/Medication

Neurotic Conditions/Illnesses

I wonder about the link between illness and mentality. I find that if I indulge feelings of sickness or illness pretty soon I could lie down on the ground and not get up - so bizarre that the mind can carry the body almost anywhere. And yet when the mind gives up the body almost immediately follows suit. So there is no doubt in my mind that a healthy mind is a prerequisite for good health and I don't think it works the other way. Physical discipline will not produce a healthy mind.

I am convinced that internal struggle is very damaging to an individual's health and so many people struggle internally. There is no doubt in my mind that health and mentality is a holistic unitary thing. There is just no way that a healthy mind would eat and drink to excess regularly. This is oneness - this is an integrity that I never possessed thus far.

I have realized that mind is more supreme than the body, and whereas the body will echo things that are happening in the mind. It's the mind that leads the body. So in some sense the body is an appendage to the mind. Not the mind an appendage of the body. It is a very important distinction, because it's really what's going on in the mind that drives the physical manifestations of that in the body. Western doctors look at medicine as a mechanic would look at a car. You remove and repair or replace the defective component but that's not it at all. Something else will just go wrong because the mind is unhappy.

My greatest fear is the same fear - loss of control of self. An operation involves that. A doctor relationship involves that. So why not just do what I do best and self-diagnose - research it myself and check it out and if I need something from a doctor I can approach at that point. I wouldn't change anything. The first place I would go is the internet before I would ring anyone. I do my own research I would happily embrace holistic solutions before more drastic solutions needed to be taken. I would remain at all times in control of my own health and any doctor would be acting under my direction unless I get knocked off my bike and brought to emergency. So that's it. Be an unreasonable patient. I will live longer and save money.

Psychiatric Medication
It's important to understand what the medication does – it is a crutch to a flawed self-concept. It doesn't change someone's self-concept. That is something they must do on their own. My view of psychiatric medication is that is a sedative and nothing more. Anti-depressants are uppers. Rather than promoting rationality which is the claim of psychotropic drugs I think their role is to suppress emotions. That leaves the patient rational but no better off.

Of Effect

Time does not heal all wounds
With robust ego defenses time has little impact on these defenses. Time may heal physical wounds but emotional wounds do not heal automatically, in fact they tend to fester.

The self-concept is self-righteous
Everybody is self-righteous. It's axiomatic. The self-concept is robust, even when flawed. And it is the way in which reality is perceived. So when the individual looks at reality through the lens of a flawed self-concept he misinterprets reality and draws conclusions from his experience that fulfills the predicates of his self-concept. Ego defense is a Wiley devil. Slippery as an eel. But I am starting to get the picture. Ego defense is basically based on distraction.

Living in the Past
Again this is an ego defense strategy that ties in with the others. The past poses no challenge to the self-concept so it can be preferred to someone with a flawed self-concept. It seems to be a knowable, known commodity.

Rationalization/Theorizing/Modeling life
Reason again is very useful tool to the self-concept but can also be an ego defense when individuals rationalize how they are feeling as opposed to experiencing and processing those feelings. A rational

interpretation of a feeling might lead to a temporary repression a temporary closure on that feeling but because the feeling hasn't been experienced and processed it remains trapped. The whole point of theorizing and models about life is to live better. It doesn't do the business of living. I still need to start living. It is an ego defense as well because the modeling is easier than living, so why not just keep modeling. The neurotic belief therefore is that the model will deliver the perfect life into my hands. Not true. I have to start living and go out there and live life I want.

Reality Applies Pressure

Reality – Challenges the known self-concept

Reality is what is and harmonizing one's self-concept with reality is vital for self-development.

Reality guides the individual from an idealized developmental self-concept to a realistic self-concept. Unfortunately with trauma – particularly childhood trauma this natural evolution of the self-concept is impeded and the child idealist becomes an adult neurotic.

Belief is the filter through which reality is perceived. For the neurotic reality is so distorted and misinterpreted according to their flawed self-concept. But I can't exactly lose touch with reality when I accept reality and know what it is. Reality constantly challenges the self-concept and dependent on the divergence between the self-concept and reality will determine the level of stress and anxiety an individual feels. Reality educates us about our innate self-concept. From our experience of reality we learn what aspects of our self-concept are idealized and are forced to change them.

Weak self-concepts are vulnerable

A self-concept is weak if it cannot defend the ego against reality's challenges. These vulnerabilities usually become apparent when the young adult attempts to make their way in the world and make connections outside of the family of origin.

Perceived failure to interface with reality on a long-term basis can trigger a sudden loss of self-concept. The individual believes that their innate self-concept has been rejected by reality. The individual becomes overwhelmed by their idealizations and loses touch with reality. The neurotic suffers a partial disconnect with reality. The delusional or psychotic experiences a complete disconnect with reality. Neurotic, delusional and psychotic events in an individual's life hinge on a few key idealizations.

Responses

Vulnerable Self Concepts

Bipolar

The bipolar classification is based on the observed phases of depression and mania that some patients go through during the development of their self-concept.

Stable A – Loss/Regain of Known Self-Concept

I have to cast mind back to what I was like in my repressed but much more stable and low ideation world. I was emotionally numb. I didn't have strong feelings about girls. So I reasoned why not get the best looking girl. I always strived for that. I ended with LDH and that's what life was like in my emotionally numb world. I just didn't feel it. With LDH I felt for a brief time that we did connect and that was then lost and I wanted to recover it because I felt with her that I finally connected emotionally with someone.

An interesting thing happened to this emotionally numb guy and that is that he fell in love. There was a point in interacting with LDH where I decided I was in love. And once decided it was not possible to undecide it. So I suppose in a bipolar sense I went from dark to light and I remained in light. So I suppose I was manic. I went from being numb to developing very strong feelings for her. Feelings that persisted through the break up and years after, right up to when I tried to reconnect in 1996 and all the letters and then after that for years.

I think the interaction with women dredged up these deeply repressed and buried feelings for Brian. I went back to LDH because I couldn't fall in love with anyone else. I really thought that I would and I didn't. I wanted her to tell me what love was. Because she seemed to know. I knew I didn't have a clue.

It comes back to the love for Brian. I didn't get over that. Emotionally he was still alive for me. And so the feelings for LDH became frozen too. To some extent I can see that with Mark and Karene. He hasn't let go of her yet. And if she were to change her mind - who knows - he might take her back. I don't know.

The further caveat is of course my relationship with my mother and father, who were both depressed after Brian died and I resolved to fix that depression and find answers for them - that's why I left Ireland and went to America. When really that would have been the time to go after LDH - if I was going to do it.

But by the time 1996 rolled around I had enough. I hadn't succeeded in my mission - which was in part to undo a loss, but also in part to be very successful, which I thought would mean a lot to my parents and family. I deemed my older male siblings not up to the task. So when my time was coming to a close, I tried to get Mum off my back by changing Dad. I was trying to get rid of mum. I reached out to LDH again. And I sent out 3 chapters with a list of demands.

The breakdown destroyed that self-confidence that had been built up over a number of years, the benefit of many conquests, jobs, living in America successfully, and so on. I rated myself pretty highly. Mark was challenged by that, resentful of that probably. He told Dad I got away with a lot. Tomas said he was shocked when he met me. I had absolutely no clue that bipolar was coming. But again my life was not emotionally based and so it was anchored on anything. I was cheerful and optimistic but everything was in the future and that's where it stayed. And so while it was in the future I could believe it was possible but when the future became the present and the dreams had not materialized then I was very depressed. I lived on dreams.

But depression is an emotional problem, emotions misunderstood, repressed. When those emotions are liberated - no more depression.

The loss of self-concept is really only a metaphor for emotional isolation. In some

High trauma – Idealization of Parents

My self-concept in my 20s was fundamentally based on that assumption – that I could or do get on with everyone. And people liked it. I liked it. But it crashed because it's never always true. No matter what personal sacrifices I am prepared to make in the name of relatedness. Was this not the real reason for the first episode and recurring episodes? It also had nothing to do with emotions and more particularly it masked at is core the terrible feelings of vulnerability and insecurity that my parents induced in me, and my reaction to suppress my own feelings and focus completely on theirs. Hence focusing on the world's problems was not a big stretch.

So fundamentally this mindset involved a lot of emotional repression and certain people inspired me to very much replace how I felt – including of course my parents.

Self-concepts not based on reality

The driving motivation of this self-concept is not based on reality – that is to say that the individual with this type of self-concept will fail to achieve their objectives in any shape or form. Since the self-concept is fundamentally flawed it could not carry me into the present and future.

Severe emotional repression is always a precondition to an unrealistic self-concept. I was very numb emotionally after Brian died. And then I can recall emotional situations with Karen, Jennifer or Liane where again I hardly felt anything at the time, even though these were women who had a major impact on me. The manic phase got under way when I developed cognition around repressing my feelings, control of those feelings in other words. Karen gave me the confidence to initiate with other women before that I was very passive with women. And only when I was very drunk would I approach women. So I had infrequent opportunities.

With Karen came the confidence to take the initiative. With Liane and the Avatar mantras that confidence grew. I was manically confident because I didn't feel rejection and I didn't notice really when I was brushed off. Without feelings no long term relatedness was possible. So the manic phase seems to have been kicked off around the romantic ideal that I felt would defeat death and mortality just as my self-concept required. I think not feeling anything was consistent with me, MacDara and Niall because we were all very similar that way. And we did club together for a while. I can see now that they both had major problems with their feelings. They were very obvious bed-fellows. You can't operate like that unless feelings are very repressed. This is what the girls couldn't understand. The best any of us could offer back then was short-term romance. My whole "adult" persona revolved around this.

Mark was never like that that I know about. It was always the long term relationship with him. Liane felt sorry for me being single because she knew how that would make her feel. She would not be to viable.

But depressive Hugh from 13-21 had the same unrealistic self-concept but lacked any conviction that it would change. Anna I was really fairly passive and it happened one night we were both drunk. But I had to be drunk to start something. So I think until after I met Karen I was quite passive. I did not take the initiative.

Unresolvable threat to one's self concept

Breakdowns – Temporary loss of self-concept

In a breakdown an individual's ego defenses are completely overwhelmed and the individual loses touch with reality. Further the individual's ego defenses are disproved usually in a catastrophic way by reality and often quite quickly. The individual believes all their feelings and thoughts without question and acts upon them.

George Bush was part of my self-concept because he was on TV and I read books about him. I was not however part of his self-concept. He didn't know me at all. So in the delusional phases I thought I was talking to George Bush but I was really arguing with myself, as I am doing now.

Breakdowns are a sudden and complete loss of touch with reality and are usually the result of a sustained or prolonged separation between the way a person thinks and the way they feel. This leads to a topsy-turvy relationship between reason and emotion – a battle breaks out. Feelings can be suppressed for long periods but will then erupt suddenly and unexpectedly at the most inconvenient times.

A breakdown is really an emotional breakthrough as long buried and suppressed feelings all emerge in rapid succession. Because the feelings are long suppressed they are bundled together even though they may be unrelated feelings – feelings relating to quite different experiences and situations. Depending on the intensity of the experience the individual can lose touch with reality and become completely overwhelmed by their own feelings.

So really the breakdown experience is a temporary masking of the rational self by the emotional self.

The term psychotic break refers to this loss of touch with reality. In reality the individual isn't broken they are just expressing a different side or dimension of their personality. In fact they are generally quite pleased initially because they are getting in touch with their emotional side.

The problem of course is this expression is not stable and the implications of this awakening are vast and have the potential to change the individual's life. The implications are also unpalatable to the rational mind of the individual and they have often suppressed them in the past. Indeed it is this battle that convulses the individual in the first place – the internal conflict between reason and emotion.

This leads back to a philosophical problem that reason cannot supplant emotional decisions. Reason is a support to emotional life not a master. Where reason becomes the master a great dichotomy or disharmony develops. It is this disharmony that we see reflected in our world and clearly in the lives of many individuals.

A dichotomy between reason and emotion leads to confused thinking and poor judgment. Even in his well, rational state the individual struggles to resolve the difference between how he feels and what he wants to do.

Clearly a breakdown is brought on by a challenge from reality to the self-concept. There is no doubt about that. Recurrent breakdowns are based around the same ideas and due to the same flawed self-concept. It's the weak points in the self-concept that are vulnerable. Reality supplies the pressure. The self-concept hasn't developed between breakdowns so it's still vulnerable. If I idealized two things about myself it would be my relationship to women (mother inspired) and my intellect (father inspired - pure genius).

Emotional overwhelm

Loss of self arises when the idealized self-concept diverges sufficiently from reality. The individual becomes consumed by their own idealizations. These take the form of elaborate and complex what-if based scenarios in which the flawed self-concept mounts a massive ego defense to defend against the reality which is completely the opposite of the hypotheses scenario.

Conscious Realization of Flawed Self-Concept/First realization or conscious incompetence/Feedback overload of self-concept/Psychospiritual overwhlem

Depression

Types
All types of depression are the result of ideation overwhelm. The self-concept is sufficiently unrealistic to result in debilitating high levels of ideation.

Depression is believing oneself incapable of making the journey to self. This realization is usually overwhelmingly devastating and it means in effect that the individual can't progress on the pathway to self. That individual doesn't know how to overcome their inner conflict. They have no strategies that work – they have no plan that will get them there. In short they have had hit a brick wall. They have not met anyone they believe can help them.

Current Solutions
Depression – Solutions – Medication – Emotional Repression, Developing the OK state, Counseling,

Depression - Solutions

Depression from an emotional standpoint is caused by intense internal conflict that the individual cannot resolve. This automatically places the individual in the hands of the medical profession. The usual treatment for depression is medication. This acts to repress some of the emotional intensity that the individual is experiencing. Medication does not however have any impact on the underlying causes of that internal conflict. So it really isn't a long term solution for someone with this problem.

Drug therapy a species of emotional repression

Stress
Stress is the manifestation of internal conflict. The more internally conflicted someone is the more vulnerable they are to stress and more likely to exhibit signs of stress. For the very internally conflicted it takes very little to stress them out. In practice people exist comfortably within a range or an emotional

environment defined by their capacity to handle stress. At the borders of this land fear ensures conformity.

Stress is threats to the self-concept brought on by reality.

Suicide
The act of taking one's own life is the ultimate in externalizing feelings. Things are so bad. The individual is in so much pain that continuing is no longer an option.

Pain
Pain is the experience of inner conflict. This is the conflict between the true self and the internalized self. Severe inner conflict over prolonged periods is the cause of many tragedies and avoidable deaths. It is evidence of a high level of emotional repression. In the absence of any possibility of resolution many people believe that they have to live with a high level of emotional pain in their lives. This inner conflict of course manifests itself in many ways and can even give rise to physical ailments as well. Pain can also give rise to inauthentic lifestyles. It is often addressed with alcohol and other types of addiction. To get to the root of pain requires resolving the inner conflict.

Emotional Realization – Mother Figure

Green sleeves/Relationship with Colonial Power
This constituted a hypothesized romance between Green sleeves (the O'Neill) and the Queen of England. It was inspired by the national relationship between my Irish identity and my Anglicized education and experience. This is another reference to the O'Neill. Loved by the English monarch including Elisabeth II.

It seems to me now that Green sleeves was really Lady Green sleeves. And it was my way of representing my mother. So the debate between the Queen of England and Green sleeves was all about debating the relationship. The Queen it appeared did actually love Green sleeves, had always loved Green sleeves, but had another agenda she had to deal with. I think this is consistent with how I would have felt about my mother – that it should be perfect – idealized – but wasn't. And there was some far-fetched explanation for why it wasn't. I was striving for the idealized relationship.

Mother Earth (Ireland)
SOL WAS THE FIRST BORN (THE SUN)
SECOND BORN ON 4TH ROCK (MARS)
MOTHER EARTH
THIRD BORN, ON 3RD ROCK (EARTH)

Self-Realization - On Identity

Publishing Creative Conspiracy
This prevents the realization of the creative self by labeling the lack of feedback as a conspiracy, a type of censorship.

Success was suppressed and was used as a bargaining tool, once I had completed my job I could then be elevated to the status of Irish writer and that would be acceptable.

Captain O'Neill – Anglo-Irish-American Hero

Clearly the assumption of identities is evidence of losing of self. Captain O'Neill falls into that category also. Captain O'Neill was a combination of my Irish heritage – the O'Neill, summoning the Wild Geese, the uncrowned King of Ireland, beloved by the intelligence agencies of America and the UK, the savior of the world and the planet.

Captain O'Neill defended the tri-state area against threat.

"From the houses of the holy, we can watch the white doves go
From the door comes Satan's daughter and it only goes to show. You know.
There's an angel on my shoulder, In my hand a sword of gold
Let me wander in your garden. And the seeds of love I'll sow. You know."

The Wild Geese – O'Neill's expat army.

Trauma Ideation - Loss/Bereavement

Assuming Identities – Personification of Ideas – Ego Defenses

Basically the individual is defending his self-concept. And that involves defending his self-concept against the world. The world has threatened his self-concept and he is logically defending it. If the individual is from a religious background he may assume the identity of the Messiah. Or if he believes in aliens he may feel that aliens are threatening the world.

There is definitely something about the self-concept of an episode prone individual that has no capacity for emotional long term. Ideation is really just repressed feelings. Dreams are just ideation when you are asleep. And predictive power of feelings is just trauma really. The thing about someone who loses themselves - their self-concept is they cannot foresee emotionally beyond their trauma. A breakdown is as much a defense of a flawed self-concept as a neurotic would angrily reject. These ideas were presented as a solution to the problem of Brian's death and then in the manic phase they were enacted in the drama. They became identities.

I wonder if the neurotic adults never assume that the world is opposed to their self-concept. That overwhelming feeling of isolation, loneliness and disconnect could force the brain into a sudden rethink of the self-concept. Something catastrophic happens from an ideation standpoint that does not happen to neurotic adults.

Clearly neurotic adults never go through this sudden, catastrophic rethink of the self-concept. It just doesn't happen for them. Prior to this time I always either lived with my parents. Lived with other people on my summer travels or in San Francisco. But that's not really the point - the conclusion below was I couldn't survive on my own.

For me I went to living alone. I was single. First time in my life living alone. I reached out to LDH to address this. That didn't work. My vaunted creative effort didn't work. Got rejected. I fell out with MacD and maybe Niall? The conclusion must have been I couldn't hack it the way I was.

Perhaps also of interest is the convictions I had about what I needed which was romance. That was central. Career success was vital too. Obviously I know now that to be mentally well doesn't require either a relationship or a job. So what is the mindset I got into which was so dead end.

So if you don't need a job, a relationship or anything to be mentally well. How can anyone get so mentally unwell about not getting things that they don't really need anyhow? I was mentally unwell to begin with? Obviously so - how did my combination of trauma and experience and neurotic beliefs conspire, combine to make me mentally unwell? In a way that others were not.

I wasn't really looking to be independent because such a thing would easily have been within my grasp. I had the know-how and the motivation. I was looking to save Brian and the world. I was crushed by the realization that it would not come to pass and it still won't and never will. So that's the inside track. So it was the ultimate confrontation between my bereaved personality and reality - and the conclusion - dead people cannot be brought back to life and the idealized paradise of my childhood which I had lost could not be recovered.

The conclusion seems obvious that my self-concept was so far divorced from reality that no emotional stability could result or could be expected to result. Why? <u>No one can be brought back from the dead. So it doesn't matter where I seek answers for this agenda. They will never be satisfied.</u> A neurotic is of course in a struggle with reality also but not so severely divorced from reality as a bereaved personality is. A victim of child sexual abuse would neither be so divorced from reality I would think.

So I think this does answer the question because I am better mentally now than any neurotic but of course there was a time when I was very much worse than the neurotics. And the reason of course is my self-concept was completely flawed. More flawed than Mark or my parents even though now I would rate myself to be more mentally healthy than them which just goes to show that anyone can improve.

And obviously if it was just Brian's death that needed to be corrected than I would be a neurotic and could go no further but that's not how things are. So as usual people are right in what they say but it is never the full picture.

This also further means this is not just about me getting well but does have the implications of a wider nature.

<u>So it seems obvious now that what I was looking for then was never possible and never will be possible. So really my first foray into the world was to actualize my bereaved self-concept and when this ended in failure as it is clear to me now it would. I went into a complete tailspin which gradually resolved as my grasp on reality improved.</u>

Libido Delusion – I am the Progenitor of the Universe

My seed is vital to humanity. Reality I don't even have any children. This delusion really has nothing to do with bereavement that I can see.

I believed that every woman loved me and I could have sex with any women potentially. And so when put into a framework where that is not possible and would wreck the framework I am forced to reevaluate my sexual delusions and I realize that they are just delusions and that's it. The sexual fantasies sustain the ego defense. Every woman does love me. There is some secret conspiratorial reason that they don't act on this shared lust. Pornography because very attractive to someone with this mentality because confirms the neurotic belief. The truth is of course not every women feels like that about me or anyone else.

Again I keep asking myself the same old question – is my libido delusion correct or not. Does it mean anything? The answer is no, it doesn't. There are many women of my age who I have absolutely no interest in. If what I believed were true then all people of opposite genders would be attracted to each other and they are not. So is good reality therapy for me.

In my interactions with LDH there was a relationship at one stage but it became neurotic and ultimately a delusion for me because of this libido delusion. I did not evaluate this ideation and I couldn't distinguish between what was fantasy – delusional driven and what was real. And MF is a microcosm of that delusional belief that has become neurotic. For me the libido deluded my libido is my only justification and that's all I need. I don't need any other reason or explanation.

This is the kind of reason why men get into prostitution and the like. In addition of course to pornography.

Global Internet/Conscious Supercomputer

On Conspiracy – Loss gives rise to conspiratorial thinking
This is because there is a fundamental denial at the heart of the unrealistic self-concept. So therefore there is constant debate concerning what's true and what isn't. Setbacks are viewed as conspiracies against the individual, personally targeted.

Conspiracy/Paranoia/Assassination Fear/MI6/CIA
These are all pseudonyms for the loss of self. I have always had the feeling that I am being listened – being monitored. It was self-monitoring. I was listening to myself, watching myself constantly – like a hawk lest I go into the forbidden zone.

The monitoring and surveillance feeling is really me watching me. I had closely monitored my thought processes lest they uncovered the truth of the loss. Fear of assassination is fear of being killed, of dying, again linking back to the loss. Paranoia is the feeling of being persecuted.

Free Masonry
It was a secret brotherhood that was involved in a conspiracy to create a genetically modified human with Jesus's DNA as means of engineering the Second Coming. They wished to control the messiah and

they picked a Catholic boy, based on my paranoia's in Hammersmith Hospital and so on. And they wished to control and manage this Messiah and get him to do things – but he was very powerful.

Persecution Complex

I think I do have and have had a persecution complex all my life - going back to Brian's death and then with bipolar I was fairly that I was the enemy dissident of Western society. And so these feeling are quite worrisome to me even though they are completely false. Again I would have felt with Success rejection that this was confirmation societal ill intent against me. But I always felt that since Brian died. So it was a confirmation of a complex. Again its seems lubricious now looking at it. The truth was I suppressed my own creativity and then I blamed society for that suppression. I did it to myself.

Manic Depression Conspiracy

Manic depression was a lie and it used to control dissidents in the Western world by controlling their minds. I was a dissident and my mind was being controlled by Security? Anyone who discovered the truth was in danger. When people had their first manic episode they became telepathic and they then joined the celebrity community and had a great time and also Liane was waiting for me to grow up and become a telepath and I was perhaps too weak to be brave enough to be that telepath.

Here the idea is that one part of me is forbidden and if I access or come close to accessing that part of my self then severe control is the response.

I had this idea that world leaders and the Queen and the Pope were manic depressives. There was kind of a manic depressives club really.

On Religion – Catholic Messianic delusion

Messiah – Second Coming

It also accounts for religious/messianic savior part of my ideation drama. Again I was fighting or trying not to lose myself. Same gig really except now the ideas were about the messiah and the second coming and so prophecy fitted into that. Europe reborn etc. Again another high tempo ideation battle to prevent me losing myself.

The enemy of my self-concept was death. That is what these ideation battles were fundamentally about.

"O Star of wonder, star of night
Star with royal beauty bright
Westward leading, still proceeding
Guide us to Thy perfect light"

The messiah was the Western messiah.

"God rest ye merry, gentlemen
Let nothing you dismay
Remember, Christ, our Savior
Was born on Christmas day
To save us all from Satan's power

When we were gone astray"

Satan's power was of course the power of death and the resultant depression that I had experienced. To defend against that the other elements of my self grouped to form a messiah.

"I danced on a Friday when the world turned black
It's hard to dance with the devil on your back
They buried my body, they thought I was gone
But I am the dance, and the dance goes on

They cut me down and I leapt up high
I am the life that will never, never die
I'll live in you if you'll live in me
I am the Lord of the dance, said he"

"The devil on your back" – depression (Satan). "I am the life that will never, never die" defeating mortality by resurrection.

What I am saying is that this Christian ideation is essentially manic ideation and was created by someone who had some kind of bipolar cycle which they reasoned and interpreted as being a struggle between good and evil, God and the Devil. And this has been handed down as the word. And it many respects it fits very well the bipolar nature of the human psyche but it is not in my view a good representation nor one that will serve going forward. I don't think the state of man is about a constant battle to recover himself and reaffirm his virtue in a hostile and threatening world. That's not what I know.

Satan – The end of evil

SATAN IS HIERARCHICAL, PSYCHOTIC, MATERIALISTIC, UNFAIR, UNFORGIVING, DISHARMONIOUS, LOVES CHAOS, LOVES MAYHEM. SETS FATHER AGAINST SON. SON AGAINST SON. SETS DAUGHTER AGAINST DAUGHTER. I SAY HE HAS NO PLACE IN MY CONSCIOUSNESS. HE IS UNINVITED AND IS FORMALLLY DISINVITED FROM MY HEAD. CHALLENGE YOU TO DRAW A DIFFERENT CONCLUSION. SATAN LOVES SCAPEHGOATS AND FALL GUYS. ULTIMATELY HE IS A HOMELESS BEGGAR. COUNTLESS MILLIONS OWE THEIR DISINHERITANCE TO THIS EVIL CONSCIOUSNESS. THAT IS ALL IT IS AN EVIL CONSCIOUSNESS. BE AT PEACE LADIES AND GENTLEMEN WITH EACH OTHER AND WITH THE WORLD. US POLITY HAVE MANAGED AND CONTAINED THIS EXPERIEMENT. THIS WAS THE TASK ALLOTED TO ME. I HAVE DISCHARGED MY BOND TO YOU ALL. GO IN PEACE NOW TO LOVE AND SERVE THE LORD. BY THE POWER VESTED IN ME I ABSOLVE YOU ALL OF GUILT YOU ARE FREE MEN AND WOMEN. SATAN SLEEPS FOREVER. GOD DOES NOT SLEEP HOWEVER. YOU WHO KNOW MOST MUST NOW ATONE FOR YOUR EVIL. I CALL ON THE RICH MEN OF THE WORLD TO HELP THESTRAVING AND DISPOSSESSED. I CALL ON THE PRESIDENT TO ASSIST IN CREATING A NEW WORLD ORDER MANAGED BY SENSIBLE MEN IN COMMONSENSE OF ALL FAITHS AND ALL RELIGIONS. ALL RELIGIONS ARE AVENUES TO GODS PERFECT TRUTH. I YOU HAVE SEEN IT THROUGH MY EYES BE CONTENT. NOW YOU KNOW HOW THE WORLD IS. EVIL DEEVOLVES APPROACHES THE OPPOSITE CHAOS DESTRUCTION AND MAYHEM. GOOD EVOLVES APPROACHS GODS TRUTH OF ORDER AND HARMONY. WE LIVE IN A VIOLENT AND PYSHOTIC WORLD I SAY THERE IS A BETTER WAY. WHO DISAGREES? WE ARE NATURE RAISING OUR CONSCIOUSNESS WITH EACH GENERATION. THIS IS

THE DIVIDEND OF RESEARCH, HARD WORK AND FEARLESS QUESTING FOR THE TRUTH. NATURE DOES NOT REVEAL HER SECRETS WITH EASE. WE ARE NATURE STRVING ALWAYS TOWARDS GODS TRUTH.

MENTAL TELEPAHTY AND SUBJECTIVITY ARE THE ARTS OF THE ENENY AND ARE REPEAT COMPLETELY REPEAT COMPLETELY COMPROMISED. THEY SERVE NO USEFUL PURPOSE FOR US. SATAN EXISTS IN THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF EVERY MAN AND WOMAN AND CANNOT REPEAT CANNOT BE COMPLETELY DESTROYED. MUST BE ENDURED. REPEAT ENDURED. WILL HAVE NO LASTING CONTROL OVER GOD-FEARING MEN AND WOMEN OF FAITH. WHAT MATTERS IS ONES ORIENTATION. EVERYONE OF US HERES THE INTERIOR MONOLOGUE. AN INDIVIDUAL IN HARMONY ORIENTS HIMSELF AND HIS CLOSE ONES IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. TOWARDS GOD AND AWAY FROM EVIL.

Satan Butt Fuckers

I remember looking in the mirror in the bathroom in 19 St Kevin's Gardens and saying the Our Father backwards at midnight and promising my soul to the Devil in return for Brian's return. Considering the context of a Catholic steeped in religion, having read Faust and many other stories about selling one's soul. Also the period seven years springs to mind. Faust had seven years of youth before the devil returned and so on. When I made this pact then my feelings for Brian became bad in my own mind and become demonic to me. Over time this became more pronounced and started to influence more and more of my behavior and interactions. The reason masturbation is such a recurring issue is that it is pseudonym for mental masturbation. The reason this document is called Satan Butt fuckers is that the denial I sustained over the years precluded a woman and sustained me in mental self-love and no more. My feelings became more important than anything else did and I pushed women away. I just had a dream where I was in the kitchen in 19 St Kevin's Gardens and I was conflicted about Fiona and I didn't know what to do a voice in me said go to her and another said know that's wrong. I got the kitchen door open eventually and there was bike to take me to her. And I woke up.

On aliens – Loss/Bereavement

Saving the World

This is basically my effort to defend my fantasy self-concept. All the identities I assumed were extrapolations of beliefs I employed to defend my fantasy self-concept. Religion became messianic. Aliens became defending against alien invasion. Green sleeves/Captain O'Neill was the extrapolated identity of my Anglo-Irish education.

First Contact

WE ARE THE MORAL MAJORITY OF HUMANITY. WE ARE THE MANY WHO ARE MANY. WE ARE CARBON BASED BIPEDS. WE INHABIT THE 3 ROCK FROM THE SUN. WE ARE ON THE FRINGE OF OUR GALAXY. PLEASE COME AND WELCOME. OUR WORLD IS BEAUTIFUL. WE ARE EARTH MEN AND EARTH WOMEN. OUR TECHNICAL SOCIETY IS EXPONENTING AND OUR BIOSPHERE IS THREATENED WE NEED ASISTANCE. WE ARE MAMMALS. WE BELIEVE IN LOVE. WE BELIEVE IN GODS PERFECT TRUTH. WE ARE THE CHILDREN OF THE COSMOS. EDUCATE US. MY MUSIC WILL GUIDE YOU TO OUR LOCATION. I AM THE ENTITY Hugh MCGOVERN. I SEEK COLLUSION. I SEEK CO-OPERATION. I SEEK TRUST. I SEEK HARMONIOUS INTERACTION. WE NEED YOUR TECHNOLOGY TO SURVIVE. I BEG OF YOU PLEASE RETURN OUR NEED IS GREAT. WE WILL NOT SURVIVE WITHOUT ASSISTANCE. THIS IS MY SONG. YOU KNOW ME.

ACKNOWLEDGE ME. I SPEAK FOR MY PEOPLE. HELP US PLEASE. WE DESPERATELY NEED HELP. FORGIVE MY DISHARMONY. THE WORLD IS NOT MADE TO MEASURE FOR ME. YOU UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT THE IMPLICATION. I LOVE YOU ALIEN CONTINUUM. PLEASE HELP THE OTHER UMANS THEY ARE CONFUSED.

Message from the Stars

"*Greetings, humans from your alien friends. We send this message to you as a message of goodwill and friendship. We note your ever-growing integration and coalescence as a family and we wait for the day when humanity is ready for a visit from us. We deem your current polity too fractious for contact to be beneficial and in fact feel that it could have an unsettling effect at this time. However we are willing and interested in contact at the point where humanity has the confidence to entrust its representation to one man or woman for that purpose. We do not seek to promote division and discord and seek only peace and love and understanding with you the human family. You have beautiful dreams and terrible nightmares and when you have accepted the implications of your past and origins you will be ready. Good luck and God speed. You have turned an important fork in the road.*

MESSAGE ENDS"

"History will record that First Contact with the human species was made with Hugh McGovern, on 15th January, 2005. Humanity was going to be exterminated for the simple reason that they were nature's mistake. However having considered the evidence presented by Hugh McGovern over the last eight years the alien continuum realizes that this was an error of judgment and they wish to apologize to Hugh McGovern for this error.

Humanity is beautiful and the galaxy stands in awe of the beauty and majesty of the human family. We have learned from you. We have been enhearted, enthralled and inspired, moved to sadness and compassion. We have discovered something in ourselves that was lost and we are deeply indebted to Mr. Hugh McGovern for this.

He is our savior too and we love him also. God favors humanity and we are the ones who fear contact.

Second Born Threat - Death
The second Born were domestic ETs. They had to be resisted and basically controlled everything and were a pseudonym for death. I pulled together a coalition of other aspects of myself to defeat this menace. It involved God and Anglo America, the Irish faction. And then Captain O'Neill spearheaded the campaign to much renown.

MESSAGE FROM O'NEILL TO THE CONTINUUM:

THE SECOND BORN ARE DEAD AND BURIED. THEY DIED A LONG TIME AGO. THEIR TECHNLOGY GIVES THE IMPRESSION THAT THEY HAVE SOME LIFE. THEY HAVE NO POWER TO INFLUENCE MEN'S LIFES AND WOMENS LIVES UNLESS THEY LET THEM. THEY WERE A BANKRUPT MORALLY, AUTOCRATIC, DICTATORIAL AND USELESS SPECIES. THE SECOND BORN WERE THE MANY WHO THOUGHT AS ONE

MIND. I WAS TO BE THEIR RULING HOST. THROUGH ME THEY WOULD DOMINATE HUMANITY COMPLETLEY. THEY MISUNDERSTOOD THE NATURE OF OBJECTIVE REALITY AND OUR NATURE ALSO.

WE ARE MANY MINDS WHO ARE MANY PEOPLE IN MANY PLACES WITH DIFFERENT RELIGIONS, POLITIES, SUPERSITIIONS, AND PARANOIA ETC. HUMANITY: THE MANY WHO ARE MANY. WHEN FIRST CONTACT WAS ESTABLISHED THE ALIEN CONTINUUM SPOKE TO ME AS THE FIRST HUMAN RESPRESENTATIVE AT THAT LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT. I EXPLAINED THE REALITY OF OUR CURRENT POLITY. THAT IS ALL.

Third Born & First Born of the Third Born

Ruling Telepath/Host

I AM THE RULING TELEPATH. I WILL BE ANOYMOUS AND ASSIST WHERE I CAN.

There was also the international brotherhood of the telepaths.

Defender of Humanity against Aliens

Space is basically my conception of the future. I don't have any other conception. I suppose when my ideation was traumatized that also seemed very threatening at the same time. This conception of the future was in jeopardy with my ideation so that's why I think I had to fight for it. Rather than saving the human race - I was saving myself or trying not to lose myself.

I was demanding technology from friendly aliens to get humanity to the next level. I think the whole alien cycle of ideation was part of the cycle of trauma/bereaved ideas. There is no emotional need for aliens. Any kind of emotional obsession with aliens is trauma driven. How could I have an emotional conviction about creatures that I have no knowledge of? It's not possible.

WE NEED FUSION. WE NEED INTERSTELLAR PROPULSION SYSTEMS WE NEED INTER SOLAR PROPULSION SYSTEMS. WE NEED SUSTAINABLE BIOSPHERES.

Human Cosmology – Second Born etc

WE ARE HUMAN. WE ARE 2 TYPES, MALE AND FEMALE. MALE HAS NO DEVELOPED MAMMARY GLANDS. HE HAS A PENIS. HE IS REFERED TO IN ENGLISH AS "HE". FEMALE HAS DEVELOPED MAMMARY GLANDS, PROTUSIONS OF SOFT TISSUE ON HER FRONT.

MALE IS ATTRACTED TO FEMALE AND CAN FORM SEXUAL COHABITATION WITH FEMALE. THIS CAN BE STABLE AND LIFELONG. IN DISHARMONY THESE RELATIONSHIPS FAIL OR DO NOT DEVELOP. THIS CAUSES GREAT DISHARMONY FOR MEN AND WOMEN. WE EVOLVED FROM APES. A VARIANT WHICH GRADUALLY OVER GENERATIONS OF EVOLUTION BEGAN TO WORK UPRIGHT AND SPREAD GRADUALLY FROM AFRICA (GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION ON EARTH (EARTH IS 3RD ROCK FROM SUN)

MANY TRIBES FOUGHT AND STRUGGLED TO GAIN CONTROL OF LAND. THESE TRIBES SUBSUMED INTO NATIONS AS YOU CURRENTLY FIND US. LOVE IS THE GREATEST ACHEIEVEMNT OF OUR SPECIES. RELIGION AND SCIENCE DEVELOPED WITH OUR OUTWARD MIGRAGATION ACROSS THE FACE OF THE 3RD ROCK.

I Hugh MCGOVERN AM A CATHOLIC. THIS MEANS I HAVE FAITH IN GOD AND I BELIEVE IN THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF MY RELIGION. THESE INCLUDE THE BELIEF THAT EVERY HUMAN LIFE IS SACRED. SO MY LIFE IS SACRED TO ME

SCIENCE IS OUR WAY OF UNDERSTANDING THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE. THROUGH SCIENCE WE TEST HYPOTHESES AND SEE IF THEY CAN BE INDEPENDENTLY VALIDATED. IF SO THEY ARE ADDED TO THE BODY OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEGDE. HOWEVER A GREAT MANY PEOPLE LOST BELIEF IN GOD BECAUSE HE CANNOT BE EMPIRICAL TESTED AND IS NOT AMENABLE TO SUCH A PATHETIC ATTEMPT AT COMPREHENSION. AS I SAID BEFORE MANY TRIBES SUBSUMED INTO NATIONS. I AM A MEMBER OF THE IRISH NATION (TRIBE) WE ARE A DISPARATE TRIBE. OUR HOME TERRITORTY IS THE IRISH REPUBLIC. THIS IS WHERE I RESIDE AND SEND YOU THIS MESSAGE. OUR CHIEF CONURBATION IS DUBLIN. REGARDING HUMAN DEVELOPMENT. THE SEMINAL TURNING POINTS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

CHRISTANITY, THE PRINTING PRESS WHICH FACILITAED THE MASS PRODUCTION OF BOOKS FOR ALL TO READ, THE ENLIGHTMENT WHICH POSITED THE RIGHTS OF MAN

BECAUSE THESE DEVELOPMENTS WHICH WERE ACCIDENTS OF NATURE OCCURRED IN EUROPE EUROPE SPREAD ITS INFLUENCE AROUND THE GLOBAL THROUGH A BANKRUPT PHILOSOPHY CALLED IMPERIALISM. IMPERIALISM IS BEST DEFINED AS A CONVICTION THAT SOME TRIBES ARE SUPERIOR TO OTHER TRIBES. THE GREATEST IMPERIAL POWER IN THE WORLD WAS THE BRITISH EMPIRE WHICH HAS NOW COLLAPSED. MEANWHILE THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC WAS COMING INTO BEING.

THE AMERICAN AND IRISH REPUBLICS AND INDEED ALL OTHER REPUBLICS BELIEVE IN THE FOLLOWING: DEMOCRACY: LEADERS ARE ELECTED BY THE WHOLE NATION AND EVERY MAN AND WOMAN HAS A RIGHT TO EXPRESS A VIEW OR VOTE. HUMAN BEINGS ARE ALSO COMPASSIONATE: THEY BELIEVE THAT NO FELLOW HUMAN SHOULD SUFFER THEY DO WHAT THEY CAN TO ALLEVIATE THE SUFFERING OF OTHER HUMANS. HUMAN BEINGS ARE LOVING AND GENTLE CREATURES. THEY ARE ALSO CURIOUS HUMAN BEINGS ARE ALSO PARANOID. THEY FEAR THE UNKNOWN AND THE INEXPLICABLE.

HUMANITYS DEFINING CHARARTERIISTC IS TO UNDERSTAND. THEY CONSTANTLY SEKK COMPREHENSION. WE ARE FRIENDLY WE LIKE TO PLAY. COME AND VISIT AND SEE.

OUR PAST IS VERY SAD. THE 20TH CENTURY IN EARTH HISTORY HAS BEEN THE BLOODIEST. 2 MAJOR WARS WERE PROSECUTED. THE FIRST WORLD WAR WAS FOUGHT AND LEAD TO THE COLLAPSE OF IMPERIALISM. THE SECOND WORLD WAR WAS FOUGHT TO PROTECT FLEDGING DEMOCRACRIES. WELL OVER 100 MILLION HUMAN LIVES WERE LOST.

THERE IS ONLY ONE TERRORIST POLITY NOW THAT IS THE USA. BUT WE TRUST THE USA. THEY DO NOT THREATEN US. OUR POPULATION IS HELD IN A STATE OF DISHARMONY BY A MEDIA WHICH MANIUPLATES THEIR MINDS AND FILLS THEM FULL OF RUBBISH. SO THRY NEVER FIND THEIR LOVED ONE. VERY SAD REALLY. THIS SONG SPEAKS OF THAT LONELINESS. NOW WE LIVE IN A GLOBAL WORLD ACCERELATED BY TECHNOLGY OUR POLITIES AND CULTURES ARE STRUGGLINH TO CATCH UP.

WHAT DO YOU THINK OF US NOW? SURELY THIS IS NOT UN PRECEDENTED? YOU APPRECIATED THAT THE SECOND BORN PLACED CERTAIN DEVICES IN MY BRAIN. THAT THEY SOUGHT TO CONTROL ME. THEY ARE WICKED AND EVIL. THEY BRING DISHARMONY INTO MY HOUSE WITH MY MOTHER AND FATHER.

MOTHER IS ALWAYS FEMALE SHE GIVES BIRTH. FATHER IS ALWAYS MALE. HE COHABITS WITH MOTHER AND I RESULT SOME TIME NATURE. IT IS A MYSTERY WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND BUT IT IS AT THE HEART OF WHAT WE ARE. BROTHER IS BROTHER TO A SON. SISTER IS SISTER TO A DAUGHTER. WE ARE THE MANY WHO ARE MANY. I CANNOT SPEAK FOR EVERYONE. I ENDEAVOUR TO TRY SINCE THE EXPECTATION RESTS WITH ME. IF THEY WERE IN HARMONY THEY WOULD APPRECIATE INDEED APPROVE OF MY METHODS.

TO EXPLAIN

FATHER (SEAN MCGOVERN)
& MOTHER (CECILA MCGOVERN)
JOHN BROTHER, FIRST BORN
BRIAN BROTHER, SECOND SON DIED OF HEART ATTACK AGED 19
MARK BROTHER, THIRD BORN
Hugh, BROTHER 4TH BORN
CLAIRE, SISTER 5TH BORN
JANE, SISTER, 6TH BORN
HISTORY OF OUR SOLAR SYSTEM
SOL WAS THE FIRST BORN
SECOND BORN ON 4TH ROCK
MOTHER EARTH
THIRD BORN, ON 3RD ROCK
DEVELOPMENTS

THE SECOND BORN DESTROYED THEIR CIVILISATION THE SURVIVORS FLED TO EARTH (3RD ROCK) MOTHER EARTH DOESN'T ACCEPTED THEM.

THE SECOND BORN TRIED TO CHEAT DEATH. THEY TRIED TO USE TECHNOLOGY TO SANITISE THEMSELVES. THEY INHABITED HUMAN BODIES AS HOSTS. THEY WOULD CONTROL THE HUMAN FOR A NEFARIOUS PURPOSE AND THEN HE WOULD NOT REMEMBER AFTEERWARDS.

THIS EXPLAINS THE DISHARMONY YOU WITNESSED TODAY IN THE KITCHEN OF MY MOTHERS HOUSE

I CAN EXPLAIN NO MORE THIS IS ALL I KNOW WILL YOU HELP US? WE THINK EVIL IS BANISHED FROM OUR WORLD. IS SUCH A THING POSSIBLE. IS IT POSSIBLE TO SUPPORT AND HELP EVERY HUMAN LIFE.

Mars & Stargate
HISTORY OF MARS

MARS WAS INHABITED AND TEEMED WITH LIFE ROUGHLY 4 BILLION YEARS AGO. TO GLOBAL SOCIEITES AROSE BASED ON GENDER. THIS IS TOTAL RECALL IT IS STORED IN MY DNA. THE PARTIARCHY AND MATRICHY OF MARS FOUGHT FOR CONTROL AND EVENTUALL DESTORY THEIR CIVILISATION IN A NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST,

THE SUVIRORS FLED TO EARTH AND IMPRENATED WOMEN INTRODUCING THE PROCESS THEIR ATTRIBUTES OF VICE, PHILIDANERING,LYING, CHEAT AND DECEIVIING.. GOD KICKED ADAM AND EVE OUT OF THE "GARDEN OF EDEN". BUT IT WAS WOMEN WHO SINNED.

THE MANY TRIBES OF ADAM AND EVE SPREAD AROUND THE GLOBE AND FOUGH MANY WAYS.

"Since the world has been primarily a patriarchal world since the beginning of recorded history men have invariably and successfully projected their sexual frustrations onto womanhood. Much of Christian myth is the sexual delusion of sexually victimized men. Christians speak of the "king of kings", not the "queen of queens". In a matriarchy it would doubtless have been the "queen of queens". All religions are sexual projections. They maintain their popularity because social disharmony prevents most people from ever being happy in a temporal way. "

THE SECOND BORN PLANNED THE MESSIAH PROJECT AND SOUGHT THE FUNDING FROM VARIOUS POLITIES UNDER THE GUISE OF THIS OR THAT NATIOANL NECESSTIIES

THE PLAN WAS TO CREATE 2 RULING HOSTS 1 MALE AND 1 FEMALE. I WAS THE INTENDED MALE HOST, Hugh MCGOVERN. LIANE DEN HARTOG WAS THE INTENDED FAMILY HOST

I SAID NO. FUCK OFF I AM NOT INTERESTED AND NOW YOU ARE UP TO DATE.

THE STARGATE WORKS. IT HARNESSES THE PSYHCIC ENERGY OF EVERONE WHO WORKS ON THE PROJECT. THE ENEMY MANIPULATIONED THE STARGATE TO KEEP YOU STUPID. WHO TOLD YOU ABOUT THE STARGATE IN THE FIRST PLACE. I WOULD CERTAINLY TALK TO HIM. WHO IS THE MOST AGGRESSIVE ADVOCATE OF THE STAR GATE I WOULD TALK TO HIM.

IF IT WORKS THAT'S GREAT. BIT DANGEROUOS DON;'T YOU THINK TO USE ALIEN TECHNOLOGY WHEN YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW IT WORKS AND WHAT IT'S PURPOSE MIGHT BE. YOURS TO RULE.

On Ideation Overwhelm
I experienced ideation overwhelm when I failed to find two things. Emotional realization (love) and progress to that goal and also self-realization (creative development). This apparent rejection took the form of LDH telling me to get lost and Cypher rejecting my script. A double whammy. But I think they were the significant events. And also I resolved the emotional realization issue in 2007 and I am much closer to resolving the self-realization with creative realism. So yes meeting Mary in 2007 was clear evidence of growth but in the emotional department. The self-realization had not grown at that point and continued to be an issue. But was much more manageable. I failed also in my efforts to develop myself. Clearly the trauma ideation was in the way and a huge problem and that impeded the self-development.

Pretty clearly self-realization was just as important to me in 1996 as it is now, which does indicate that it remains important and will always be important – clearly developmental. But creative realism is first and foremost an aspect of self, self comes first, creative works were started and not completed because I had still not developed self to the point necessary for me to be creatively realistic.

But as I can see from other people's situations that to be rejected on both aspects of one's developmental pathway is overwhelming devastating. There was long history of trying before it came to that. For the neurotics I know they would have achieved progress in emotional realization and that would avoid the catastrophic feelings and ideation that I went through.

Neurosis becomes psychosis

Conditions under which

Ideation levels reach a point where the connection with reality is lost. Stress is definitely a factor in this switch over. Emotional liberation, the individual becomes consumed by historic ideation, repressed and unprocessed feelings. The lead up is a more creative, emotive phase in the individual's life, which he is usually pleased about initially but quickly loses control of.

I think the ideation levels become too much and the self-concept is too unrealistic for the individual to maintain rational control of themselves and they slip into delusion or psychosis from neurosis. Medication returns them back to a neurotic state where they remain living in fear of loss of self-concept.

This is of course a rational fear because having lost their self-concept once they may again. However once the self-concept is sufficiently realistic there is no possibility of loss of self.

It is recurrent also because every time the individual approaches the truth about their emotional dysfunction the ego defenses kick in and the cycle of ideation and fear is triggered. Obviously when someone is delusional or psychotic they have no grip on reality at all but the neurotic would at best have a partial grasp on reality.

Stability therefore is during the rational, emotionally repressed, unemotive phase. The onset of the creative, emotive phase spells a period of high ideation and emotional instability. The individual cannot cope with the rapid stream of ideation and rational ego defenses collapse and the individual begins to believe and live out their dysfunction.

This is an inevitable recurring vulnerability unless the cycle of ideation is reduced to more tolerable levels. When the self-concept grows sufficiently and becomes sufficiently realistic then high levels of ideation will dissipate and the individual will be able to handle their emotional issues without intervention or outside help.

The role of medication in this process interrupts and represses the ideation cycle and the individual becomes once again rational and relatively unemotive. He often has no comprehension or rational awareness of what he did or said during the highly emotive phase. In this sense medication colludes with the rational but highly emotionally repressed individual to maintain that emotional repression.

The difficulty with ideation overwhelm is that it appears from an outside perspective and often to the individual as well that the individual has regressed as a result of the ideation overwhelm. Emotions have been surfaced that were unknown to the individual. These are however the individuals emotions so they belong legitimately and need to be dealt with. However with emotional repression the individual has much greater control over their emotions.

It comes back to the very old debate is repression better than expiation. If someone life is at stake then perhaps repression is better. I think however it is possibly to out the feelings and emotions in a safe and contained way without periodic episodes and upheaval. And I believe that talking about feelings goes a long way to settling the individual with those feelings. Often times they will have not told anyone how they feel ever and that therapy is the first time they openly talk about how they feel.

I continually underestimate the significance of having someone to talk too. If I had someone I could talk too in 1996 or during the last 15 years I know it would have made a difference. Nobody I was related to had a clue and I didn't talk to anyone professionally. I did talk to my parents and siblings all right but that didn't help. They couldn't provide any insight.

Telepathy – Internal conversational ideation
Internal dialogue believed to be other personalities in the head. The warring factions within the developing self-concept debate, argue, urge and cajole.

Mind Control
This is a delusional or neurotic idea that one's mind is being controlled by others. It stems from a lack of emotional control in regards to relatedness. In the developing self-concept the model of relatedness is the idealized parent of the opposite gender. When the individual is developing their self-concept they tend to dislike or reject this type of person or the perceived attributes of people they interact with who resemble their idealized parent. They disapprove in short of this type of behavior or more superficially this type of person.

It becomes mind control because ironically at the same time the individual is naturally drawn or attracted to this type of personality and to making peace and understanding this type of person. So there is an irresistible desire to relate which is then suppressed and becomes internal ideation.

My mother was to me incredibly controlling so I highly resented all females who I thought tried to control me. It was unacceptable behavior. The only similarity I know between my mother and all the women who made me feel they were controlling me was as with my mother I responded to their lack of approval by being more attentive, supportive and more approving. At the time this response of mine was involuntary. I naturally responded this way with LDH. I didn't have to think about it. So I had no control over the way they made me feel and my likely responses.

The process is they are forcing me to relate to them more and more and I trying harder and harder. I getting angrier and angrier, and I am having more and more ideation about this. So I really can only control this by avoiding the person who is making me feel like this and I dread any encounter with them.

Thought crime
Thought crime is any kind of deviant thinking concerning repressed emotions and the necessity for that repression. The developing self-concept knows that repressed emotions are repressed for very good reasons so there is a certain type of ideation which is criminalized pertaining to these repressed emotions. This feeds into other delusional ideas that an individual is being watched, monitored, and recorded, under surveillance.

An example of thought crime would be an individual brought up in a religious environment who might grow to question the existence of God. Such a thought is highly unacceptable and must be repressed.

Hearing Voices

In the emotionally disordered state the individual rationalizes their feelings and often attributes personalities to those feelings. It is a rudimentary attempt to make sense of very troubling and powerful feelings. Feelings that are rationalized as personalities can in extreme situations dialogue with the individual's conscious mind. It is an internal effort to resolve emotional disorder. This dialogue can become sufficiently intense that the individual hears voices.

This is in effect an ideation dialogue. The rationalized feelings will demand attention - can be very distracting, may in some instances completely overwhelm the mind. Again is a result of emotional intensity. What may be an acceptable dialogue or interior monologue for most people becomes unsustainable and unacceptable for an individual who hears voices.

In this scenario therefore the individual can lose touch with reality completely and become completely consumed by their internal conflict. This loss of self is really the loss of the rational self, subsumed into an emotional dialogue.

In our society restoring the rational self becomes the priority of medical intervention. However this is only putting the individual back together the way they were and does not offer them any insight or assist them really on the journey to self.

Again being rational is not enough to achieve oneness with self. It is precisely because individual have emotional preferences, preferences that their rational self often does not accept, that they find themselves in a state of distress and disarray.

Delusion

Step up of neurotic beliefs. The self-concept is highly idealized. The gap between the idealized self-concept and reality starts to reach unstable levels.

Psychosis

It is loss of touch with reality.

Clearly there is an ideation escalation with mania from a growing dogmatism to then assuming the identity of the ideas, beliefs and philosophies which sustained the unrealistic self-concept. *They are the ego defenses of the unrealistic self-concept.* An empathic NO to reality in effect. With growing intensity. At some point in this process the mind splits and takes sides in the struggle. And an internal (telepathic/voices) debate ensues.

Stable B – Neurotic Adult

Low Trauma – Unresolved stable idealization of Parents

There is high emotion with parent of opposite gender – charged environment and no realization of self.

These personified ideas were ideas that neurotic people like my parents, Spock etc carried around all their lives. Obviously they never personified them. And interestingly they would all be pretty reluctant to change. Their self-concept is partially based on reality and the rest is covered by ego defenses.

Adults hide the way they feel even from themselves. They will go to inordinate lengths to avoid admitting that they are wrong or saying sorry. They rarely support each other by showing empathy and compassion. Displays of emotion and outbursts are normally ignored in adult society and rarely responded too. They usually externalize the way they feel. So to be happy becomes for them a process of finding things or getting things or achieving things. They tend to be unhappier than their children.

Emotional realization and self-realization is stalled – prevented? Tends to be a lot of anger at the parent of opposite gender and self-realization of innate self-concept is also confused and repressed.

Self-concept partially based on reality

Neurotics have a partial grasp on reality and because their ego defenses have never been overwhelmed, they have never suffered psychosis they would tend to be very robust ego defenses. But the reality about neurotics is that they are not emotionally independent nor can they be until they grow. Neurotics are emotional dependents but their concept of relatedness is quite complex and diverse involving often many people.

Macks is a neurotic. He is not independent. He has a wide circle of casual acquaintance which is very important to him. He has no career or interest in one seemingly. He is quite coquettish and prone to violent outbursts of temper. Sounds like Mark McG. His ego defenses have never been overwhelmed but I would suspect he has come close. What is the prognosis for neurotics I wonder?

Neurotics definitely believe in mind control and that other people can adversely affect them and their mood.

Idealization of self-concept - Neurotic Beliefs

Belief is the filter through which reality is perceived. Because of his neurotic beliefs the individual's perception of reality is distorted.

Childhood idealized beliefs that do not become realized become neurotic beliefs.

A neurotic belief is an ego defense. That's what it's for - to defend the ego from painful realities.

See it more as an impediment to the evolving self-concept. Not as a permanent state of being. It will always be a necessary step.

Every neurosis centers on the fear of loss of self-concept. The neurotic is always fighting to sustain their self-concept. Every day is a battle between their perceived self-concept and reality. And it is a battle that seems to rise and fall and cycle from positive to negative as they go through live. Sometimes the battle appears to be going well. But it is not a battle that can ever end so long as the neurotic beliefs are sustained.

Neurotic ideas are generally unquestioned beliefs from childhood that are false but are deeply felt and believed by the individual. Neurotic beliefs distort the individual's self-concept and give rise to neurotic behavior and physiological problems.

This behavior however may only manifest itself at key critical points in the individual's life when the neurotic belief is subjected to testing from a change to the self-concept, i.e. the death of loved one, the break-up of a key relationship, the loss of a cherished position or role.

In the interim the neurotic engages in strategies to defend their flawed self-concept becoming a jealous or obsessive partner, a needy and emotionally demanding parent.

Central to the concept of being a neurotic is the neurotic belief and the neurotic refuses to surrender this belief regardless of the circumstances.

Neurotics tend to have a solipsistic self-concept and engage in an internal struggle with their distorted self-concept. This is the challenge the neurotic belief poses to the self-concept as the individual struggles to validate the neurotic belief.

Neurotic beliefs are childhood beliefs that survive into the older individual's self-concept. Time has not disabused the individual of these childish beliefs. Beliefs that are acceptable in the self-concept of a child are not desirable in the self-concept of an adult and the usual maturation process has not worked for whatever reason. Neurotic beliefs cause a lot of stress, anxiety, suffering and confusion to the neurotic adult.

Neurotic beliefs are usually learned from parents and are a reflection of the parental self-concept. As such they form part of the developmental self-concept for the developing individual. These neurotic beliefs are probably passed from one generation to the next by example rather than being learned.

The neurotic belief is false so it can never be validated.

On Self - Idealizations

Every man loves me (daughter)/Every woman loves me (son)
This is the neurotic belief formed by the daughter as a result of her idealization of her relationship with her father. And also the neurotic belief formed by the son as the result of his idealization of his relationship with his mother. This neurotic belief can be life long and in situations where it is proved to be false great stress and confusion results, though ego defenses quickly move to defend and protect the neurotic self-concept.

Omnipotence of feelings

Directionless
Directionless is the result of a lack of belief in one's own competency, skills or abilities to handle things on your one's own and the fear to set out on a course of self-direction and independence.

On Self - Negative

Low Self-Esteem

Categories of people vulnerable to having low self-esteem include the following:

Children who were verbally, emotionally, physically and/or sexually abused
Children who were not loved and accepted unconditionally either at home, at school or in the community
Children of parents or grandchildren of grandparents who came from a codependent or dysfunctional family system
Children of mentally ill parents
Children raised in a high stress environment
Children raised in an environment where feelings were not openly expressed, experienced or welcome
Children who have experienced the loss of a parent or significant other in their childhood

On Needy/Neurotic Parenting

This type of parent requires a lot of emotional reassurance and re-affirmation. Children act to fill that role and become their parent's most ardent supporters and encouragers.

Emotionally needy parents have emotionally needy children. Effect on children is that my parents need me emotionally. This forms an obstacle to self-development. Children act and intervene to address conflicts and resolve issues of their parents. I became my mother's counselor and my father's advisor on all matters – business, emotional etc.

The thing about Mum is her emotional realization was always a closely guarded secret that she kept from all of us with undesirable consequences when it came our turn to meet the opposite sex. She probably couldn't resist the feeling of being idealized. She needed it perhaps? Dad wouldn't have been far behind her either.

Neurotic Mother – Familial neuroses

The neurotic mother relies emotionally on her children, but forms her particular romance with her sons. The son's pivotal relationship with his mother forms the major aspect of the development of his emotional self-concept. If it were otherwise for me then I would be on the phone with Mark buttering him up and instead I am not.

Neurotic Father

Relies emotionally on his children but forms his particular romance and expectation with his daughters. Again Dad seems to be the pivotal relationship for Jane and Claire. Their relationship with their father seems to be the pivotal relationship in the development of their emotional self-concept.

Have to emotionally support my parents/younger siblings

On Relatedness

Neurotic Womanizer

Idealization of mother – every woman loves me.

Womanizing is a dreary quest for joy that has turned into a cycle of negative and self-defeating behavior. .Meeting someone new triggers that temporary feeling of joy and the absence of inner conflict that the womanizer is trying to capture and repeat over and over. Of course this doesn't work. It engages the individual in a cycle of abuse and counter abuse. They fail to capture or control that elusive feeling and when it passes their inner conflict reasserts itself and they feel compelled to meet someone else. Again they are trying to make themselves feel better the only way they know how. Being single or even being in a long term relationship would not satisfy their need for constant reassurance. They require or expect the unconditional approval of someone of the opposite sex. Since this in practice impossible they settle for the approval of the initial encounter.

Womanizers are men whose mothers suffered from child sexual abuse. They maintained an idealized emotional relationship with their mother and this allows them emotionally to inflict a cycle of abuse on women of their own age who take an interest in them. Emotionally they are in love with their mothers and as such unavailable emotionally to current commitments. Their maternal experience of love was conditional so they sustain ideated doubt concerning their lovability. As such continual reaffirmations are required. This is best achieved by a continuous string of short term relationships.

Neurotic Romantic
The neurotic romantic believes that being in love and being in a relationship is vital to their self-concept. Such a belief necessitates strategizing to avoid at all times being alone or without a companion. Extreme loss or depression results when the neurotic romantic is separated from their designated love. With marriage such an eventuality can generally be avoided for the greater part of the neurotic romantics lifespan.

The object of the neurotic's desire does not even need to be around or alive. The neurotic romanticism can continue without it. Love is the highest ideal to the neurotic romantic and is the basis of every justification. It can be grounds for divorce, affairs and much whimsical activity. Love as the neurotic romantic understands it is a distortion of their self-concept.

The romantic neurotic fears loss of self-concept. This is because he has based his self-concept on his relationship. So obviously he is very vulnerable to anything happening to that relationship. It would necessitate a complete rethink of his self-concept.

Love is that which vindicates my self-concept.

Neurotic People Pleaser
Irrational beliefs of people with the people-pleasing personality traits
I must be liked by everyone.
I must do nothing to upset others.
I must work harder to make things better for others.
They would never like me if they knew the truth about me.
I must be careful in my decision making so as not to upset anyone.
I can never do enough to please them.

I am responsible for other peoples' happiness.
How they respond to me is important.
The harder I work for them, the more they will appreciate me.
If they don't like me, I'm no good!
Always put others first! Put yourself last.
There is no task I won't do for you, large or small.
People can only like you if you appear nice, pleasant, friendly, and cheerful to them.
Your only role in life is giving to or helping others. (Self-abnegation)
If you are not successful, you are a loser and losers are ignored, unloved, and unwanted.
It's not who you are but what you do that counts.
You must always be understanding and have an open mind with people who are hurting you or putting you down.
If someone doesn't accept me, it must be that I'm not "good enough'' to be accepted.
No matter what I do, it never seems to be "good enough.''
I can do nothing right. I am worthless, useless, but I can't let others see this about me or they will reject me.

Anxious to please/Neediness/Conditionally accepted

A variant in people pleasing is of course the excessively charming individual – possibly motivated by getting parental attention by being nice.

Neurotic Messianic
Everyone likes me/Obsessing about people who do not like me

I think I have to allow other people the right to define their relationship with me. So I have to allow Mark, the Dags, Macker, whoever that right. I can't take it away from them. And it is instructive and definitional of me to allow for that. Otherwise I am wrestling always the neurosis that I can change other people's minds and get the kind of relationship I want from them. It's quite fascist and I should not attempt to overlook this sophistry because I think therein lies the insight into my soul. They are basically telling me - we don't want to relate to you and we don't rate your company very highly. Is that so unacceptable? Do I really need to spend all this time futilely trying to find a way for everyone to do what I want? That's what this is. Jane is the similar boat - last time I kind of felt that it was my agenda for us to spend an afternoon together.

I can carry on futilely trying to relate the above or I can just do nothing and not even worry about it. I was all set to call Mark and invite him to Achill. Why? He wouldn't want to go anyhow. It would just be embarrassing. I had a similar conversation with Greg about Niall. Greg was maintaining oh Niall is fine. He doesn't have any problem with me. But the reality is he has a really big problem that will never get sorted. And that's the truth. Can I handle the truth? Yes I can. I think I have nearly always been aware of it. Maybe I do divine some of the reason for the way things are, but so what. Bully for me. I still have to face emotional reality and when I do I can guarantee I will not be hyperventilating about the Dags or Mark. I roll it up into they don't like me, and that's okay. I don't expect them to like me. But that's the emotional closure. If I can figure out some level on which they do actually, really, kind of, sort of like me then it doesn't end, for emotional closure.

Maybe I am overstating but because it has never occurred to me that someone wouldn't like me I need to make this statement. Because it may be precisely for the reason that people would find me off putting. Because of the presumptive nature of oh you have to like me. I don't have to like. In fact maybe I don't like you because you think everyone likes so the deficit - the weakness that needs to be put right is people don't like me. Some people don't like me. Don't know why. Probably never will and don't care.

If everyone likes me then there is always work to be done. How interesting is it that the people I struggle with I focus on the most. And spend most time wondering about.

So to define the boundaries of my emotional self - the boundaries that so need to be set between me and other people I have to fully accept the possibility of being disliked. It may be rare but it is possible and to rule it out means that as I find I am completely way laid by the people I don't get on with.

It's a species of Christian masochism – this relentless messianic zeal to relate to all. It's never going to be reality. It doesn't matter who it is – there's always going to be somebody. And I am crucifying myself on the altar of my own self-delusion. It means I have spent a lot of my time trying to get with other people – instead of living which is what I should have been doing. I lived in a theoretical utopia.

It classically was my developing self-concept and so I fought manfully to justify it. But it was never true. Any time there was creative vindication two and two made five. And then I felt emboldened to ring up the world and reach out in all directions with no sense of my feelings. That's incidentally when I contacted Sherrard in 2009.

This messianic neurosis is of course a neurosis. I can't get on with, relate to, everyone the whole world.

Mark McG and Macks get around this problem by staying firmly within their circle and not straying outside that circle. Hughie gets around it by have a strict inner sanctum of family and everyone else is kept on the outside. The outside for him is a broadcast relationship. My situation was I was neurotically trying to relate to all and sundry. Behind this was a delusion belief in my own virtue, decency, goodness. I spent a lot of time trying to rationalize why people didn't like because I simply never accepted the fact that they did not.

This is where the creative self is not being realistic. I know what is creatively realistic about my capacity to relate. I have considered it more than enough. And so I have a conclusion. But the creative self with this neurotic belief will override the conclusion and insist upon the neurotic belief. They do like me, just try again, just try harder. That's how it works. If I listened to my feelings I would never be obsessing about these people. Because I know how I feel about them.

Without this information signal the creative yen always overreaches the predicates of relatedness and other people's reactions. I couldn't possibly have a clear sense of self with the messianic model of relatedness.

On Behavior – Socially Acceptable

Neurotic Aggressive/Violent

Seeks revenge and to do violence upon those who threaten his or her self-concept.

Neurotic worrying/anxiety/stress

Neurotic Successful

I believed all my life that success was what was deficient in my childhood environment. I actually don't believe that anymore. I think that my parents didn't face up to their issues. That's what the problem was. And I think success would have come my father's way if he had made progress on his issues. But success doesn't come to people with psychological problems. That's just it. Despite their best efforts it doesn't work. Hence my long diagnostic.

So the I Ching self-first and all else falls into place. So not success first self second. That's not going to work, always self first.

With Claire's situation I do see a bereavement complex behind the career obsession. Claire is creative and struggles with that. She like I evaluates herself constantly as people do in their developing stage. Ultimately however there is no necessity for evaluation just acceptance. Acceptance of her creative self. So she is the only one who doesn't believe in herself - just like I was. The stage she is at with it if anything like my own is she alternately suppresses and permits for her creativity. Rather than accepting it. Now she has decided it will be based on the success of her consulting business, as though that had anything directly to do with her being creative. So in effect she is putting a huge evaluation on herself - in my view unnecessarily and a lot of stress and hassle to prove something to herself too. It is an incorrect ordering in my view. Claire's creativity comes first and she must accept that and then see about what she might or might not do to share with others.

Neurotic Illnesses/Psychosomatic illness

The invisible and inexplicable illnesses. Socially acceptable manifestations of a poor self-concept. Neurotic illness and emotional pain are a physiological manifestation of poor self-concept and a strong internal struggle in the self-conscious.

Cancer, Anorexia, Bulimia and other problems

Neurotic Habits
Confusion/Indecision/Poor Concentration/Poor time management/Punctuation

On Behavior - Asocial

Pedophilia

A pedophile male is a sexual fantasist of the highest order. This is a highly developmental ego defense and a reflection probably of extreme disempowerment as a child in relation to an adult. The pedophile imposes his sexual fantasy on an unwilling child and finds this gratifying. It would appear to be consistent with his own childhood experiences of disempowerment. What was done unto him strikes him as normal and acceptable. It is also an inordinate need for control in relatedness – and what better opportunity for taking control than on a child. A normal adult relationship for this type of developing

self-concept is not possible. The pedophile needs such a high level of control that he is never going to find that with another adult until he overcomes his childhood trauma of disempowerment.

Indiscriminate murder

The indiscriminate murderer who murders innocent people who he doesn't know again is seeking to impose his developing self-concept on his world. There is implicit rage in such an action and the murderer wants society to pay for his emotional isolation. It is probable that such an event is kicked off when the murderer comes to conclusion that he can find no way to resolve his emotional isolation without an episode of extreme violence. At the very least he has succeeded in getting everyone's attention.

This event bizarre as it may seem to many is a vindication for the indiscriminate murderer of their developing self-concept. A spectacular violent reaction to their suffering seems justifiable to them. They are possessed with self-righteous rage and indignant.

Again there may not be any serious evidence of trauma or physical in their backgrounds, but I would suspect there would certainly emotional abuse and emotional isolation from both parents. This emotional isolation is the intolerable state of being that they are striving futilely to end. They just don't know how to connect emotionally with other people but they never knew how. They live in a barren, alien, desert world where there is no human fellowship or warmth or kinship but they yearn for it and in the end they will do anything to get it.

The point about indiscriminate murder is it's a motive-less crime. There is no motive. The victims have done nothing to the murderer. With criminal murder there is a motive. It may be money, drugs, whatever. So the indiscriminate murder has no justification for what they did and yet they did it.

It's hard to understand what it feels like to be completely disconnected emotionally with the sense that no one understands me. It's far worse than solitary confinement. The murderer is imprisoned in their own mind. He can't connect with anyone emotionally. People with good emotional intelligence would never be in that situation. Because they know how awful it feels. And it does feel awful. So the murderer has a very high level of emotional repression. This allows him to commit asocial acts without any immediate sense of empathy or concern for his victims. He quite simply doesn't feel it.

From an emotional perspective he is very closed emotionally.

On Religion

The religious doubts their self-concept and is haunted by recurring visions of their own mortality. So hence the self-concept has to be continually reaffirmed by prayer and regular devotion. People pray because they doubt their self-concept. Prayer gives them an illusory sense of their own virtue. Prayer is in essence self – confession. It is the manifestation of

Healthy Self-Concepts

Stable C – Normal Development of Adult Self-Concept

No trauma, evolving de-idealization of parents

Completely unwind ego defenses

Changing the Self-concept

Changing ones self-concept is very stressful and requires complete self-honesty, courage and personal bravery. Many neurotics are not able for this kind of self-change and often they have a low opinion of therapists and counselors seeing them as a threat to their fragile self-concept. The fact is a neurotic may be right and changing their self-concept is just too much and too painful. And they can't go there.

Counseling

The solution to much mental anguish is to vocalize one's feelings. Tell other people how you feel. Admit how you feel and don't struggle to hide it and fight it. The better case scenario is to adjust your self-concept to reflect how you feel and create for yourself a lifestyle that reflects your feelings and then congruence is achieved between self, feelings and other people.

The first step is to admit one's feelings and accept them and then the changes necessary to reduce ideation.

I think probably the Sinead Dillon fiasco was the spur to go and see Clare Regan, which started in July 2006 and went on for six months. So when I failed to connect emotionally with her I knew I needed help.

I really wasn't content to be a neurotic so there was more to be done I felt. It seems unlikely to me that at the end of it all I would end up like the 2 Marks or whoever.

Journaling

Self-reflection

Education
Deliberate development of a healthy self-concept

Should it not be society's responsibility to ensure that people reach their goal of knowing self?
It is in society's self-interest. That might be the educational ticket - time alone for the developing human. Because if it's a headlong rush from parents to relationship that's not good for self-development.

Enlightened
Actual Self Concept = Reality = Self

I am indispensable to me only and not to anyone else.

So I have complete emotional realization. I find self-realization is within my grasp. And I find trauma ideation is resolved.

Enlightened Self-Concept

Enlightenment is to achieve the ability to self-validate one's ego and self-concept. This is an achievable state of mind for anyone. The self-concept becomes known to the conscious mind.

I see now that the truth I have always sought is the "emotional harmony" the syncing of head and heart. The emotional truth combined with rational self. This was what I only knew in glimpse before.

Mature self-concept

The mature self-concept is the realization of the innate self-concept.

I talk a lot about being someone, doing something, being a therapist, being a writer, being a something. But in fact I just am. I don't have to aspire. I am. Stop aspiring. Self isn't a matter for tomorrow. It's now. It's the present.

Self-actualization of self-concept
The interesting thing is that once I embraced the concept of self-concept change as being beneficial rather than thinking of it as something to be resisted then things started to change quite dramatically. Thing is the neurotic sees no reason to change. And someone who doesn't question their self-concept - could be quite healthy in many respects - again would be inclined to be resistant.

So there is plenty of implication for all because it seems as though very few people would have taken their self-concept to the limit of self-improvement. What would be the motivation? It would never occur to them there was anything actually wrong with them! Therein lies the issue. Humanity is neurotic.

Moving from trying to change the world to trying to change my self.

Chances are if the individual has problems with their feelings and difficult expressing how they feel that the world they have built around them does not reflect how they feel. Because they have constructed this inauthentic edifice sitting on them it seems like an impossible and monumental task to change it. And yet it is causing problems and needs to change. Again it is necessary to focus on self first. Everything we do flows from self so knowing ones true self makes it very clear what role that individual should play in the world.

Again the individual is coming from a mentality of externalization so they believe they have to change the world in order to change themselves. And that is why they give up trying. However they don't need to change the world. They need to change their own world. Their own world consists of what they do, who they interact, who they call friend, what kind of work they do. These are the defining attributes of an individual's world.

Success - Achieving self-concept

Success is self-knowledge and the fulfillment of that journey. Obviously we are exposed to other definitions of success as we go through life. And often we need to cast aside those popular

misconceptions. When someone knows themselves then their actions in the world will be successful. This is to say that those actions will be consistent with how they feel.

This is also why children are nearly always successful whereas many adults are not. Again children act on how they feel. Their feelings are in concert with themselves. Adults on the other hand often do not act on how they feel, say what they mean, express how they are feeling and as a result find themselves locked in unsuccessful lifestyles.

In the material world success is the acquisition of property and assets, fame, power, prestige, high office and so on. None of these are inimical to self-knowledge per se but they are not enough. And they are not the answer. We start with self and we end with self and if we get confused and befuddled in between then we can't blame anyone but ourselves. Journey's end is self so reason would suggest that taking the most direct route possible is the best strategy.

It tells me also that achievement is a personal metric always and only. It doesn't matter what accolades you get or seek. I evaluate myself according to self.

There is no failure – Only learnings

In our modern world failure is regarded as a terrible tragedy. We don't like it when things go wrong and we are not equipped emotionally to accept failure. But implicit in our journey to self is the realization that we will always fail when we deviate from that journey. Because it is that journey that really matters and all other journeys are digressions. When we arrive at self we are at our journey's end and then there are no more paradigms to more successes and failures, no more critical self-evaluation, just peace and self-awareness. So the sooner we fail in our externalizations the sooner we reach our journey's end.

Of course this may seem incomprehensible in the logic of our world that if a man loses his business or his job or his marriage that he someone better off and more enlightened. And it is not the case to suggest that having involvements or material possessions are a barrier to self-enlightenment. But it is more the pursuit of such things and what we are prepared to do in order to have them and how devastated we are likely to be if we lose some of them or it doesn't go our way.

The sad reality is that people often define themselves by what they have not who they are. When we are defined by our possessions and our involvements we live or die by the success or failure of those things. When we look into ourselves and find within ourselves sufficient self-justification a terrible burden of fear is lifted off our shoulders. We all know how transient life is and how strengthening self is the only way to shield oneself against sudden misfortune and the unpredictable that we all live with.

Relationships – a reflection of self

Being happy – don't betray or cheat yourself – don't be the instrument of your own repression and self-abuse.

The developmental pathways are all unique and different but the outcome is the same for everyone and if they develop them will all draw the same conclusions, because they are obvious and no other conclusions are possible. It's only by completing the journey that this realization is possible.

As I grow in confidence in my self-concept it becomes apparent to me that the dictatorships of the world should be democracies and that is unambiguous. That the plight of humankind will be improved by a better understanding of self, nation and the world. That all goals of import in the future will be common human goals collectively posited and executed. Too late for nation in my view. Ad Astra is our destination. The teenager needs to grow up.

This is the vindication of those of marginal culture – nation is in the way – big or small.

The output of my thought processes is creatively realistic. Creativity is fun and everything and I enjoy other peoples creativity but that's all it is on its own - recreational really. Life is meaningless with realism on its own. It doesn't mean anything. Why would do anything just to be realistic? This puts the whole thing in the correct perspective. Creativity isn't all consuming any more than realism is. That is a mentality I had to develop out of. It's hard to see how I could bring anything to market without doing that.

I would just have been as I have alternately consumed by creativity and then completely repressing that creativity. Creativity may have felt all consuming because well it really didn't get let out much. So when it did it took center stage always. But that's not how it has to be. Obviously it needs to be as aspect of me not all of me.

So creativity assumes its proper place with me and no longer needs to struggle to be heard. Neither do I need to talk creatively to people who haven't a clue what I am talking about or resent them for not understanding.

My creativity was always all consuming. Everything had to be dropped in favor of this creative monster. I couldn't do anything else when in the grip of it. And then as quickly it was gone and I back to my completely uncreative self again. Lacking in passion, purpose, direction, meaning. All these things that had somehow been segmented away from me. Until the next episode.

I did however prioritize my creativity to some extent always. I remember writing books in ITC and other places. I just don't think the whole story about me is purely just creative. It was creative realism. So that would mean that I would move on from creative projects that didn't deliver that understanding and go to the next project until I found what I was looking for. That's pretty much what happened. I sought the fusion implicit in myself.

I don't think I was looking for publication - I think I was looking for self-knowledge. And that each time I did this I found a little more. I think it's true to say that I could have exited the cycle at any point really. But it not satisfactory so I kept going. Another round. This is a circular argument - the whys and wherefores of the past don't interest me. We all make mistakes. The trick is to stop making them.

I think I regarded my situation probably correctly as a deficit of self-knowledge and I reasoned further that if addressed that I would resolve my issues. That's basically it. I think that's pretty reasonable.

I think when anyone has a catastrophic collapse of a psychological nature and they go to the caregivers and they tell them they have an incurable condition and I also know and always knew that it pertained to my personal psychology but did not understand the connection – then I say to myself well I have to sort this out myself and I will and the rest is history as they say.

This all has lost its emotive value. Growing pains! What else is there to say?

Surrender to self
I have to surrender to self. I have to give in and let go. Let self take over and guide not this neurotic shadow boxing.

Success
On a personal note I have an innate fear of leaving the bipolar cycle of ideation and perhaps a fear of abandoning and relinquishing the idea that Brian can be saved. As long as the drama continues I can avoid confronting the emotional reality of the loss. So there is fear accompanied to getting over this. But me getting over my developmental trauma is not going to change the world. As Sean said you might do something great when you come out of it. So the fear is not how I would cope with public attention – it's actually an intellectualized discouragement of relinquishing my grief. As I have read – people are afraid of being successful.

On Self
I expect no more major bells and whistles because the developmental ideation is resolved. Before it wasn't - but then it was of diminishing intensity. It is over for me. And that's fine. No longer vaunting in my developmental sap!

On Emotional Realization

Harmony
It is the harmony between the emotional self and the self-concept. The self-concept is unconditional.

There is no connection between the way I feel and other people and the way they behave or the way they feel. There isn't a connection. My feelings are not contingent on other people.

I think in answer to my earlier question I thought my feelings would kill me. The pain was so great that I thought I would die and so I always negotiated with my feelings. So that's why it takes 20 minutes to figure out how I feel about Martin. The complete cycle of ideation as I have now long suspected always ends in my death (loss of self). So I was never actually suicidal I ideated my own death and the ideation cycle starts and ends with the feeling I am going to die. I recall now that last night I dreamt my teeth were cracked at front (getting old). The gap is now closing fast between feelings and self-concept. So self-concept is a profile of one's emotional self.

The ideation keeps demanding emotional responses - essentially the same response. When I go through the ideation maelstrom I find that like the example of Mary - an established, stable, healthy relationship causes zero ideation. Contrary to my treatment of myself people do accord each other the benefit of the doubt. I never gave myself the benefit of the doubt. I couldn't be wrong. Being wrong could kill me. It truly was a life or death situation from an intellectual standpoint.

So trivial whys and wherefores don't matter. When to call, what to say, what not to say, really doesn't matter. What matters is that I make the connection. Maintain the connection.

Self-concept is a profile of emotional self - but only ever an approximation - so ideation is always necessary to bridge the gap between feelings and self-concept because it is a gap that can never be closed, so there is approximation. There is a sense or intuition. If the gap between self-concept and feelings is too large - high ideation results. If sufficiently high the individual would be considered to be exhibiting signs of emotional instability.

The ideation cycle represents the developing self-concepts ongoing dynamic approximation of reality. It is the rationalization of the developmental process. When the developmental cycle is complete the ideation associated with that cycle - the developmental set of ideas, impressions, concepts etc. is resolved and the self-concept and emotions, feelings sync. This is a state known as emotional harmony.

I think I like everyone fundamentally believes their emotional responses are valid. After all it is the way I feel. The question of intensity therefore determines if such feelings can be socially constructive or sufficiently gentle to permit relatedness. I can after all feel such rage that I want to kill my neighbor or I can simply cross the street and avoid him. Both are emotional responses to the same feeling of dislike for the neighbor. However the killing is obviously asocial.

In practice in our modern world most people repressed or internalize intense emotions to the detriment of their health and well-being. Some find constructive avenues for the intense cycles of ideation and find themselves constructively motivated and energized by the cycles.

So the end of the journey of self is not the end of emotional responses but rather emotional responses that are gently and stably responded to and dealt with.

In terms of emotional harmony I think that feelings in tune with reality mean feelings in tune with self. Means feelings are self-contained. Feelings not in tune with reality mean behavioral difficulties. Feelings not in tune with reality are the responsibility of the individual. Where people run into difficulties is always with severe emotional reactions - particularly as children, grief, loss, abuse, emotional and physical these events create a divorce between feelings and reality.

Truth & Freedom
Truth has a variety of meanings, primarily being in accord with fact or reality, fidelity to an original or to a standard or ideal and, in common usage, constancy or sincerity in action or character.

It is a visceral, heartfelt connection that arises between reader and character or characters through the unfolding (and possibly the resolution) of an invented, narrated conflict. This truth arises through a combination of immersions in details, settings, actions, dialogue, inner monologue, "living flesh on the page" as Barry Hannah said. Without emotional truth, a key purpose of great literature, empathy, is hard to conceive.

On an emotional level I would now think Claire and John would be the closest possible relationships I could have. Not only is this okay it's the way of the world. And to think that I could get on with everyone in my family - which is a big family - to the same degree and level - was never reality. It never happened. I just lived in a neurotic world where fantasy and reality were blurred. I would say Mags has always known how she felt about me - I that I always struggled because I didn't know how I felt. Mark probably the same - I really doubt he is giving any major consideration.

Isn't this an emotionally stabilizing realization? Rather than thinking that I don't connect emotionally with anyone in the family I now see because I am acquainted with my emotional self that I connect with John and Claire emotionally. I think that's fine. It's not what I would have expected but I didn't have a clue anyway so what odds?

It's good for me because as regards family - I don't live in a desert on my own as I previously thought. I do have family I can connect with. I thought I didn't but I see that I do.

I think it is true if you have universal model of relatedness that works then I think everyone I come into contact with will respect me. But like me, want to be my friend, any of that I cannot say. I will get respect because I will be showing respect.

As the Dad in First Contact - what makes the loneliness bearable is knowing, we are not alone. So finding emotional connections in the McGovern family I can tell you was some project but needed to happen. Now I see Mark more like the Prodigal Son really on safari. He will check in when he does.

If I think about my Mum for second she is completely defensive emotionally. She is completely self-righteous and will never admit anything. Hyper critical. And massively insecure. Low self-esteem. Mark pretends he this aloof, detached guy. He is a mass of insecurities. He is also very critical and touchy and irascible. Jane as well – I don't feel that emotional connection. I could be wrong but not getting it.

For all these kind of reasons an emotional connection is not possible. Should I feel bad about this? Is anyone struggling to get on with me?

With Mum I can't win and never could. I can't make her happy. It's beyond me. It's really up to her. So I let go of that.

What is the disappointment exactly with mother that I find so disconcerting? Is it that I expect emotional support and don't get it? That could be. I don't think we will ever find agreement emotionally, nor the emotional connection that I have always striven for with her, don't think that's possible. So we connect on politics and general chit chat. And that's okay. I think I am finally satisfied knowing a) that emotional connections exist in the first place. Something I didn't know and b) I know how to find the connections

that I need and already have some. Then my emotional self is clearly defined. And all this upheaval of ideas and concepts and culture can all settle.

Connections with Self

With Brian there was an emotional connection? And with him gone the world was desolate. Neither parents nor older male siblings. John I say now could be but John when I was growing up was very problematized. Not saying he isn't now but it is no longer a problem for me. So I can very easily see how I got to feeling I was all alone. And I felt an emotional connection with Karen Barlow, right? And that gave me a huge boost. And then Jennifer? And not again until Mary.

And so from an emotional perspective the women I have had an emotional connection with are Karen, Jennifer and of course now Mary. All the rest there was no emotional connection.

What am I to make of emotional connections? Well I suppose I am just looking at this from my perspective. What else? Karen, Jennifer and now Mary. I am sure Anna would think we connected emotionally at one point. I am also fairly sure that Karen wouldn't be interested in any contact now - even an email. Do I need to connect "emotionally" with my mother? Would it make any difference? How do I feel about people within I am unable to make an emotional connection?

Or now that I am emotionally reconnected with self does this mean I stop looking outside for relatedness? I think it must mean that. The only person I need to feel unconditional about is I.

Feelings/ Connections

My likes and dislikes are based on my emotional connections and disconnections. Are based on my feelings. This is the thing about emotional intelligence - it's never explained. You are got it or you don't. And people have degrees of it.

It's not at all a great tragedy that everyone doesn't get on. There would be no color and uniqueness in people if they all got on the same way. Mark is happy with his friends and his life. I don't fit into it. So there it is. The Dags are happy and I don't belong in their world. Why would I want to be in there anyhow? It's not a tragedy. Roll it up to - ah well you know - different strokes for different folks. The thing I am going to see all these people again so mellow is good. If I can manage it.

We had mellow yellow with complete repression and no emotional intelligence. Now we have mellow yellow with emotional intelligence - better right?

So I would be low key about preferences. But as long as I know - that's all that matters. Not just because I might offend people but also so I can navigate around many different types of people without incident. That would be possible if I was highly reactionary.

Realists

The emotional part of the brain is clearly older than the rational part of the brain. All the emotions motivation, passion, drive, love, hate, revenge, jealously, envy and so on sit beneath a rational higher level which attempts to work out and resolve these feelings in the most desirable way. Poor self-

concepts give rise to high levels of ideation. The more the emotional self is known the less there is a need for rationalization and high levels of ideation.

Men tend to be less emotionally developed than women. This is because they don't need to be. Women on the other hand need better emotional intelligence because they are responsible for the survival of their children. So they tend to have a better more realistic self-concept and look after themselves better and live longer.

The fact is reason is only an approximation for feelings. But feelings are only an intuition about reality. So reason interprets feelings, whilst feelings provide an emotional response to reality.

Since Martin and I are both emotionally promised elsewhere we cannot really form a stable emotional bond. And a certain amount of repression is necessary. However to sustain a friendship or any relationships requires a sufficient empathy for friend's feelings - to maintain the connection.

Mainly I must accept my feelings. But I do accept my feelings. As much as anyone does. I want to connect with people but I like my solitary life. So I don't want to be involved in a lot of society. But people need to be given a chance to get to know me and get comfortable. I am emotionally conflicted but I want diametrically opposed things. I want closeness. I want freedom. I want closeness when it suits me but that might hurt other people. Is this not Lewis's fundamental contradiction - spiritual animals. Emotional rationalists.

On Creative Realization

Creativity & Self Realization
My creative self has nothing to do with my emotional self. However the two were completely mixed up for me. I approached my emotional problems with a creative, intellectual, problem solving approach.

Creativity is a mindset, an aspect of personality, a way of looking at things, creative problem solving and creative realism. This is what it is. I can trace through my earlier efforts the heavy hand of emotional dysfunction upon them. They really just didn't make a lot of sense. Creative people can make intuitive jumps and leaps and connections that more linear thinkers would be unable to do.

Creative ideation is not necessarily unstable only I was always believed that it was – but I suppressed my creativity. I know creative thinkers who are perfectly stable and never had any medical problems. They do I think find the creativity quite consuming when the creative ideation is high. But it is not a problem necessarily. It has been said that there is a preponderance of creative thinkers with mental health issues but I would not think that to be the case from my experience. Emotional issues are not a prerequisite for creative expression per se, though they can be a motive.

I was little afraid of the consuming nature of creativity but that's really because I had a negative view of my creativity – it was stimulating but meant trouble was coming.

Emotional instability is caused by unresolved and repressed emotions. If those unresolved and repressed emotions are addressed there is no instability. I think I was striving for emotional connections because I

felt emotionally isolated. I do think mental health problems are caused by emotional issues only that develop as a result of trauma and parental relations.

You could be a very successful writer like Hemingway or Joyce – highly creative and acknowledged by society but clearly with emotional issues.

Again I keep looking at this backwards. Emotional growth facilitates development of self. One's abilities depend on where one is at in the development cycle - the further along the better.

I applied my brain to the problem of my emotional development and this is the result.

Creativity and Money
I think maybe the salient feature of my development was intensity and extremes. Everything became a major battle or struggle - even the simplest of things. Through all that I still tried to get on with things - live. My emotionally reasoning was highly intense and phased. A healthy lifestyle is the first priority.

Of course the creative struggle which has been at the center of my struggles for so long is of course hard to realize. I have to accept the difficulties associated with this prime directive of me. They not easily resolved in fact living in hope of that resolution is probably a mistake. Not associating money with creativity is probably the smartest move - anything that places constraints on my being creative I will always struggle against.

Obviously my binge drinking on Friday had an adverse impact on my mood and forgetfulness too. I suppose such bouts do illustrate the strong need for escapism in my bereaved self-concept. But mainly there is an inevitable quality to these episodic feelings of loss followed by feelings of hyper, manic enthusiasm.

So I see more clearly now how the idea of worldly relevance resolved for me the insecurity of being creative in an indifferent world. And that might easily predate Brian's death. Fact is I accept that I just am creative. Has nothing to do with money or relevance to other people. I might believe in aliens. I might not. It really hardly makes any difference what I believe. It changes from time to time. Fact is I intend to be happy and enjoy life.

So the publication thing is still up in the air but it doesn't stop me being creative.

Creative Struggle and Uncreative Work
So I see more clearly now how the idea of worldly relevance resolved for me the insecurity of being creative in an indifferent world. And that might easily predate Brian's death. Fact is I accept that I just am creative. Has nothing to do with money or relevance to other people. I might believe in aliens. I might not. It really hardly makes a difference what I believe. It changes from time to time. Fact is I intend to be happy and enjoy life.

This is quite a scary realization for me for to have the calm and peace of mind that I need will require not working fulltime in the financial industry. That is a world of frustration for me. Part time would be okay.

And it has to allow me the time to create. The kicker than in AIB was the constraints the uncreative, demanding work.

I suppose JOS is the pent-up frustration of 32 years so am I not past the kind of struggle, frustration and misery Greg Keen is writing about? But Greg resolved his problems by not working in the corporate sector. Martin is covered financially. Would they not be having major problems back in those sectors just like I would be? My peace of mind started when I left AIB?

It is the money then isn't it? I think I have to accept that the frustrations I have felt before would return. And in fact I would be less likely to put up with it not more. I think I have to accept myself without conditions. Otherwise I am bargaining.

Greg Keen is right. There isn't enough time working full time to do anything creative during the week. Then the weekend the dread of next week is upon me and I drink too much. Also it is so stressful and mentally demanding to be at work in the finance industry that there is nothing left for other pursuits. For a healthy lifestyle then day work has to be relegated and not too demanding. P/T would be okay. Hence the struggle.

I have to accept therefore that I just am creative and that means not being constrained and limited by a work framework. It means that I need to be in charge of all that. And it also means I have to accept that it may not result in money because again that is just another constraint. So a part time job and whatever occurs to me as suitable and meaningful to do in a creative way is the plan.

So I actually think the biggest part of my struggle in life in my adult life has been my uncreative profession. That was just an ongoing struggle. Unavoidable and inevitable. And yet there is no job for me. I create. And this struggle has been very soul destroying for me for my confidence and self-respect take a constant hammering in this environment or structure. No wonder then I feel so alienated from the world I live in.

I don't blame anyone but I know I was too influenced by my mother who always encouraged me not to be creative and disapproved of creativity.

Time goes on and these artists get depressed by not being able to enjoy work. Their creative energy is killed by a job that requires creativity but doesn't allow for self-fulfillment. They are unable to create art in their spare time either, because after a whole day of frustrating work who could? Greg Keen

So all that taken into consideration I see that I don't need to evaluate JOS or my creativity at all. I was basically dismissing my creative need periodically depending on criteria. I dismissed myself which presumably contributed to my losing of self. It was like all struggles self-imposed.

Creative Realism – Creative Struggle
Even though I have vague intentions of doing something other than being creative I don't seem to manage it. And I wake each morning thinking today will be great I will have a clear deck and I can for the first time be free of this project. And then I find 100 additions from the day before. When I being creative I forget to wash, to eat, to exercise, it's overwhelming. I think I have my answer concerning

motivation - I am highly motivated to be creative. So there it is. I have a passion. I am strongly motivated to finish JOS and I will.

I realize that my two sides are converging - have converged - creative and practical - into creative realism. I don't have to plan further segmentation. No need. The split was in me. Creativity on its own is useless. Rationality on its own is useless. Only together do we have a winning combination. I am that singularity. There is only one of me.

I was either overwhelmed by my creativity or demoralized by my realism. Never the twain would meet in me until now that is. I realize now that my creative projects until now lacked realism and that my realistic endeavors were devoid of creativity. An impossible conundrum and the two states of mind were separated and split into phases with no communication or intelligence between phases.

Creativity and the World

Clearly the creative struggle stems from the fact that as Clare noted it is only my rational, practical face I show to the world. I dismiss my own creativity as rubbish and don't show this face because I think it is insane, lunatic, undesirable, worthless, and so on. As Eric Guiry told me you are creative - you will never amount to anything unless you are creative. So the great schizoid denial of my adult life was I pretended I wasn't creative. When I repressed all my feelings due to my parents and trauma, I also in some way repressed my creativity along with it. It became associated with that.

Creative Hugh fights for recognition even from you. You have described to me how you feel as if there is a constant internal battle between the two aspects of yourself, creates ongoing tension, agitation and anxiety. Clare Regan

So by accepting my creativity and according it self-recognition I end the negative cycle in relation to my worldly face.

I wonder why I would doubt this for even one second after fifteen years of futilely striving in office environments it should be pretty obvious. I need to create and will always resent any environment that stymies my creativity. There is again obviously no job for me. There never was. Any framework created by others immediately would constrain my creativity. The best option is a part time job, something that will not interfere with the creative process.

I had this idea that my creative self was being persecuted which was actually true but instead of the world doing it I was actually persecuting myself. Just like I wanted to blame my Mum for the way I felt. I wanted to blame the world for the way I felt about my creativity. But I never believed in my own creativity. It was always a pile of rubbish.

So I just have to give in and accept it and continue to follow my creative journey. It has led me to here and it is a continuing journey. The negativity concerning creativity is again the same old bereavement complex.

Creativity and Motivation

So by accepting my creativity and according it self-recognition I end the negative cycle in relation to my worldly face. So believe it or not there is a creative engagement with all this. And there is creative ambition and there is the desire to perfect one's art. So this will now direct me going forwards. But it is a gentle movement or transition so it is happening and will continue to happen.

I think I should relax and be open about my interests. There is nothing sinister or unwelcome going on here. There is a pull and push here and I feel it. It is not unwelcome - quite the opposite. It is healthy and I shall move on with it.

Beyond a wholesome discipline be gentle with yourself.

It is strange. I suppose I saw my father's struggles with creativity and my mother's critique of it and I concluded that it was a very dodgy idea. So the minstrel boy really shouldered his father's intellectual sword. I repressed my creative urges because I knew my mother would disapprove. Artistry was crazy, irresponsible, unwise, foolish, unpredictable and so on, all the characteristics that my innate self-concept disliked. Of course creativity was completely associated in my mind with being emotional which of course it has nothing to do with. I associated creativity always with my father and his characteristics when in fact my mother was far more successfully creative than my father. But my father at least expressed his creativity more openly than I did.

So the struggle in the office was the uncreative work and the directive environment not the awkward relationships with co-workers. That never had any material impact on me. No material impact maybe but I think it did affect me quite badly to be constantly fighting with the people around me. The walk outs nearly always tallied with the onset of a manic phase.

I think creative realism means this – doing what I like and realizing that it is not crazy, foolish or imprudent, and losing that fall on my sword, bereavement mentality. There is no drama here. So ultimately as usual I have demythologized my own self-concept.

So I would add the need to create to the trauma and the parents as a further element of the lethal cocktail that led ultimately to a very prolonged experience of bipolar. I misrepresented myself to me and of course to the world so my public persona was never stable. I was not known to other people and I doubted that creative face. As Clare says I am sure the world would accept that side of me too.

So to summarize there was the rejection from LDH, the rejection from Cypher, the moving out alone falling out with the 2 lads in Chicago.

So the part time job will be completely subservient to my creative needs and that's the way I like it. Uncreative jobs just don't work for me and they never will. I just have to accept that and focus on my creativity. I think I have seen enough now to know. Even if I was dumb enough to take another full time corporate job I know it would never work out. The same thing that always happens would happen.

And yes there is a push to achieve with creative things. But I could hardly expect to be motivated without one, so onwards and upwards.

Clearly my dad repressed his creativity too. Or certainly struggled with it. Then again his father encouraged him to suppress it. And his wife certainly did. So there is a long history of frustrated artistry in the McGovern family. Anyway I am content that is the bottom line.

I think if I accept my creativity and allow it to take its twists and turns then I will lead myself on naturally in the right direction. This is after all an emotive journey and I know how much I struggled with my emotions. So again it's simple. Stop struggling and accept. It's nothing to do with notches in the bedpost. It's really about unfettering my emotional self and allowing it to develop. This isn't the end of growth. This is just the start of stable, continuous growth.

I have to surrender to self. I have to give in and let go.

On Ego
The vaunting self-concept is the stressful self-concept.

Healthy ego– No need for control – Letting go of ego
Healthy ego defense means I come first before all other considerations. My concern for others is only allowable on the basis of myself coming first. It's not in reality real concern just a desire not to worry about others and thereby intervene to address or head off those worries.

*You may need to accept uncertainty, imperfection, **the possibility of a bad outcome**, and lack of some control. **Let it go to let me live.** I will never have certainty, never have complete control, never be perfect. That's OK. I am human. I don't need certainty or complete control. How do I know? Because every day I live with uncertainty and lack of some control. And the world hasn't ended. Finally, focus on what you can control.*

I have to relinquish control of the future in order to live in the present. One bad thing happened to me aged 12. Am I forever to live in fear because of it? Stop trying to control outcomes. There is no control - just life. But that's okay. Worry isn't concern. It's selfishness.

There is no difference between interacting and getting on with

"As far as possible without surrender be on good terms with all persons." Desiderata

Self-validation of self-concept
A stable self-concept. Do I even need to validate my ego?

Respect – Defining of self
Respect is definitional of self. I think I have always known this. Respect defines the borders between me and other people. I don't expect love or liking but I do expect respect and if I don't get that then I am not happy. It's not acceptable to me to be snubbed, ignored, put down, and dismissed and so on. I am not going to respect anyone who treats me like that.

I am not out to settle old scores or get even. I just expect respect from the people around me and if I don't get that I am not going to entertain them. That's all. I don't care who it is. So it is one rule for all. And I really don't think I will go wrong with that - and I not asking for anything unreasonable.

Agendas for people don't work. I can't have one agenda for one person and another for a different person. In the same way agendas for life or the world don't work.

I think that self is a complex interplay of emotion, reason and physical - and then they are feedback effects from food, alcohol and so on. I think that is still syncing up for me and it can be draining.

The creative self and the realistic self, have to meet, get acquainted, get cemented, get married and become one. And maybe this takes some time I don't know. But I know I have been getting ahead of myself and when I am overly creative is when I do something like that.

Dropping Self-Concept and Sense of Self
This was another analogy for the world and my self-concept. It occurs to me now that I no longer aware of a self-concept and I don't really believe in an innate self-concept anymore. I didn't have an innate self-concept when I was a child. I don't think I believed anything that a typical child wouldn't believe. Adults regard children as vanilla - undifferentiated. That may be because people are undifferentiated and adults spend the whole lives pretending they are unique, special and different when really they are all alike?

I make great mileage from my creativity but wasn't it necessary to survive and didn't it start because I creatively denied something that was true and obvious. Another way is I don't need a map when I know the way. My much desired sought after unconscious competence has arrived? I no longer conceive of myself within my own mind which I did. It strikes me as not sustainable or supportable.

There is only me. There always ever was and ever will be. The rest was stuff I made up along the way.

No ego defenses
I think that now I accept people's ego defenses and I don't worry about them. That's the way they play it and I am fine with it. The fact is I was trying to break down those walls and I was erecting my own wall against relatedness in so doing. John is good example. I got on better with Mags before all this shit started. Same with Mark McG. Accepting people's ego defenses is about accepting them and where they are at. That's the starting point anyhow. When my mother got really focused on my father's inadequacies it really undermined their marriage.

If I attack people's ego defenses however ever subtly - it's going to drive them away. They feel that I don't accept them. People don't have to be anything for me. There is no agenda. There used to be an agenda. And I can see other people's agenda. But I no longer have one. I don't have ego defenses and I don't want them. I am going to enjoy getting on with people.

So even though I can see other people's vulnerabilities and may have more than educated guesses as to what they are don't need to say anything or threaten to say anything. I think no less of them as a result. After all I am someone who had huge ego defenses.

I think this is like building the house from the outside in, which is very unorthodox. Normally as far as I can imagine you build from the foundations up. These cultural concepts were pseudonyms always for the deeper meaning or relevance of emotional self, self-realization and trauma.

Ego defenses based on self-actualized self

If I don't have any feelings for someone and can't connect with them then they are outside the Pail and subject to my ego defenses. The problem for people who suffer from depression is that they have ego defenses all right but they get in way of establishing emotional connections. So those defenses form an obstacle to emotional growth. If those defenses are too high then no emotional connectivity will be possible and the individual will lose themselves and internalize all their developmental energy.

I accept that I need a Pail and everyone who has any kind of emotional stability has a Pail. This forms the bulwark behind which self is protected. Without emotional connections of course self can't survive. That's what happened to me. I couldn't make any emotional connections. I thought I was going to be able too but as it turned I couldn't so self was lost and psychosis resulted.

I had no Pail because I never developed one and it didn't seem to me that I would need one. My self-concept was lost and regained continually until it developed sufficiently for me to question my ineptitude at failing to connect emotionally and for me to see that my situation was created by me.

Motivation/Agenda

I think I also forget what a high expectation I placed on myself and I felt was placed on me by my mother and father and the fact of Brian's death. I was really up against it and I drove myself on and I still drive myself very hard core. Bipolars are like this. They are absolutely unforgiving on themselves. So that kind of motivation was there throughout and so that must account in some way for the permanent self-abnegation. I have to admit the Mark and even John know how to look after themselves better than me and will always withdraw from the cliff edge.

My agenda is a better world and I am only really modifying my process because it's not working. People shouldn't die but they do and there is nothing I can do about it but I can always find some other agenda to champion and so I do. I am the supposed champion of the McGovern family who crashed and burned and has struggled ever since to reinvent himself. Mags is the champion of the Ferns right?

More simply I want what I want and I will settle for what I can get but I do have an agenda. I think this is precisely what I have always wanted to have and may have had in glimpses before but now it's perfectly ok to have an agenda. In fact people will revile you for not having an agenda. They really won't like you if you don't know what you are about.

All I have to do is accept that I have agenda and know what it is and go about it with no fuss, no drama. What's the big deal?

Mature model of relatedness

The human model of relatedness is based entirely in my view on reciprocity. I never feel bad when I accept and appreciate this. I do notice that other people feel bad when they violate it. Reciprocity is as true for me as it is for anyone else.

Obviously it's about relating to self.

I would have said in earlier iterations of this cycle that I disliked the Dags or people I struggled or couldn't relate too. But that's not the case anymore. I don't mind them at all. And funnily enough I expect that to be true of everyone around me. Everywhere. Additionally that I felt negative about people I didn't like but with an internal adjustment I don't mind. I see it clearly with children - the temptation is there to impose my personality on them. They won't resist - or younger siblings. There is that acceptance. Therefore I liked my young siblings. But in truth of self to relate to others does not necessity self-abnegation but self-awareness to the point of not imposing self.

I resented my parents because they imposed their personalities on me. Or my older siblings tried too and were rejected by me. That is the secret of relatedness. Don't impose self on others. But if I am not self-aware then I will. Self isn't an imposition.

I am still a game changer only now I am effective.

I am not out to settle old scores or get even. I just expect respect from the people around me and if I don't get that I am not going to entertain them. That's all. I don't care who it is. So it is one rule for all. And I really don't think I will go wrong with that. And I not asking for anything unreasonable.

Agendas for people don't work. I can't have one agenda for one person and another for a different person. In the same way agendas for life or the world don't work.

I realize now that a successful model of relatedness does involve treating everyone the same way. And implicit in that is having the same expectation of everyone. It is impossible to have two or three models of relatedness. In my neurotic phase I would have tried to have a different approach for each situation – of course it was a disaster.

Then: Dismissed everyone in my 20s

Now: Don't dismiss anyone. Self-concept defined by need for respect. No time for being disrespected.

I think the model of relatedness is very simple. Humans validate themselves by helping each other. It predates in my view religion, Christianity, but they all incorporate that into their philosophies. When humans fail to help each other consternation results and self-doubt, another argument that would pull humanity together - or more truthfully the revelation of a fundamental truth.

All relationships are reciprocal - otherwise they are not relationships. When relationships fail reciprocity has broken down between two people.

I think with my model of relatedness and reciprocity I have a comfort zone around me which I need. It protects my self-concept. But now that I think of it I don't feel vulnerable anymore. So that's much of a muchness.

Obviously I because of my people pleasing have become completely obsessed with other people's problems to the complete detriment of my own. I don't do anything for myself. It's all about Mum, Claire, Jane, John and Mark if only he would appreciate it. It's completely unhealthy. I wonder too if JOS

fits into that I had to solve other people's problems first and then I could attend to my own. Does that not account for a psychological model to solve everyone's problems? So is it not a bizarre outcome of people pleasing.

Which is more likely that I need to change everyone in order to relate to them or I need to accept them as they are and change my outlook? I know that I need to accept my family as they are because otherwise I always live in hope and striving for that connection.

Acceptance is the key to understanding people - not liking or getting on with necessarily but accepting. This has been a big problem for me because I didn't accept people the way they are. This is really the way of peace and comprehension for me.

All the ideation is clear indication that I do not accept other people as they are. So the ideation is an attempt to justify them to me and justify the neurotic beliefs that sit behind my ego. So in some shape or form I can sustain the neurotic belief and keep going.

The best I can do is accept the way people are around me and defocus from them. Let them ring if they want. I think stay focused on me and what I need to do, permanently. Jane will take of Jane and the same for the rest. And that's it.

If I can honestly say that I don't want anything or need anything from other people then I can confidently conclude that my model of relatedness is based primarily, fully on self. If I wanted something from MF then that indicates to me that my model of relatedness is partial and developmental. Because I don't need anything from her nor should I. My principal criticism of my parents is they were needy. They always made me feel they needed something from me.

My world is my relationships. That's all it is. There is nothing else. My approach to the world was naïve. I approached it without limits. And now I approach it without surrender.

The basic point is as far as possible with surrender be on good terms with all. When I have reached my limits I disconnect, cease and desist from trying to connect and give the matter no further thought.

I can see clearly now that all my ideation is tied up with the people I struggle to relate too for whatever reason. Not the people I relate too. I don't think about them at all. But the fact is that I don't need to know much or anything about other people/strangers in order to know how to relate to them. Again without surrender and when I reach my limit I disconnect. This is all encapsulated in the feeling I have about each of those situations. I don't believe in the PT analysis because I have done this before and I have done it recently and it feel like surrender so I disconnect.

The question of relatedness is not amenable to ideation, or to rational consideration. It's emotive. I could do a lot for some people who would ask for a lot and I would very little for some other people who would ask for not much so the question of limits in relatedness is emotive and my difficultly was I couldn't disconnect from my desire to connect. My sense of self was such, that I had either no limit. This became limits that were not comfortably defined. More recently I became defensive and would risk very little in

relatedness. Because I had realized at that point that I could be hurt and I wouldn't know where to draw the line so better not to chance it.

The truth is that my immediate relationships are of course indicative of any potential relations I may have. Stymied in doubt and introspection as I was then I remained within the room of mirrors. I was bogged completely down on immediate matters – MF, Mark, Mum, Niall Sherrard. These all caused me problems. And I was caught in a deliberation cycle of ideation about them.

I fixated on the people above but I interacted with them on a regular basis. But then again in AIB I could see it was a problem with Clare and the Accenture guy and Martin, the architect. I didn't know how to behave around someone I couldn't relate too. And this would undoubtedly recur in any situation where I had to interact with strangers.

So I was right that the office was a pseudonym for life and since I fundamentally had problems relating to strangers I was really going to struggle in any environment including even around loved ones. And I did. How do I behave around someone I can't relate too? I stop trying to connect. And remain my usual self, polite, mannerly, and courteous. And that's it.

Basically my attitude to the world is friendly but with limits and not willing to go beyond those limits.

I think I was striving for an emotional connection with people. And the reality is I don't have to strive. It's either there or it isn't. If it's not there that's fine. It doesn't have to be there. Only someone who can't connect with anyone emotionally is going to feel a lot of desperation and will struggle mightily with a lot of conditional relationships. With Mum and Dad as a child I felt this was non-negotiable. There had to be an emotional connection and I had to find it. That set me on trajectory of struggle in relatedness.

Is not the emotional connection principally with the mother? Is this not the nature of the struggle? Could it be that the emotional connection is always with the mother? And if that is problematic then relatedness is problematic? The father doesn't really come into it. The father's role/struggle is in the realm of self-realization.

I had an idea that at the end of this process I would be able to connect with everyone. I find that to be completely false. I had an idea that I would be able to connect with immediate family. I find that to be false with Mum, Mark, and Jane. So my self-concept is much more realistic as a result of this. Emotional connections cannot be forced or contrived only enjoyed.

Obviously the better I relate to myself the better I relate to everyone around me and I do mean everyone. But more importantly having a strong sense of self automatically entails a good, robust model of relatedness. Since I feel unconditional about myself I presume I will replicate this around me, right?

I think I imagined emotional connectivity was external – not internal. Obviously I developed the type of self-concept that would believe that. So love really actualized my developing self-concept in my 20s. So the failure of love led to a loss of that self-concept. I put the cart before the horse.

"You say Hugh that when you were in your late teens and early twenties you thought that romantic love could "save you." This is course didn't work. We all need to know and love ourselves first. I think this is something that is very difficult for you." Clare Regan.

So obviously the "love" aspect of my developing self-concept failed. I get that. And I had all the repressed ideation concerning Brian's death which came up in 1996. And then I failed to realize creative self.

I think if Karene had said no to Mark on the doorstep in Paris that might have sparked an episode. She was central to his life over there, at least at that time. He thought all Karene's friends were criminals. By the time she did say no he had Tom to care for.

Brian's death signaled the end of emotional connectivity for me. As Clare noted I had been emotionally isolated for a long time. I reasoned that LDH was the only woman in the world that I could have an emotional connection with. So I wasn't taking no for an answer and couldn't in all reasonableness. Without emotional connectivity life was meaningless which was true it was.

Or put another way I maintained an emotional connection with a dead person. So the likelihood is I would have shacked up with LDH if I hadn't been bereaved to the extent I was. And then I guess I would be more like Mark. I would have gone over when I could have gone in 1993?

I am not sure it's going to be possible to distill the relative impact of the three factors – trauma, emotional & self-realization. I only twigged the CSA when I met Cora and I realized she reminded me of LDH. Then I had this theory that Dad was CSA when it was actually Mum. Then I penned my theory of emotional harmony, proposed marriage to LDH, sent out Success.

So I was living alone for the first time in my life. LDH said get lost. Cypher said no. All the trauma ideation came up at once. I had a big row with Dad at Xmas. I was accusing him of CSA. Then I went back to Chicago and things just escalated out of control.

It was a gradual descent into madness but a descent nevertheless.

I think living alone is significant. One does need a certain emotional maturity to be able to live alone. And in all my moves around the US I always lived with other people. For someone with a very developmental self-concept being alone is frightening. More reason to reach out in a very impassioned way to LDH to end the isolation.

And then when I came back to Ireland the only options were to live with my parents or to live alone in grotty bedsits. I didn't have much money and I didn't like working in offices. It was pretty bad for a long time. I went back to California a few times but that didn't change anything. I think meeting Clare Regan was the best thing that ever happened to me. But I did the work. And I worked through it. And it worked.

I used to think Dad's death freed the way for me to meet Mary but I realize it was Clare's help that made that possible. But to be fair to me I grew and confronted some of my demons as she put it.

I do think that a conditional sense of self is very devastating and very handicapping. But don't all McGovern's have that? I guess. That really leads to massive self-doubt which I can see in all McGovern kids. In fact Mum and Dad had less self-doubt than we did. I suppose Mum had her mother, who made her feel unconditional and Dad I guess got that message whilst Bina alive.

I am fairly sure that the emotional conditionality comes from the mother, because LDH wouldn't feel conditional about herself. Dad didn't feel conditional about himself. He always gave himself the benefit of the doubt. I think also the kids do try to put that at the mother's door. And she sure don't like it.

You have to be emotionally connecting with someone to trust them and to be open to them. Otherwise you remained guarded and watchful. With my Mum and Mark and Dags and whoever else I do not connect with emotionally I need to remained guarded. Otherwise I will be hurt. Simple as that. It really doesn't have anything to do with whose has been abused and who hasn't. It's just that sense that you can trust someone.

So it's a simple rule. I need to always follow my feelings when it comes to relatedness and then I won't be disappointed or feel foolish.

We are motivated in our relatedness to find confirmations of self – confirmations of things about ourselves we like or believe in. Friendship, love, relatedness are all based on aspects of self we find validated by these relationships.

Relatedness is a romance with ourselves through the mirror of others.

Ones model of relatedness is a reflection of self. We seek always to find reflections of ourselves.

My public self is still self and I don't expect it to be any different. I know there are always huge bells and whistles on the developmental road as milestones were passed but I actually think publication feels low key. The developmental struggle was the challenge.

I feel therefore I am

I think my ideation concerning politicians and other major political figures is a metaphor for self. Their acknowledgement of me would be a vindication for my developing self-concept I imagined. They don't have to notice me however and all the vindication I need comes from self.

The further point is the emotional self comes before the rationalizing. In fact the emotional self drives all the ideation. So really we feel and therefore we are because how we feel defines who we are.

How we feel defines how we behave, defines our realm of self.

On Struggle

No need to push/struggle

My natural inclination is to struggle - to push all the time, when really I don't need to do anything. Let go. All struggles are internal struggles. So I don't need to fight myself and in ceasing to do this I align myself with reality and life.

Trying to force conclusions and outcomes is the ego at work. There is no need to be right or to predict the future. The ego always demands to be validated and proved right.

Self-relevance
With enlightenment comes the realization that one is only relevant to self and can only ever be relevant to self. One cannot be relevant to another person and shouldn't try. Neither is another person relevant to the individual.

Reality

Reality is about perception and for the internally conflicted they perceive reality to be externalized and beyond their control. Internal conflict intrudes to disrupt the notion that reality is the preserve of the individual. With internal conflict it places reality outside the reach of the individual and can lead to much frustration and unhappiness. The fact is that the individual only needs to control himself and that in a free society he is always entitled to do. So there is no problem. And therefore the individual controls their own reality by controlling themselves. To reach this level of clarity requires the absence of internal conflict.

Again people struggle because they are trying to control their perception of reality which is not reality. It is a perception – an internalization of events, experiences and interactions. To uncover their true reality they will need to uncover their true self.

Reality is about acceptance and change. There are those aspects of our feelings that we must accept and those that we can change or do something about. For added complication the proportions of acceptance and change are not always fixed. In other words they move. As individuals we move the bar in our own lives and collectively we move it for each other also.

Where feelings are at odds with reality a dichotomy or role play emerges in the psyche. We as individuals attempt to rationalize the discrepancy between how we feel and how things are for us. Depending on the degree of separation between feelings and reality determines the intensity of this dialogue.

Again in the state where self is not well known we struggle to change feelings that we will not reveal or accept. This consumes enormous quantities of energy.

Joy

Joy is that absence of inner conflict, whether temporary or permanent. Falling in love is something like this. People feel when they do fall in love that that they have answered one of life's deep and pressing questions. Joy is normally experienced when some progress is made on the journey to self. This can take many forms. Of course joy is something that many people experience when they complete the journey to self. It is akin to self-love and self-esteem.

Confidence

Confidence is an internal matter. Confidence is the absence of inner conflict. To achieve this again the individual needs to deconstruct the internalizations and reveal as much of their true self as possible. An individual is always confident on the pathway of their own self-discovery and few would stand in their way. This is because the individual is undertaking a necessary as opposed to whimsical journey and will usually find that other individuals will facilitate him in this effort.

Fulfillment

Happiness/Contentment/Inner peace/Constancy of affection

End to Self-Blame

No one is to blame for how you are except you. To take full responsibility for oneself means not holding anyone else accountable for how you are. Whatever trauma one has suffered has to be overcome before an individual can truly accept personal responsibility and develop a mature self-concept. In this sense we are to blame for how our lives are. We cannot in maturity hold anyone else responsible. There is no else to blame. This is what it means to be truly free of trauma. Because otherwise we are held hostage by the things that happened to us and the people who affected us in ways we didn't like.

Self-acceptance

Living in the present

Deliberate Action
Deliberate
1. Done with or marked by full consciousness of the nature and effects; intentional: mistook the oversight for a deliberate insult.
2. Arising from or marked by careful consideration: a deliberate decision. See Synonyms at voluntary.
3. Unhurried in action, movement, or manner, as if trying to avoid error: moved at a deliberate pace.
4. To think carefully and often slowly, as about a choice to be made.
5. To consult with another or others in a process of reaching a decision, to consider (a matter) carefully and often slowly, as by weighing alternatives.

I think one of the myths about this process is that at the end of all I will spring into action and life fully grown, fully competent, fully aware and fully able. I don't think that's going to happen. I think I have improved my judgment a lot, but I still need to do the work and take the deliberate actions that I need to take.

Positives on Death & Dying
Everything is of course capable of being knocked by the bereavement complex. I see my new found stability - the tree image and immediately I think of it being knocked down and burned. It is a misinterpretation because of course I have experienced the feelings of losing someone but that is not DYING. I still don't know what dying feels like and I never will. So if I do access some bereavement ideation it can only be based on past feelings - which whilst of course being very distressing and heartfelt have nothing to tell me about dying. So any conception of dying - trees being cut and burned

and so on, is a reference to Brian dying. And those dreadful and terrible feelings of complete and utter loss.

In the same way there is no need for a response to bereavement. So any bereavement style responses are a mistake in my view. Anything motivated by a fallacy will fail. That individual will pull out and not complete the task.

Is therefore the motivation to drink and engage in all manner of distraction and idle pursuit therefore not the indication of a powerful ideation cycle? The latest round of the bereavement cycle was kicked off by seeing my Mum and thinking how old and frail she is getting. Reminding me of course that I was going to die. But again emotions come first and ideation second. So the feeling I am going to die accesses the trapped emotion of how I felt when my brother died. It can do no other. That constitutes my outlook on this so-called question which really isn't a question at all.

Again I can't say it often enough. I don't know anything about death. I only know how it made me feel when people close to me died. And the extent to which I haven't accepted their passing determines my dread at the anticipated next passing. Very selfish really.

Conditional Emotional Self

"Despite their level of involvement in your life I get the sense of something about both of your parents that was intangible or emotionally unavailable to you. Certainly yours was not a household where feelings were readily shared." Clare Regan

I am wondering if I had or carried this intangible sense of being emotionally disconnected. A feeling that when "unproved" by childhood experience leads to endless trouble in relatedness? Or was I emotionally isolated and now I am not? Or did it just make me feel that some essential part of my childhood was conditional when it the feeling or aura or sense should have been unconditional?

Is there something tangible about this experience? Or is it intangible? Does this account for my notional unconditionality?

Did my experience make me feel is someway conditional about myself? Was that the issue and is that the correction that has occurred? All my theorizing then was really to develop an unconditional sense of self. Something that people like the Murags has naturally from earliest days of childhood I would think. Never developed a conditional self-concept. Hence I never forgave myself for my failure to relate or regarded my own feelings as something I was entitled too. They were alien and I was divorced from them for that reason, perhaps another way of saying the same thing.

The conditional emotional self therefore is a result of the perceived conditionality of the maternal relationship in my case. My first experience of love was then the enduring experience in so many ways. That then accounts for the anger and resentment towards my mother. She was ever a disappointment.

This explains why Mary could so easily draw obvious emotional conclusions that always eluded me with my conditional self-love. I really just didn't accept myself as much as she accepted herself.

This is an intangible but critical development. This should eliminate a lot of self-doubt and self-questioning.

So the self-concept was fundamentally conditional and all information added to that self-concept was not going to correct that fundamental deficiency. Hence all the layering which I kept mulling around in my head to no particular avail.

Perhaps this explains why men did not inspire in me such a sense of uncertainty in the workplace as women. Women could withdraw their approval which was always devastating - this irrespective of their motivation in so doing or the origins of that disapproval. So really any women who disapproved of me could undermine me. Or who I thought disapproved of me. But this would be true of any guy with a CSA mother which is a lot of guys I would think.

My relationship with my Mum has gone through phases - in my 20s her best friend or one of them. After bipolar very angry towards her and often resentful. And then more gradually a disappearance of that anger and greater acceptance, and now the elimination of conditionality in me, which is great.

The deeper more fundamental changes are more difficult. So again the summary was I was conditional about myself. It has nothing to do with my mother – only she would constantly remind me of that conditionality and make me angry.

On Ideation Cycles

Mature self-concept loses the developmental cycle of ideation
Trauma ideation has been resolved. Preference is clear. And as a result life-force is clearly directed and purposeful. The self-concept no longer struggles with reality. In fact the individual has a clear and consistent perception of reality.

The mature self-concept is entirely focused in the present so the cycle of ideation is of course trauma driven.

For me I have my positive image of stability - the oak.

Enlightened Ideation Cycles – End with Closure and Release
The simple summary of the Martin ideation cycle is as follows. I woke up in the morning and felt worried about him leaving abruptly. Have I offended the guy? And then I need to do something about it. So I texted him. And we hope to meet for lunch soon.

On MOS and Mary. MOS is my friend. Not MOS. So I should be loyal and honor that. MF doesn't have to come. Nor does she have to like him. That's up to her.

Mark McG hurt me by his dismissiveness so I don't owe him a phone call, on Dags no issue. On Sherrard he hurt me and he won't forgive so I don't know him anymore. Heavey the same.

All these scenarios are closed emotionally because I see my way on them.

Ideation cycles Bipolar and Circular
Death cannot be ideated. It cannot be conceived. It is imagined.

Clear now that my ideation cycle was bipolar. It could be positive it could also be negative. So in practice I struggled with ideation cycles. I found it very difficult to know how I felt. I would work something out positively and then flip flop into the negative. So it took a long time to work out how I felt. But bipolar was of course the ideation cycle that was broken into two parts. When really the ideation cycle is circular. When it is circular closure results and resolution and release results. When the circle is broken repression is inevitable because closure cannot be reached.

So the ideation cycle remains and continues to cycle and runs all the time in the background with emotional repression. The cycle cannot complete and remains phased. When the repressed ideation is resolved then ideation cycles become circular. They resolve, close and release. Relationships become circular. Healthy. Stable and predictable. Self becomes knowable.

I think that no matter how euphoric each phase shift may be it is not the same as entering an alternate universe. It is merely a phased shift - and the ideation cycle becomes again positive. So a personal discovery for sure but there is no doubt now that I had major difficulties with my feelings so I can now see that my peer group did not. Now that ideation is circular and no longer phased and historic. I am expecting that decisions should be very snappy.

I have to also remember that I never got it right in the phased ideated world. And every time I entered a trigger situation - interacted with someone who I was unsure about how I felt - then it would resurrect the ideation cycle concerning that person. Mark, Dags, Sherrard spring to mind, unresolvable and interminable as a result unending circle of ideation concerning the feelings about these people.

The further caveat is the unresolvable ideation cycles require a change in the self-concept. Then the ideation cycle ends and resolves and releases. Provided that is the change is made in the self-concept.

I think people just go with their feelings. There is no second guessing. I am the second guesser. I can see in Mary and Mags the instant and unquestioned emotional reaction. I don't him. I don't like her. Or bitch about x,y,z. Women with poor emotional intelligence like Claire or Jane or Mum need to talk inordinately about their feelings. Because they lack the emotional intelligence to resolve them. And men with poor emotional intelligence repress. Because it's the only way. So Mary and Mags know who they are and so does the Mum but Anto and Thomas don't. And Thomas really doesn't.

You have to realize that Mary and Mags didn't help their brothers. But then they didn't know how. Feelings are secret. They are not articulated except in coded ways. So at some point, at many points I am sure those conversations occurred but to no real effect. So I have gone further than Mary and Mags? Would seem to be the case.

Feelings are very private because you revealing yourself to someone by admitting your feelings. Potentially exposing yourself to ridicule. You thought I cared. Ha Ha. So ego defenses are required. So it would appear that I get the 2 Marks. Mark Mc G was fed up with the turkey saga and the sking and not

wanting to go. Macks was pissed off that I didn't go to Marbella. And in each case a change in attitude resulted because I sensed the change in attitude just as I sensed it with Martin.

Sometimes I just can't go there with someone. They expect or ask too much. So I have to run the risk of their disappointment and disapproval. I sense the change and do nothing. What can I do? Same with the Dags – I couldn't carry on being nice to them and getting nothing back. It had to end.

End to Emotional Intensity - Blame – Being Appropriately Self-Culpable

No one is to blame for how I feel

No connection between how I feel and the people around me

Can't generalize based on personal experience

End to Segmentation – Ego Defense

This is the practice of segmenting the creative and practical, the libido and the rest. Obviously with a unified self there is no need for segmentation.

The segmentation mentality is that with improvements I will advance in one particular area. The reality is with a general improvement all areas are improved because they all benefit from better judgment and so it's all good. The dilemma posed by segmentation how to be creative without being practical or how to be practical without being creative don't apply are meaningless. They were dilemmas of the developing self-concept.

Also an end to segmentation for me combines creativity and practicality together to form creative realism.

Judgment

Clear Rational Judgment

It seems to me now that JOS is to do with the cycle of trauma ideation. And that it is a way of dealing and coping with that. And I suspect a lot of things that I have mentioned are actually okay and there is no problem with these things. Only was not okay and my outlook was impaired and so everything was problematic.

I was not okay. That's the reality. There was never anything wrong with the world. There were definitely problems in my family but again in maturity they don't constitute a problem for me. And so I don't need to worry about it. Now that I am okay. I can see that everything else is okay. So I can move on and do my thing. The upshot is that I have dropped or largely dropped this trauma cycle of ideation. So clear rational judgment results and nothing external has changed. So there is no need to dismiss one thing and embrace another as I have been doing in a circle. Just apply clear rational judgment like to JOS and that's it.

Intuition

This is the ability to understand something immediately, without the need for conscious reasoning, a thing that one knows or considers likely from instinctive feeling rather than conscious reasoning. I am sure I do and will continue to make the best judgments for myself as required.

It seems pretty clear to me now that I don't have to review the whole history my emotional reactions with a person to understand how I feel about them. I really need only sense the most recent and use that as the basis for my intuition and my emotional expectation of how their future behavior will affect me. In this respect I can expect that connecting emotionally with my mother will not happen next time because it didn't happen in the most recent time. Also with Mark I can expect that because he didn't call me back twice and he is on Skype constantly and he booked to come in Sept completely forgetting than I was supposed to come in Sept to Paris that I am not on his priority list or any list of his and I can expect that this will be the next interaction also. With the Dags similarly last time was not good and I would expect next time not to be good either.

So I realize now that the anger I felt was anger with me. I was angry at myself for ignoring how these people made me feel. When I listened to how they made me feel and accepted that then I found and find that I know exactly what is going on.

So intuition is accepting the reality of how I feel and using that to predict future outcomes. One bad date suggests that the next one will be bad too.

Intuition can be wrong but it's more likely to be right in my experience.

How do I still get into a growth phase that works? I get all the problems of the past. But clearly the answer is that when there is an emotional underpinning to these initiatives they will work right?

The Macks example springs to mind. I could have asked him to meet for a drink. Zero emotional intelligence. He says no. I am further confused. I meet nobody for a drink. I go home and drink alone and get a bit more depressed and decide not to ask anyone for a drink. Right conclusion or wrong conclusion? Well I asked the wrong guy. Martin is more than happy to meet up. So such a little thing - gives such a completely different outcome.

Or imagine a world where I thought I felt the same way about everyone. Then Martin and Macks would be the same to me. Which they are clearly not. One is a friend and one is an acquaintance. While I pursued Macks I ignored Martin. And at no time did I find what I was looking for.

So why do I enjoy or strive to meet people who don't want to meet me? Well I have to get on with everyone right? Irrespective of how they make me feel. That's just nuts! Always was. That's emotional suicide. Is this the imperative – had to get on with parents no matter what? Is not JOS shot through with it and my self-concept also?

My self-concept in my 20s was fundamentally based on that assumption – that I could or do get on with everyone. And people liked it. I liked it. But it crashed because it's never always true. No matter what personal sacrifices I am prepared to make in the name of relatedness. Was this not the real reason for the first episode and recurring episodes?

It seems pretty clear to me that looking back over the emotional history of an interaction with someone is a type of emotional denial. It is a rationalization of my feelings. And then I end up suppressing that feeling and the abusive situation continues.

Work

Knowing what you are good at/Not miscast in ones role in life
Far too often people with a confused sense of self are in jobs and working in roles that do not suit them. This can be the cause of great dissatisfaction and unhappiness.

80% of people don't really like what they do and perhaps 20% do really like their jobs. It is hard to imagine that someone who knows themselves would do something they don't like on an ongoing basis. Such an arrangement is evidence of a confused sense of self.

Everyone has talents but unfortunately few people use their talents effectively or at all. They remained buried beneath an internal conflict formed by the internalization of the expectations of others.

Always must remember that in life ones primary motivation is self and this is always the case through all the ups and downs. All externalities are not as important as this goal and though we may not realize it we always relegate externalities to secondary importance. This is not to suggest we don't care about our externalities but they cannot come between oneself and the journey to self. The correct priority therefore is self comes first and all else second.

Playing a role in the community/world
This is implicit in a developed self-concept. It immediately is obvious to an individual all that may be wrong in the world of their self-concept. And all they might be motivated to change or where they might be able to add some value. So playing a role comes naturally to some who has a developed self-concept.

Office Jobs
The challenge in the office of course was to successfully interact with the people around me. This included people who I could relate to and responded to me in some sense, people who did not respond to me, and then people who I didn't like for whatever reason. I found in practice that of those I could relate to a conditional type of acceptance emerged. Those I could not relate too I continually tried to relate too and exceeded my comfortable limits in so doing. And those I did not like I really struggled with and tried to dismiss - which was of course impossible. If they were in authority over me.

Entering the creative emotive phase meant I nearly always dismissed the office as a result. With high historical ideation it was just impossible to function. This just meant in practice that I would enter the job rational and unemotive and pass into a creative emotive phase during the job. This would then spiral out of control.

The new departure would be to relate to those who respond, not bother with those who don't respond and to tolerate those I do not like and not dismiss anyone. Obviously I can't dismiss anyone around me in the office. It's not possible. I need to work with everyone who I interact with. Then it should be possible to complete a six month contract without fuss. If I so desired.

The further caveat is assertiveness. I would be a lot more comfortable in the office if I knew how to be assertive. I know aggression is not acceptable and I would hide that. But I know also that the assertive office workers were much more effective. Do I want to be stellar in the office? It's not my pathway really.

I think I would win a lot of respect from other people with that model of relatedness because it shows them respect and I think that I would find that they would want to facilitate me. Certainly more so than in the past. There is implicit assertiveness in that I think.

If I think about it in the past I would avoid or dodge the people I didn't like so I couldn't ask them for anything and these would often be key people like managers and so on. I was angry at the people who didn't respond to me in some way so that was complicated. And of the people who did respond I would be unsure because of the conditional acceptance just how much I could ask of them. So in short the whole thing was a disaster.

In Dell none of the managers liked Sandra Rogers. They were all afraid of her except maybe Jacky. But they were stuck with her and as Eoin said there is nothing I can do about it. Mary often tells of insensitive things Joan did or didn't do or things John McCormack would say that are offensive – there is nothing she can do about it. But she doesn't like him. That much is clear.

This is the drag about the office. It's not really the work. That's never the problem. It's the people, as a contractor though I shouldn't really be having any problems. In a contract the chances are my manager will be someone like Sharon Keogh and far less likely to be someone like Cheryl Zatz who I liked.

Again respect comes into it. In Irish Rail I earned Cathy's disrespect by crossing the boundaries with her. It started off very positive. That could be that we just didn't know each other – but I think some people are easy to work with and I was not one of those people. I was high maintenance. Most of my office scenarios would start off positively and quickly degenerate as I basically struggled to relate to the people around me. I had some idea that it was office and not me. But now I think the opposite. That was irrespective of being rational and unemotive – which clearly proves the point that the emotional subtext was what mattered and what was driving me and driving other people away.

On a six month contract I should have minimal ideation and hardly notice being there at all, because there is nothing of relevance for me in that space. There was. And it was what am I like well no better mirror than an office full of strangers. The office has nothing to teach me. So now I am free of it. I think simply put with the office I would like the option.

I think saying to myself I don't like the office – is probably true but there is a lot of detail behind that statement. I can see where I went wrong in the office but I can't imagine I would ever grow to like the office and the structure and the hierarchy and the politics etc.

I think this is a lot less confusing if I appreciate that I had a lot of historical ideation at each time in the office. If it was repressed it was still influential and when it was out it was clearly a big issue too.

I think I feel about the office the same way Maeve Trimble did – not a long term prospect, which is addressed somewhat by being a contractor. I think I can win in the office environment as long as I am clear about what I expect and what it will do for me.

Stop Comparing/Competing

Competing and comparing are signs of poor self-knowledge.

"If you compare yourself with others, you may become vain or bitter; for always there will be greater and lesser persons than yourself." Desiderata

Though it might seem somewhat informative to compare myself to others and what they are up to - it is actually a barrier to further self-development. I cannot know self – be myself – by comparing myself constantly to other people – regardless of whether that comparison is favorable or unfavorable.

Competition for an individual emerges when the individual internalizes their ambitions and this is usually done by an internalization of the expectation of certain personalities that had an effect on the individual. Again parents would constitute the primary motivation for competitiveness. The individual believes that by beating the competition they will be liked, esteemed and approved of. Again esteem and self like are internal and competitiveness postpones esteem and self-love, places it outside the individual and informs the individual that he must perform in order to have those things when really he can have them anyway. The individual doesn't have to do anything to like himself.

Competitiveness is internalized from an early age as a fundamental necessity in the individual's self-development. This the individual then externalizes by participating with others in competitions and contents. This can become a lifelong pursuit or agenda as the individual jumps through successive and unending hoops in the mistaken conviction that they are learning or achieving something by so doing.

There is of course only one taskmaster and that is self. All other taskmasters are internalized or voluntarily affiliated too. The individual has nothing to prove and need prove nothing. It is a species of internal conflict. Self tasks the individual to find self and to be true to self, to reveal true self. This doesn't require a competition or a challenge.

Competition has pervaded every aspect of our culture. Fundamental to Western culture is the concept of winners and losers. So many things in life are reduced to a competition between opposing forces. The more resourceful individual or team or organization is the winner and to the victors go the spoils whatever they may be. It could be medal, or profit a contract to do business and so on. Enshrined in our culture is the conviction that this is the most effective, efficient and successful way of organizing people. Of course if there are to be winners then there must be losers as well. And unfortunately for us this mentality creates a lot of stress and false urgency for all involved.

This mentality puts a lot of pressure on people to be competitive – to compete. The individual internalizes this pressure to compete and as a result is never actually free from competitive pressure. He carries with him wherever he goes.

In reality there is no reason to compete and the individual's desire and pressure to compete is simply his desire to know himself. Competing, even successfully, will not necessarily bring an individual closer to themselves. And the competitive process is essentially a learning experience for an individual with a poor sense of self. All competitiveness is internal and the individual is bizarrely competing with themselves and pushing themselves on to ever greater efforts and endeavors.

On a macro level competitiveness leads to the current bizarre distribution of resources where a small number of winners have managed to gain control of a gigantic share of the world's resources. Whilst the losers in this model make do with whatever is left.

Winners are of course good at winning and they are feted and celebrated in our world. The less successful many look to them for inspiration and as role models.

It is possible to circumvent the winner-loser paradigm and regard it for what it is – an externalization of the individual's desire to know themselves. Winning medals and making money do not necessarily facilitate the process of knowing self. They don't necessarily impede it either but an individual will never find what they are looking for outside of themselves.

 "When you are content to be simply yourself and don't compare or compete, everybody will respect you." Lao Tzu

Realize that you can't win.
Just consciously realizing this can be helpful. No matter what you do you can pretty much always find someone else in the world that has more than you or are better than you at something. Yes, you may feel good for a while when you get a nicer car than you neighbor. But a week or two later you'll see someone from the next block with an even finer car than yours.

Give up both sides of comparing.
If you can't stop doing the negative comparisons then stop doing them both. Because if you're in the headspace where you compare to feel better about yourself then it's hard to stop it and not also start to compare in way that make you feel worse and inferior. So you may need to step out of that whole comparing habit because the two sides are often connected. Give up the upside to be able to move away from the downside.

Compare yourself to yourself.
Instead of comparing yourself to other people create the habit of comparing yourself to yourself. See how much you have grown, what you have achieved and what progress you have made towards your goals. This habit has the benefit of creating gratitude, appreciation and kindness towards yourself as you observe how far you have come, the obstacles you have overcome and the good stuff you have done. You feel good about yourself without having to think less of other people.

Solitude

Another proven benefit to time given in solitude is the development of self. When a person spends time in solitude from others, he may experience changes to his self-concept. This can also help a person to

form or discover his identity without any outside distractions. Solitude also provides time for contemplation, growth in personal spirituality, and self-examination. In these situations, loneliness can be avoided as long as the person in solitude knows that they have meaningful relations with others.

Me - Self - Ego

Game Changer
A game changer is a person who is a visionary, a company that alters its business strategy and conceives an entirely new business plan. This type of company switches up and forms a new business strategy in order to compete directly or indirectly with competitors. A game changer changes the way that something is done, thought about or made.

A game changer has new and different ideas that stand out from the crowd. This person has an idea that completely changes the way a situation develops. Companies employ this tactic to create ideas or events that change the outcome of a plan.

A visionary strategist uses creative innovation to alter their business plans, or conceives an entirely new plan by exploring new locations and different products - the architect.

Visionary
Something that is or has been seen, unusual competence in discernment or perception; intelligent foresight: a leader of vision - the manner in which one sees or conceives of something, a mental image produced by the imagination, the mystical experience of seeing as if with the eyes the supernatural or a supernatural being, a person or thing of extraordinary beauty.

Prophet
A prophet is a person who speaks by divine inspiration or as the interpreter through whom the will of a god is expressed. A person gifted with profound moral insight and exceptional powers of expression, a predictor; a soothsayer, the chief spokesperson of a movement or cause.

A realistic world view
What boy does not dream of being king? Or fighting heroic and noble battles and striving and achieving great renown. Is that not what little boys read about all the time? The enduring appeal of Narnia, Lord of the Rings, James Bond etc. is that they are male fantasies - not reality nor ever likely to be. And when boys grow up they put aside childish things no? How can I know the difference between my dreams and my fantasies?

I could say that my childish refusal to accept Brian's death put me at odds with reality and initiated a long dreary saga of refusal, which could only ever end with acceptance of reality. That combined of course with my developmental struggle with my parents.

I look at my childish world view of being a King or a prince, of being in Narnia, of the Lord of the Rings, and then my obsessive desire to change my parents, to undo the damage of Brian's death, a hopeless and self-destructive utopianism. And I wonder what if anything of all that is valuable and can be a lifelong and is a lifelong characteristic and healthy to have.

I don't know what is left or what should be kept. I don't regard death as evil anymore so that concludes that no part of my experience is evil. I don't think mental illness is evil. And I don't think that at any stage I was evil. I see why a little boy would want to be a prince or a King and do great deeds of renown. That's obvious to me. I understand why I needed to change my parents and older siblings. There was a necessity there in order to relate. Changing the world comes from my battle against mortality. Do I still strive for an earthly Eden is this a watered down utopia? And yet despite all this I understand that my responsibility is to change myself. That is all I can do. And all I need to do. Creative realism answers these questions.

What remains then is a concern for those who struggle - in a way that I believe is unnecessary. It has implications for everyone. Everyone affected by association, everyone directly affected. There is a bigger picture here in terms of aggregated self-concepts and so on. The so-called "normal" whose self-concept is cemented by partner, family and job there is still disillusionment and disappointment. So no utopia but things can be better and I can help. Not a fantasy but a realistic goal. So finish the model, expand on the wider implications and write it up. Maybe include something personal?

I help the people around me. I work on my wider contribution, the model, the writing that goes with it. It is a contribution to things being better, not perfect, just committing to the task of improving and helping. That's what's important to me and that's what matters.

I don't "help" people anymore. I am not a "helper". I am just myself. That's all I ever needed to be.

I think the external result of this process is that I am creative - not episodically - but indefinitely creative and that's what I do and want to do. There are no conditions attached to this creativity - and I interpret my struggles in the office as evidence of the fact that I was suppressing my creativity during those times and not doing anything creative. It wasn't AIB or Citibank or Elavon or the rest - it was an internal struggle always from my creative self that sought and demanded to be on top.

So the net result of this is I will finish JOS and get it published and then probably do something else creative - I don't even know what that would be at this point. I see all the creative - but uncompleted works in the same context as all the brief but intense relationships. I think money is always secondary to creativity. To apply the condition of money to creativity makes it uncreative.

I arrived at the office with an internal struggle regarding my creativity. So I brought that to the office. I didn't find it in the office. I resented the office because I felt it made me struggle. But I was struggling anyway.

Again I think Claire's situation springs to mind. Clare was not being creative while she worked for Ron and Hill. So she blamed them and was unhappy being there. But they didn't stop her being creative. Her issues at that time were all around her creative self. They don't notice me. They don't appreciate me. They don't include me in what they are doing. These were her issues.

This also reflects a fact which is also true for me that creativity can't be postponed. It must be accepted which means of course right now today I can make that acceptance, and also that sudden dramatic

changes in other aspects of my life are probably quite likely when creativity is being suppressed and then surfaces.

Creativity in the developmental phase was a struggle all right. But it was an internal developmental struggle. For me I think that I was impractical because I didn't realize I was creative at least not consistently. Now that I realize I am creative should I not also be practical all of the time too? I would think that would come right and be the way it's supposed to be - the I Ching. So not a corporate employee but that doesn't bother me. Contractor - for the time being - maybe? Is that so bad?

It's about growing the circle and making a difference in other people's lives. That would mean a lot to me. Blowing my own trumpet doesn't mean anything to me. That's the motivation. That's a motivation I need to share with others. That's a vocational kind of motivation. Anything that makes that difference to people and their lives appeals to me.

A few things emerged clearly to me yesterday. Removing the necessity for validation from the way I think and feel brings self into complete focus. Reality is that I am alone and that now I see all the ego maneuvers as a denial of this reality. The endless questing for relevance is the denial of the truth. My self-concept did not incorporate the reality of my aloneness. Hence the great anger - it is essentially a childhood abandonment complex - that's all it is. Because as an adult I can survive and look after myself but as I child I cannot so it is the infantile sense of fragility.

So the discovery is of course I knew I was biologically, physically distinct and that I was alone. But emotionally I was not alone. And that is what I have now chased down. So emotional self is self now and there is no dichotomy.

So this is freedom. The freedom I never had. And society stood, in my mind, between me and my freedom, particularly after I ingested the bipolar label. But the truth is nobody knows anything about how other people think and feel. They can barely articulate it themselves.

The limiting factor in human development was of course the limiting factor preventing my growth - death - and my emotional responses. So clearly in the developmental journey we assume the world knows exactly how we feel and is playing some kind of cruel trick on us. So all agendas for others are developmental agendas. We strive to impose on the world the emotional deficiency we perceive in ourselves. That is the ultimate loneliness of the developing agenda.

I see now why pop music is not popular with older people. It's completely developmental. And also the obsession with pop music during the creative phases. As to the global paranoia and the feeling of being watched and listened too that was the developing issue of relevance. Do my thoughts and feelings matter? No is the answer. But that doesn't change who I am and when I can make that connection then I exit the development cycle. Otherwise I recycle in order to have another attempt to prove myself to myself.

Why did I have such low - esteem? Well like most humans in my society I was plagued by self-doubt because my self-concept was partial. And prone to constant reiterations. I may not have lost myself per

se in the classic psychiatric sense but I was a victim of constant recycling ideation about who I was. This is the chronic flaw I perceive in our global society and it accounts for all the misallocations, the economic cycles, and the other societal dysfunctions. It is simply the roll up of the flawed western self-concept.

Ad Astra as ever! But in practice there are plenty of terrestrial problems to preoccupy humanity for the time being. An important limit has however been identified for me at least.

It's clear to that if I hadn't been creative I would never have been motivated to go to these lengths to make sense of it all. Maybe I just saw more deeply. Do I really need another apologia?

No longer striving for emotional connections

For me reaching out it's going to be very important that I have some kind of connection with the person I put my trust in - otherwise I won't trust them. So it would be better to go and meet a publisher and suss them out then to send out scripts here and there to people I don't know. For me it is very important to feel that I connect with that person. And then I will trust them with the script and accept their criticisms. But otherwise now. No deal.

Business didn't work for me because I had no emotional intelligence. It was a wilderness really. I didn't connect. So the connection in any arena will be best established - only established by the personal touch and by a shrewd appraisal of the situation, their needs, my needs, and the possibility of a connection.

See business and publishing as relationships. That's what they are. And then operate on the basis of making an emotional connection.

I think in my situation mentoring is probably essential but I should see a potential mentor as a friend. I gain the benefit of their experience and they gain the satisfaction of guiding someone they like, approve of through the publication minefield. All I am saying is I shouldn't be averse to the right people's comments and input because I need it. With the emotional intelligence I shouldn't be offended and would be glad of the critical input.

I don't want to struggle with authority anymore. I want to be an authority myself someday, somehow. I want to come in from the cold. I am ready.

My model of relatedness is friendly and open to the world. That's how it is. I like it and I don't feel like changing it.

My emotional connections consist of Mary, Claire, maybe John, maybe Greg, maybe Chris, Martin, maybe Sully. And that's pretty much it. For friendship I think an emotional connection is required, right? I would do something for the people I have a connection with. I just see people outside my pail as people I have no connection with, I have no expectation of them, and I don't really know them. I get on with a lot of people the vast majority of the people outside the Pail but I don't connect with them. In the same way as in an office I would get on with the people around me but there would not be an emotional connection.

I think I am fortunate really because most people only have a couple or one emotional connection but I could myself having more. So that's the context in which I would get on with

I would get on a lot better with Mrs. Fern Sr then Margaret. But I do get on with both of them. I was kind of confusing all this. I just don't talk to Margaret I don't expect that to change. I guess what I am talking about in terms of getting on is there are no issues. I have no resentments. I am not harboring some grudge, disappointment. And I really am not. So then it is cool. I am at peace with my world. And in that sense I get on with my mother too.

Not get on is I can't tolerate at all - and I don't really know anyone like that. So in that sense I do get on with everyone. For the purposes of politeness and the social machine. Yeah I get on.

So I suppose I would say that there is the emotional connection at the innermost heart of me, there are people outside of that who I get on well with, and outside of that there are people I just get on with. And that's my world. I think I am comfortable with other people moving around between the three categories. I would accept flexibility I think now that I understand it.

It's not pejorative or unfair to others. It's just a question of the correct priority.

This problem was a question of priority and it would appear that my mother was still in the ascendant over Mary and that was wrong. Once corrected and she correctly relegated to the minor leagues all is well. I do think this has been the case for some years but this the complete restructuring.

Completion of Journey to Self
So the journey to self is finally complete. My self-concept reflects the reality of me solely. I did not like what I saw in the mirror of my mind. And so lately my self-concept has gone through some rapid but subtle changes.

Contribution
I can see also that my "intellectual" version of saving the world is the same old denial of loss. There is no basis under any circumstance for me to imagine I can "save the world" and the reason my bipolar dragged on so long was that I resolutely refused to relinquish my loss and experience those feelings. I could have let go a lot sooner but I didn't. That said there may be unforeseeable benefits but from an emotional standpoint the resolution is the same. No doubt I will make some contribution of sorts when I get over myself - but that would always have been the case.

So there is no advantage to exceptional emotional stubbornness that I can see right at this moment. The point is to entertain the possibility of "stellar" contribution is to play into a continuation of the trauma ideation cycle.

I can see also that the kind of linkages I was capable of creating all hinged around the trauma ideation. And my ability to make creative connections is very contingent on my emotional disorder and bundling - whereby things were connected for me that for other people would not be the case.

Spirituality

Concern for the poor and less fortunate

Maintain a Spiritual Dimension to one's life

At least my Dad had somewhere to go where he could put aside his own personal agenda even for a little while. And not being to do that is very exhausting and ultimately overwhelming. I may not care for the Catholic mass but at least those people who go get a release from their own egos. At the moment I am not getting that and I need it.

I think it is the quality of believing that intellectually, spiritually you are not the master, the supremo, the absolute backstop, final authority. Because that's not reality anyhow. We are only here for a little while and our egos get in the way all the time. And that's quite natural. So there has to be a release mechanism. To release ego

The problem then is I end up battling reality all the time which is telling me my ego is not supreme, not dominant, not the only ego, and then regroup fight back and when another inch or two and process recycles and it goes on. Why because reality and the human ego, emotional self are not compatible fundamentally. We are Lewis's spiritual animals. St Paul says the structures of this world are not adequate to the human spirit.

My thing about church is I never found answers there but I did find peace there. And my faith kept me alive until such time as I could live a more wholesome life.

Any of us run the risk of being arrogant, or being full of it. It can happen to anyone. Lewis says whatever is high in the natural order can be turned to evil when it turns from God.

Prayer

Prayer releases the ego buildup and allows me to be free of myself and release from myself. I need that release regularly. So I release now that all the way along with this process I was able to make peace with it. And at the end of it I don't really have any answers, but have acceptance and I certainly struggled with that. And yet I know to that I will get hit with more situations where acceptance is going to be difficult, perhaps very difficult.

Respect for God - The God Delusion Debate

The bottom line is we all run the risk of being deluded by our own egos. Because what we want in this world seems so compelling, so right, so justified that we often can't see beyond it. The ego is fundamentally at odds with reality in this respect. And to mitigate this inevitable and distressing struggle some kind of release is necessary. That's why it needs to be righted and benchmarked in a healthy, positive personal philosophy and belief system.

My danger is intellectual pride and I need to temper that somehow. I always be ahead of myself otherwise.

Respect for Civil Authority

I think respect for the civil authority is also a vital part of ego balancing. That the world the ego lives in makes sense and the ego can find some accommodation and connection with the leaders of his day and his time. I accept the role that these people these elected representatives play in my life and in my ego. And I am okay with it. I think no one can have a healthy stable ego without respect for authority. And that normally starts with the parents.

Respect for Parents

Again this is a vital part of ego stability – having respect for one's own parents. Whether I like or not these things define my ego and I just have to accept that. I have some idea my ego was defined in some other way. Forget it. These are the defining aspects of who I am and who my father was and who my mother was and is have resulted in my journey. I am just going to be nice to my Mum and not fight with her. That's it basically. That's the plan there.

I don't want to put beauty before age. So I don't want to upend the apple cart. I would show respect and should to older people. It creates an imbalance for a younger individual to be highly critical of an older individual. It creates an imbalance for me, because it is distorting the natural order.

Take kindly the counsel of the years. (Desiderata)

I don't have to be a choir boy or kiss ass but I do have to respect the reality of age. The more years one has under the belt the more they know. There is a certain inevitable cyclical aspect to life that older people appreciate much more keenly because they have seen so many times. And younger men don't know this. People who are older have been through more of life. They also feel their mortality more keenly. There are many ways in which they are wise without needing to be familiar with current cultural references. You stand on the shoulders of giants. There is no other way to look at it.

Respect for Peer Group

My respect and my admiration should also extend to people in the fields I am interested in past and present. I can't see how it wouldn't. I have been saying I don't have any heroes but that is really not a healthy way to think. That's like saying I have no identity. Their struggles can be very instructive for me and probably quite similar. So writers and psychologists past and present should be of interest to me.

Individuality is developmental

The rise of the individual in western culture has undermined the traditional relationship between the generations. Old people are now seen as impossible burden on young people who very heroically and spiritedly are leading their lives with a determined indifference to their parents. Allied with this the family is nuclearized and the extended family is increasingly sidelined. To be an "individual" is really about growing up and development. Individuality is reached in opposition to parents and other constraints not in tandem. It is the unique ego placing its imprint firmly on the world.

Unfortunately this version of society is very harsh and unforgiving to the elderly and young people have little time or patience or interest in older people. In developing societies it was never like this. It seems tragic that people who have lived full lives and contributed to society should live out their final days in

fear and marginalized. Again this reflects our modern abhorrence and terror of death. We want all reminders removed from sight so that we continue to believe in our own immortality for as long as possible.

I have to understand that the fact that my ego postdates these older people has an impact on the nature of the relationship and that has to be accepted. The tail does not wag the dog.

Aggregated Self-Concepts

They are evidence of the belief in collective consciousness. Religion, national identity and many other affiliations form the basis of collectivized thinking. At various times in the past these collectivization's were necessary for survival and so on but now many of them are obsolete.

Nationalism

The imposition of a collective psychic identity based on cultural, linguistic, territorial and geographical differences. Nationalism is solipsistic. It has no relevance to the developed self-concept. Every nation has its own identity, its own unifying attributes. It may have its own language. It most certainly has its own unique and defining history. It may be a litany of success or failure. It would seem that national identity is something that resides primarily in the conscious mind. It is learned. And it is learned from parents, school, the media and so on. We cannot inherit genetically a predisposition to a national identity. It is learned identity. War is the aggressive imposition of the authority of one collective psyche upon another.

Nationalism is a neurotic belief. It polarizes the self-concept in favor of the virtue of those sharing the same national identity and the antagonism against those who do not. It is flawed because it is not true – there is no special virtue to any national identity. There is no difference between people from one nation and another. Even in it's more benign recent incarnation nationalism still poses a threat to human development by encouraging the misallocation of scarce resources, promoting conflicts over material resources and undermining the global decision making necessary for survival.

There were three national identities at the heart of my self-concept.

1. Irish - which was based on my father and older brother, an assessment of Irish history, and the events and traumas that shaped the Irish psyche particularly the Potato Famine.
2. British - which was largely due to my education, my time in a Jesuit prep and secondary school and also the books I read which were largely by British authors and also the BBC etc.
3. American - based largely on my experience of TV shows and of going to LA aged 21 and the impression that had on me.

There was also the European identity, being a citizen of the EU.

In the earlier iterations of my manic cycle these identities were fiercely debated. The royals would represent Britain, the current president America, Ireland by the Taoiseach and various politicians. The question was which of these was the best ego strategy and the answer I debated but could never

resolve without a deeper dive into my self-concept. As I already know generality was an ego defense so in my 20s I was very negative about Ireland because I felt I would be happier in the States. Being in the states didn't resolve my depression and I ended up coming back.

National identity is definitional of an individual's ego.

I used to think my cultural locus was quite global. It just isn't - at all. It really is Anglo-Irish-American. That is the lens through which I perceive reality. It really doesn't appear that I could grow beyond that - even if I wanted too! It really seems to me that these images of self are compelling and I pull them all together and there is nothing else. There really isn't. But what else could there be apart from what I know. The sci fi stuff is projections based on the past, human history. I like to think I am selecting the best of the best - but am I not just biased. This is an Anglo-Irish-American vision of what the world should be like. Not what it is like or what it is likely to become.

There are a few aspects to this - firstly my identity is now very stable. I see exactly where I am coming from. The second point that transcending national identity is really vital for comprehension of reality. And also for my development of self. My pathway through Irish->British->American->Self.

There was also something that was absent for me in the Irish locus of masculinity. I didn't feel we were really masculine enough for me. So I looked elsewhere for that feeling. There are no positive male symbols from Irish culture. The only one I could find and I did look was the O'Neill. I bet if I looked colonized countries would not have positive male role model symbols because they were worsted and their culture was overthrown. These types of characters need to be fictional because they can't lose. So Rommel is no good because Rommel lost. And so for German youth male he is not a positive male symbol. But no real man can be. It has to be someone who has magical powers almost.

This where Anglo American packs its hegemonic punch - it's in the cultural DNA. Those little boys in India and China think Clint Eastwood is cool. And maybe for the purposes of convergence there cannot be a pluralistic global cultural reference system. Otherwise Clint Eastwood would be Irish or German right?

This is why the hegemonic culture is impossible to defeat - because the battle has already been lost. Hitler failed. Russia failed. I don't think China is even a contender. I don't think they are even looking for that. How would they impose their culture - whatever that is - on the international community? It's too late.

For all its appeal I would contend that nationalism and national identity are developmental and the developed self is unaware of their national identity. I do think the human self-concept; the current global self-concept is developmental.

On a side note I never thought there was anything wrong with Irish femininity – they could always produce babies and are equal of women anywhere in the world. This is a male developmental issue.

Marginal culture ideation struggle – male?

It's very easy as a member of a marginal culture to be angry, upset, opposed to this global cultural steamroller which is subsuming everything in its part. It's already chewed up Ireland a long time ago and

where my identity in all this is. So I think I need and people like me to find a positive relationship with what is essentially an inevitable process as far as I can see.

The worsting of the marginal culture is the historic failure of arms. The men of the culture forever hang their heads in shame as a result. Why should I feel bad that the native Irish were a disorganized rabble and the forces of British crown were far more organized, better equipped, centrally managed and had a much stronger sense of national identity even then? This is a battle my ancestors fought and lost. And yet I do feel bad!

There is a cultural hierarchy for men in particular. Because I imagine they are primarily rational and emotive on a secondary basis.

If the future is going to work the hegemonic culture needs to compromise as much as the developing cultures need to swallow their pride.

Irish inferiority complex – male?

We don't have in Ireland global male characters that are Irish. If they are global they are not going to be Irish so I had adopted what was on offer. What was offer were Bond and the American tough guys - like Clint and John Wayne. This is very significant for someone from a marginal culture. There is an implicit dislocation, disassociation that someone from the hegemonic culture would not suffer. Let's face it when I am watching Bond with Darren and his kids its Seamus Murphy the intrepid spy reporting to Enda Kenny. The whole thing starts to make me laugh. Because it is preposterous and unparalleled. And yet for them that's normal.

Multiply that by the loss of language and Gaelic culture - as offered by all marginal cultures and if you the essence of a global inferiority complex which is no fault of the incumbents. They may be very open to other cultural motifs but they do not have this problem.

A small country cannot expect nor does it need a global character to project but they do positive male role models.

I think my inferiority complex - cultural I picked up from Dad. He wanted to be French. I don't think I got from Mum. She is very into her Irish culture, speaks Irish, and is quite accomplished culturally. So really this inferiority complex is in me - primarily - solely. I admit it. It's true.

I don't think culture and identity are interchangeable you can't drive a car backwards at speed without crashing. When all is one and one is all then it makes sense. I was a Zelig but not always. I was working through a lot of stuff. I see my inferiorities and also see how nice lads from Laois know who they are and knew who they were when I didn't. But I see too that I do now. So now there is no difference. Sean was right in his comment, but he less right than he would have been 2 years prior and so on.

The reason therefore that Gaelic culture and language is not embraced by the mass of Irish people is the inferiority complex.

Nation State Formation

State is legitimized by violence

An ego defense strategy

National identity is an ego defense strategy. It defines an individual's ego borders in a way that gives that individual a sense of identity and belonging. Of course with modern travel and migration of people such national identities are under threat but in terms of the misallocation of global resources nationalism is still very influential. There is also the potential rise in nationalism from emerging nations like China and India who will want to leave their nationalistic imprint on the world also. National identity remains a very potent and potential divisive aspect of the human psyche. Traditionally national identity is based on geography and before that it was based on land. So the national identity corresponds to lines on the map.

Wars are conflicts between the national identities. They have traditionally been about land and resources. And still are. At the end of a conflict territory is ceded by the vanquished or new trading rights and routes were negotiated.

Generational trauma transmission

So the transmission of bias, judge mentality and remembrance of past hurt comes down through the generations. And I think national identity is like that. It's an inherited belief. Nationalism is an inherited belief. It is not environmentally schooled. It is based on the national identities of the parents.

National Traumas

Irish Potato Famine/Emigration

Jewish Holocaust

Germany/Japan: Trauma of Defeat

Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki

National Aggressors

Germany

Allied to this then is the aggression of Germany in the 20th century, which was a sign I think of disempowerment. They started the first and second world war. Of course the Brits had managed to carve up in the globe in a way that suited them before hand - so they were in effect the incumbents but fact remains Germany started two world wars.

Racial Traumas

Exploitation of black people

I did also think that young teenagers in the Drimnagh area mix up assertiveness and aggression. Aggression is really a sign of disempowerment. And because these young lads are completely disempowered in nearly every aspect of their lives they are extremely touchy, aggressive and sensitive

as a result. The mature development of that aggression would be into successful assertiveness but for a lot of them that never happens if they stay on the dole and live with their parents. This is what Furious Styles was trying to explain to the Boyz in the Hood.

Crime amongst black people

Trauma of colonization

Generational transmission

Marginality of colonised culture/language

Consciousness

I always mixed up the collective conscious with the singular unconscious. In fact I never knew there was a difference. Which means that in the singular unconscious resides all the vision and emotion and everything I could possible want or need to propel forwards. This is my inheritance and my goldmine. And it's all for me. I don't have to share it.

Collective consciousness

There is no collective unconscious. There is a collective conscious for humanity formed by the global media, books, and so on. We all know who the president is, but no collective unconscious. If it's not in the public domain then it's not part of the collective conscious. So it is an ego defense and it's a bit like covering up the evacuated foundations of this building I have found.

The collective consciousness consists of identities - national, religious and affiliations - like employers. *There isn't really a collective consciousness is there? Just because something is on TV doesn't me I have to watch it or believe it.* For me there was a collective consciousness. But there isn't anymore. I don't actually know people because I read their profiles or watch them on TV. I know of them. I know something about them. And anyone who accesses that public website can know what I know. So perhaps being liberated from the notion of a collective consciousness which may run in the background for a lot of people? Maybe - I don't know. I only know one person. That's the freedom. It's a bunch of crap - all of it. Think for yourself, mate.

I don't believe that because two people are informed of the same thing that a mental link is created between them. That's nonsense. There is no Borg Humanity.

It was clearly developmental that I had issue with political leaders. Even in the mania that naivety was acknowledged. In my developed state I realize these people are just people like me. They are not on any pedestal - unless I put them on one. The more I live the more I realize the similarity between people - all people - even the Joker and Brevik - I am not too far off the mark in understanding some of their issues. Anyway I had a problem with the world. And now I don't. So these images are actually reassuring. That is the breadth of my comprehension and its growing. But it has now grown enough for me to be comfortable in this world of ours of mine. What troubled me was these personalities who I have never met who nevertheless inhabited my collective consciousness.

I think the mentally ill have some kind of internal ideation that makes them feel connected to public figures and they debate with these elements of self-concept in their minds all the time. And often act on this as well. Their self-concept is sufficiently generalized for them to believe that they are actually having mental conversations with public figures.

Unique/Individual Unconscious

So a belief in a collective unconscious is a neurotic belief and it is untrue because there isn't any collective unconscious. The domain of the ego seems to reside in the sub-conscious not the conscious mind as previously theorized. This would account better for diverse phenomenon. We share our collective consciousness not our sub-conscious.

Global Structures

Bipolar society –Triumph of reason/Suppression of emotion
With regard to work/Economics – The Ying and Yang of Boom followed by bust

Emotions have to be the answer now for greater social stability and happier people. What's lacking is an emotional fulfillment not a lack of material things. Somehow modern living has to accommodate the way people feel. It currently doesn't and this is a huge problem. So I believe there is a strong need for restructuring. Work needs to be restructured in such a way as to offer emotional fulfillment. That means that the profit motive cannot be the only criteria upon which people do things. There a lot of things that need doing that don't generate a profit.

Modern society offers people a very limited range of options that they can do and support themselves doing. As a result there is a preponderance of financial people and other professions that don't really contribute and people have to slot themselves in somehow however reluctantly they may feel about doing that. As a result people limit what they do to what they are going to be paid to do. So immediately there is a huge disconnect between an individual's feelings and what they spend most of their life doing. Clearly an individual is more than some proscribed role in a company

On top of that for the unemployed there is no role of them at all in the economy and no one wants to pay them to do anything so they fester and internalize a sense of failure and redundancy.

Materialism is a form of social organization that has grown up and become a global template. It is destructive of the environment but more so it is destructive of people and their feelings and it pressures people to compete in ways that they would not normally do. It encourages people to spend most of their adult lives in the mode of acquiring material things usually separated from where they grew up and often only with immediate family or even on their own. It encourages people in the notion that this will make them happy.

Materialism has nothing to do with the journey to self and acquiring wealth and assets is of course an externalization of internal conflict. This can lead easily to the contradiction of a financially successful individual who is an unsuccessful human being. Like all externalizations it is a distraction from self

Hierarchies

Hierarchies reflect the fact that human society is most often structured in a pyramidal fashion. It seems to be the case that nearly all human organizations whether they are military, political, commercial or religious favor this method of grouping and structure. This entails a head or chief. It also involves rules and regulations, a culture of conformity and grades usually attained by seniority and exceptional commitment and contribution. Management therefore becomes a key function in a hierarchy and essential to its smooth functioning. The limitation of hierarchies is that they are based on one simple and inflexible idea or set of ideas. A change to the hierarchy has to be approved from the highest level in the hierarchy and hierarchies are notoriously slow to adjust to changing realities.

Chain of Command Structures

Global Social

The cult of celebrity
Personification is the means by which many neurotic people define their aspirations. They want to be like somebody rather than being themselves.

When the self-concept is fully established there is no interest in the lives of celebrities or other people. Further they believe that being like someone who is successful copying their life and mimicking their behavior will make them happy. This is also connected with the cult of certain personalities and celebrities who attract an enormous following for the same reason. In a sense people are being rational because they want to be happy and they think that successful people hold that secret. Celebrities view it as the price of fame and stardom that they have lost their personal freedom and anonymity. But in practice as the individual realizes that other people's lives have no relevance for them and that they everything they need they possess they will lose interest in the media and celebrities and so on.

Our pseudo-scientific age
We live in a scientific era – a world shaped by the science and technology. However what was innovation at one time has now become planned obsolescence and versioning. Cars are versioned every few years and a new model is put out. Rather than a car lasting for a long period of time which is perfectly possible technologically cars now seem to only have a shelf life of a few short years. People are encouraged and people want to consume the latest and the newest and the best and so on. Software is versioned also. A new version of popular software packages coming out nearly every year. In the entertainment industry old films are frequently resurrected and rebranded. There is a painful lack of originality in so many of these areas and contrary to another popular myth the profit motive is usually to blame for this lack of originality.

Real innovation comes along much less frequently. However pseudo-science has transcended every aspect of our culture and to deliver the so called new products that there is an insatiable demand for requires launches and releases on a near annual basis. So we are constantly being bombarded with so called new things. The fact that they are nearly always not new things but rehashes of existing things

Allied with this is the popular notion that technology and the march of time will unfold a brave new world for the human species. It is a species of social Darwinism that every year is a little bit better than

the last and the time will result in all human problems being resolved. So in effect the can is kicked down the road for each generation. The fact of the matter is that there has been no appreciable change in human nature since the time of Jesus Christ.

Historical Figures Reevaluated
Churchill was motivated in life to defend his self-concept. He saw or foresaw the British Empire in decline and Germany and principally Hitler as a threat to his nation. He was apocryphal in his visions and utterances.

Hitler's self-concept was formed in the shame of Germany's defeat after the war. He was injured in the First World War during a gas attack. He was strongly motivated to address the injustice of Germany's shameful and humiliating settlement at Versailles. That struck him as a profound injustice and once in office he set about dismantling the terms of the treaty. He was imbued by anti-Semitism and notions of racial superiority – ideas not uncommon in pre-war Europe.

Global Self-Concept
Of course it is tempting to confuse or externalize the way one is feeling. The individual's feelings are determining their perceptions. Further to this certain events, people, locations and other externalities can act as triggered for an individual with internal conflict and in effect set off a negative train of thought. Again it is not down to any externality that this happens but the individual is convinced that their mood is influenced or determined by such interactions. This mentality is again consistent with the false belief that the way we feel is dependent on the world outside of us rather than realizing we have internalized aspects of that world and that is what is really upsetting and driving us.

The teenage human psyche
Collectively we are immature and our world despite the best efforts of some is grossly unjust, resources are unfairly distributed, under threat from environmental degradation and so on. We all know the problems. For an outsider looking in or observing we are not really ready for a dialogue or contact. Who would speak for humankind? We don't speak with one voice on any issues. We don't treat each other well and we don't look after our world properly either. We are very teenage.

We ran from our animal legacy and in the blink of an eye all that now is was created – an affront, an impotent challenge to nature by nature. A paradox lost only on us the ones who created it. And what would our animal psyche have to tell us about ourselves? Well quite a lot it would seem. An animal only eats when they are hungry. But it is only in the psychic unity of man the conscious animal that we find the truth about ourselves because that is who we really are. We are sentient animals – no more and no less. Our culture is largely a self-congratulatory mirage – a hocus pocus of half truth and paternalistic myths, comforting ideas that we console ourselves with our bloody road to self-development. The truth is we don't like ourselves very much and we don't like who we are so we prefer to ignore it.

It matters also because in order to survive and progress we need to disabuse ourselves of this cultural baggage rather rapidly. It will not serve us going forward. And the evidence is already there that the system is creaking under its own weight. Not everyone can be a rock star or a celebrity and there wouldn't be much left of our planet if they could. Our philosophical paradigms are based on infinite

extrapolations – endless unlimited economic growth – sourcing endless new markets the implicit endless supply of raw materials and the factors of production – and so on. These are flawed and dangerous belief systems in a finite world.

Capitalism may have won the battle of the ideologies but that doesn't prove that it is right. Again the flawed logic of winner and loser applies.

In the same way that we are individually in revolt against our own natures so too collectively we are in revolt against our world as though our world has done us some injury. Nature offers many examples of more holistic forms of resource management and organization. But we don't have to look far for the answers for all that we need. A growth in individual self-knowledge would have vast implications for science, learning, development and education. Just as there is a misallocation of scarce resources in our world so too there is a misallocation of people. There are potential scientists that end up making pizza and talents squandered in the wrong areas, stultifying and frustrated.

The fact is quite simply that external models of organization do injury to human individuality and talent. Resources are being shunted around the globe for all the wrong reasons and with little hope that they will find useful homes or application. Free market capitalism is hardly the best thing that ever happened to the human species. You certainly wouldn't think that if you lived in Africa. But even then the free marketers are undeterred. Africa's standard of living will be raised in due course. Just like Asia was. They are a bit vague on the timeline.

We are prepared to base the declaration of human rights around the entitlements of the individual. Well now we need to organize our society with this in mind also. Rather than accepting a world in which conformity and affiliation are the norm, why not a world where human individuality is celebrated in all its diversity?

Global Economy

The global economic cycle is a collective consciousness idea. It's periods of boom followed by periods of bust. We are in a period of bust - but there is no question that we will be in another boom someday. Timing is unclear obviously. Neither state is desirable. For the purposes of stability cycles or episodes are quite destructive and dislocating. It reflects the very human tendency to collective do things and makes collective assumptions and decisions.

In Chris P's example the collective news became negative and the sandwich shop owner harmonized his views with that collective news. He became risk-averse and mean and is his business suffered. For the developed self, collective bad news should not change the way that person feels. The developing self-concept is vulnerable to external information that is unfavorable and is inclined to make decisions based on that information rather than their own insights. This gives rise to epidemic behavior. The bipolar economic cycle is a mass delusion. It has no basis in reality. It is a cycle of bad and good news that goes around and around. Since the war there have been six recessions?

In the last boom/bust cycle people reached a point in the cycle of boom where they began to be imprudent. Not initial but ultimately. Had they maintained their prudence they would not have

overextended themselves financially. There is the argument that economic indicators were being manipulated and this give confusing signals to the market and market participants. The Fed with its manipulation of the interest rate created a supply of cheap money.

My point is the bipolar economic cycle is undesirable and this collective consciousness of ideation must track back to the individual is some sense. The aggregated self-concept is the sum of its individual parts. And some part of that is flawed thinking – which if it can be changed removed the undesirable effect we all know so well.

I recall now being anxious and worried when the recession hit in 2007. Would I get a job? I was nearly thinking there was no point looking – then I looked and everyone said they were hiring. But if I didn't get a job I couldn't buy that apartment the property developer was thinking of building and I certainly wouldn't by the new car that the car company saw no point in making because they couldn't sell. And if I lost my job I wouldn't be buying anything and if the company I worked for was the car company and they let me go because they couldn't sell me a car then the cycle has come full circle. So who is the Piper?

Is the Piper the Devil? Calling men and women to account? What exactly are they afraid of? Going to hell? When the unity of the self-concept is apparent there will be no further necessity or possibility for such collective delusions.

Ideation cycles for only one of two possible reasons – loss or abuse.

Materialism

We live in a global, free market economy where the rise of the individual is delineated most clearly by the rise in that individual's possessions. We have definitely made the connection that the individual has rights and should not be coerced by government or other institutions in most countries but this growth in personal freedom which has occurred seems really to be only a greater personal freedom to consume. If possessions made us happier then we should all be a lot happier because we have a lot more things than we used to have. But material things don't advance the cause of self-knowledge and like any externality don't change anything. In materiality we witness the monumental struggle of the nascent self to find itself. It is like any struggle in history war being an obvious example. The surface of our world is convulsed, rearranged and plundered in. Our era is unquestionably the era of the individual more than at any time in human history and individual preference.

Property is quite central to identity and of course national identity too. However in our global society it strikes me land as a symbol of identity is very restrictive. Clearly the American Indians had a more holistic relationship with the land and one that was not destructive of the environment or other animals. Actually a lot of "modern" concepts make the assumption of unlimited growth, land and resources and so on. So they probably need to be reconciled with reality which is the finite nature of the world we live in. I think the solution is to contrive a philosophy - a way of doing things that doesn't emphasis personal ownership but rather self-actualization. People think they want the biggest house, the most expensive car the best of everything - but really they want to be self-actualized so my view is that materialism is actually developmental - and does not have a bright future - still that might be an audacious assumption given the reality of the world we live in.

Consumption

What motivates an individual to buy a new car when they already have a perfectly good functioning car is of course the conviction that buying the car will make him feel better. Consumption therefore is it is aptly dubbed a type of retail therapy. People want to buy good feeling and good times. And they have the money so consume they do. However buying things only give a feel good for a short time and pretty soon it is necessary to go back to the mall again and buy something else. Or next time it is necessary to buy something even more expensive.

False Innovation/Versioning/Planned Obsolescence/Misallocation of scarce resources

Religion – Idealization of self-concept

Religion is a coping strategy for loss and an ego defense against the reality of loss.

Christianity

Christianity appears to be principally a bereavement complex. The Genesis aspect is clearly a creationist myth which has been supplanted by evolution. This idea appears again in the concept of the Immaculate Conception linking the creator with humanity. Principally though Christianity's appeal is the resurrection and everyone reunited in some earthly paradise (heaven). Per evolution the more complex forms of life develop sexuality as a means of generational transmission. For primitive men and women it seemed most obvious that the universe was conceived - birthed. They were of course innocent of evolution.

There is obviously the paternalistic aspect of Christianity also. There is a creator. He is male. He sired all of us. It certainly connects humanity strongly with the cosmos but it seems far more likely that we made it up to comfort ourselves. God is our shepherd – our cosmic parent – the father we never had. He knows everything – he is ubiquitous. He can read our minds and hearts. Does he take a form that takes sides in our internal struggles?

Again the battle or struggle between God and the forces of evil is played out in the psyche of the religious man and woman. The bereavement complex aspect accounts for the greater appeal of Christianity amongst older people. They are more keenly conscious of their mortality.

There is also a strong messianic and self-abnegation theme running through the sacrifice and martyrdom of Jesus Christ. Jesus denied himself for everyone else. Christ sacrifices himself for humanity and Christians are urged to make similar sacrifices.

Catholicism

Catholicism has this idea about a messianic self, a giving self-sacrificing individual who always puts the needs of other people before his own needs. It is fundamentally a people pleaser.

I think with Niall I never accepted nor got the message that he didn't like me until recently. I never disliked anyone so it never occurred to me that anyone would dislike me. I used to pray for people who didn't like me. And forgive them their trespasses against me. This leads to this notional idea of unconditionally which is the neurotic people pleaser, the neurotic messianic. Of course I realize now

that Niall disliked plenty of people and often used to tell me about people he didn't like. And if I disliked other people I think it would have been easy to imagine that he or other people didn't like me.

The reason I thought I got on with everyone is not that I did - I just didn't feel anything so I just assumed I was getting on well with everyone. And I really wasn't. It wasn't any different to how it is now. I was just emotionally unaware of it. So I can say all I like oh I had the right attitude in my 20s - no I didn't - I just didn't notice what I feeling, what rejection felt like and so on. I was numb, unaware emotionally.

Possibly Jesus went to his grave with a messianic complex fully fledged.

Faith
A random walk through a lunatic asylum proves that faith signifies nothing. Nietzsche

With a mature self-concept there is no need for faith. You don't need faith to be yourself. The individual completely accepts reality and does not need to console himself about reality. He knows all he needs to know in order to be happy so he doesn't have to dream about it or fantasize about it.

Faith to the developing self-concept turns out to have been the hope of reaching a robust and self-validating self-concept. That is the most any of us can expect with consciousness. That attained

Morality
Self-forgiveness is central to the emergence of a healthy self-concept. We have all of us internalized a sense of good and evil. These are things we think of as wrong and unacceptable morally to us. As we deconstruct our internalizations it becomes increasingly obvious that we are neither good nor bad and that the value judgment serves no purpose. In a state of oneness with self – self imposes no judgment on self. Such a thing is meaningless and laughable.

Clearly as Jung suggests we are not as good as we like to think. Evil acts occur in the world but does this mean that humankind or some part of him is inherently evil or does it just mean that we fail to understand or comprehend the universe well enough and label what we cannot control or like as evil.

Fundamentalism
The fundamentalist self-concept is virtuous with an ongoing fear of the evil part of their self-concept. They maintain their self-concept by acts of devotion, supplication, prayer and condemnation and judge mentality.

Prophecy and Mental Illness
It is probable that by today's standards the prophets and the visionaries of the church and other religious organization were mentally ill. They heard voices. God spoke to them in a variety of unlikely and implausible scenarios. They had visions. They were inspired by their experiences to make a huge but generalized contribution to their world and demonstrated great bravery and self-sacrifice.

In ancient times someone could have one manic episode - recover and shares these insights with his community - perhaps becoming a patriarch and leader or men. For those with recurring mental health issues in the ancient times the prognosis was not good for them. Hearing voices, connecting with God,

dialoguing with God, these are all prophetic experiences and there also completely consistent with mental illness. So one episode could have worked but multiple episodes would not in my view. Jesus in all probability was a manic depressive. It seems likely that Paul was as well.

Jesus went into the desert for 40 days. The devil tried to tempt him. Paul heard the voice of God on the road to Damascus - a life changing experience.

Original Sin
About Self-Virtue

Congruent with their neurotic sense of self-wickedness people develop a neurotic sense of their own virtue. This is sustained by heavy repression of their "bad" thoughts and feelings. In so doing the individual falsely convinces himself that he has no bad thoughts or feelings and as a result he must be virtuous. Since humans are neither virtuous nor wicked but merely exist this false sense of virtue leads to other neurotic convictions like the neurotic religious for example.

About Self-wickedness

One's sense of one's own wickedness – for people born in the Christian tradition their sense of evil and wrongdoing and wickedness is determined by their own sense of their self-wickedness. The individual's conception of evil is based on their self-concept.

Original Sin

If the human psyche is not evil, neither of course is it particularly good either, then we can dispense the notion of Original Sin. And dispatch this traditional concept of evil thus promoting better human relations. In essence humanity is not to blame and should stop blaming itself. Any human crime can be explained by reference to the psychology of that individual.

Neither is past human transgression something we should now today hold ourselves accountable for. When we forgive ourselves as individuals we automatically forgive the crimes of our ancestors. They didn't know any better and so they are not really to blame.

If I can see evil in the world then I must be aware of it in myself. Because my self-concept determines how I see the world. So since I don't see evil in myself and neither great virtue then I can conclude that there is no evil on Planet Earth.

People think that good and bad is thinking and feeling good and bad thoughts and feelings. Good and bad are doing good and bad things - very different. It is only when the asocial behavior manifests itself that something needs to be done about it. However with a poor self-concept the tendency is to confuse thought, feeling and action.

I think humanity has evolved to the point where we can explain the actions of our fellow man without reference to good and evil, God and the devil and so on. People are not born good or bad. Their transformation into an individual who commits asocial acts has to be a reflection of the environment

they live in. As such whereas their actions are not necessarily condonable – they are comprehensible without resort to traditional simplifications.

In this sense all men and women are knowable. They may not be reachable but they can be made sense of. This has important implications for the present and future of human governance and interaction. It simply will not do to dismiss other people on the basis of traditional concepts. Rather than saying people are good or bad it would be better to say they are troubled.

It's precisely concepts like Original Sin that now pose the greatest barrier to human development and integration. Evil must leave the human psyche in a conceptual way to allow the necessary coalescence to happen.

Eve ate the apple of knowledge and woman brought evil into the Garden of Eden. But there is no original sin. Humanity is forgiven and has graduated. So earth can be an Eden. Culpability and guilt and blame are gone. Earth becomes Eden, on a religious basis? Death isn't sin. People die irrespective of their moral probity. Death takes us all - the fool and the wise man.

Prayer

Prayer as far as I can see is an exercise in mental self-forgiveness, unless God is listening and intervenes to resolve the individual's troubled emotional state. Excessive blame and guilt are therefore key emotional elements of the cycle of Christian ideation.

Belief in God – a distorted self-concept

Religious people want to believe there is something perfect and virtuous about their own natures and human nature. But there isn't anything perfect or virtuous about anyone so this is a neurotic belief. It doesn't square with reality. And so the religious individual has to spend a lot of time defending their self-concept. They do this by regular church attendance, prayer and so on.

God is a virtually universal concept for the human psyche and few cultures lack some conception of God. However a belief in God may not facilitate ones journey to self. The fact that there needs to be a paternalistic entity advising, guiding and leading on the individual devolves from that individual the need to face up to certain truths about themselves. In the same way prayer can be a form of denial or avoidance where fears and hopes that may be entirely unrealistic or unreasonable are projected an alter ego the individual calls God. In fact such a belief and process of belief could be a huge obstacle to self-development.

Clearly the human psyche is not a forum in which God necessarily is obliged to reside. Completing the Journey to Self is the best possible way for an individual to perceive reality and religious beliefs fall into their appropriate context when the journey is completed.

The alien myth – the new religion

Modern man/woman doesn't know who he is and needs aliens to tell him if he is any good or not. He's not sure. He's confused. Aliens are an element of self.

So again it is quite a developmental notion that some being some place should take an interest in us. The fact is that the universe is not particularly interested in humanity and that from a cosmic perspective we are pretty insignificant. This is hard for the developmental ego to accept or swallow so our culture develops a whole mish-mash of denial to hide from ourselves are fundamental inconsequence. But if we think about we take very little interest in the other species on our world and they are at least from our planet. We don't spend large amounts of time trying to talk to baboons or dolphins. The more we learn about the universe the more ephemeral we realize we are and we don't like it. Our culture is full of our centrality and has only comparatively recently become acquainted with the idea that we are not at the center of the universe. While we look outside ourselves, and in every conceivable place except internally, our own world wallows in misery and chaos. Rather than being depressed by our insignificance we should take heart to cherish and conserve ourselves and our own world.

I do think the alien sagas where bodies are taken over or minds are controlled or humans are impregnated by aliens and give birth to more aliens are really scenarios about losing self, losing identity. I think that is scariest thing that can happen to a human is that they lose themselves. Those who don't dread it and those who have live in fear of it.

The point being it's in the struggle against opposing forces that a body is tempered or a mind is tempered and something valuable results. Sloth leads nowhere. And inertia and self-doubt followed by gluttony - it's all very easy to see how it's going wrong.

I do take issue with the concept of sin. But for our ancestors the way people live now make no sense at all. But then had no comprehension of mental illness or any of those things, homosexuality. Lots of things they didn't know anything about.

I do think modern man's greatest fear is losing his mind. Aliens could take away our selfhood - our unique personalities. That's pretty scary - right?

The basic ideas behind "aliens" as we know them center around fears of loss of self, loss of identity, individuality, need for direction paternalism, someone to tell us what to do or think, primal jungle fears of being eaten, impregnated, malformed, merged with an alien species, being replaced. Nearly all negative ideas for one thing. That we would be taken advantage of, ruled, controlled, eaten, exterminated. So when we look into the future we are looking into the past. These are all things we did to each other. In the jungle humans were on the menu for wild animals and also each other. Does that extrapolate into space?

As I dig deeper into myself I find more things - some of which I like and surprise and some I don't like. I find truth in everything these days - in what people have said to me over the years and the wisdom of the church and so on. They were bastions to protect selfhood. And still are. With popular culture I see recurring themes. I suppose the medieval knowledge of the world was quite primitive and to expand that people had to go the places that were unknown. So I don't see how we can know anything about the cosmos without exploring it. Also I think we need to leave our baggage from the past behind.

The obvious thing I notice is very earthbound fears are being projected into space. I don't think space will be about territoriality or resources or unlikely mating between alien species and humans, or humans being sucked into something where they lose their identity. It seems to that the alien delusion has replaced the God delusion and both delusions are bound up with identity and self. The self-aware and the self-enlightened don't feel alone. It's likely though a lot of the population do feel alone.

What the alien hypothesis suggests to me is the modern man has low self-esteem and doesn't know who he is.

We are alone individually. Always have been and always will be. It is the developing self-concepts most ardent desire to find reflection of self. If you want to see an alien look in the mirror!

Global Directions

Philosophy
The first commonality we all share as humans is our species. We share the same biology, and it is this reality that has arguably had more impact on the human psyche than any of the developments that have come in more modern times.

We are prone to believe that evolution has placed us at a distance from the animal kingdom but the reality is that our animal identity has come with us and is the fundamental and deepest aspect of our psyche. Built on this primordial foundation is all what we like to regard as higher order psychic functionality. In this space in our psyches that lust becomes love and instinct becomes feeling and emotion.

A modern man is a neurotic, and doesn't know who he is. Religion is a death complex. Aliens are a death complex. Modern man lives in fear of losing self and all his waking strategies are with one intent in mind protecting his flawed self-concept.

Societal sanity doesn't mean anything. Self is the arbiter of right and wrong. Society is not to blame. They just don't know. Forgive them for they know not what they do. Said Jesus. Who are they? There are no they. What makes a man sane therefore is self-acceptance. Jung is right - the evil we discern in ourselves is the evil we fight in the world.

No national identity can claim vindication

Man's search for meaning – Urgent desire for self
From a philosophical standpoint moving from emotional disorder to emotional order is a motivation and an urge – an impetus. That said the individual can stray very far from emotional order in their lives and convince themselves that emotional order is not important, can be postponed, can be rationalized away. There is however a cost to such prevarication. Emotional disorder can manifest itself in a variety of ways including depression but not exclusively. Other related signs of emotional disorder include psychosomatic illnesses, anxiety, panic attacks etc.

Fundamentally a life built on rational principles is unstable and ungrounded. For the life to have strong foundations there must be emotional preferences at the heart of it. This then accounts for the myriad psychological and psychosomatic disorders that can result from a lack of emotional grounding. There is a fundamental incongruity between the rational choices and the emotional preferences. This leads to conditions of stress and disharmony at the core of an individual's lifestyle.

This is not to suggest that individuals in a state of emotional disorder can't enjoy success or achievement. Indeed often the driving force behind their competitive zeal is their misunderstood desire to resolve their emotional disorder. They believe that by being successful they will achieve a state of emotional order in their lives. This of course is a false belief. Material success does not lead to emotional order. Only revealing processing and releasing trapped emotions will yield the happiness and contentment they yearn.

Where are we going?
The problem for humanity is the collective consciousness. That heterogeneous mix of ideas, beliefs, identities and so which are at cross purposes and contradict each other. How do you change the collective consciousness? Deselect people from it. Show them a way out. And it will change. They don't question. That's the thing. JOS?

It will change on an individual basis and roll up. When an individual is presented with a better argument, insight, concept, idea – they always take it on board. It always gets added to their collection.

Change a life, you change the world.

Where are we going? Eden on Earth. Practically no crime. No hunger. No environmental degradation. Clean energy. Clean cities. Conservation. Protect other species. Space development. Meaningful roles. Economics structured around the needs of humanity. Not the other way around.

Definitions

Externalization: Finding manifestations of one's own feelings in the external environment in the hope of resolve them.

Internalization: Taking on board the views, opinions, beliefs of others – usually parents – and trying to make them one's own despite the fact that they are not innate

Inner conflict: The conflict between one's true and views, opinions, beliefs and so on that one has internalized.

Success: Completing the Journey to self

Joy: Milestones, progress on the Journey to self

Breakdown:

Rational self:

Emotional self:

Feeling: An emotional state or reaction.

Thought: An idea or opinion produced by thinking or occurring suddenly in the mind, an idea or mental picture, imagined and contemplated.

Mood: A temporary state of mind or feeling. A category of verb use, typically expressing fact (indicative mood), command (imperative mood), question (interrogative mood), wish.(esp. of music) Inducing or suggestive of a particular feeling or state of mind.

Emotions: A natural instinctive state of mind deriving from one's circumstances, mood, or relationships with others, any of the particular feelings that characterize such a state of mind, such as joy, anger, love, hate, horror, etc.

Solipsism: The view or theory that the self is all that can be known to exist. I have the view that the self is all that can be known. And all that can be inferred.

Suppression: an act or instance of suppressing, the state of being suppressed, the conscious intentional exclusion from consciousness of a thought or feeling

Repression: the action or process of repressing, the state of being repressed <repression of unpopular opinions, an instance of repressing <racial repressions>a, a mental process by which distressing thoughts, memories, or impulses that may give rise to anxiety are excluded from consciousness and left to operate in the unconscious.

Repression allows the ego to keep threatening or disturbing memories or impulses at an unconscious level, so that the individual is no longer aware of the conflict. Memories of unfavorable or tragic events may be repressed and the accompanying unpleasant feelings thus avoided.

Rationalization is unconsciously false self-justification. The individual is primarily concerned with preserving his own good opinion of himself or with not allowing this opinion to be damaged any more than is necessary.

Sublimation involves the rechanneling of the energy of an unacceptable impulse into another more acceptable activity. Thus the repressed energy of the sexual drive may be sublimated into vigorous athletic competition.

Projection, used defensively, involves attributing one's own unworthy impulses or motives to others. Projection is also sometimes used by the individual to cover up traits that he does not actually have but is tempted to have.

Regression: The individual reverts to an earlier level of behavior in regression. For example, a toddler may adopt some of his earlier more babyish habits when his new baby brother or sister joins the family. The various defense mechanisms enable the individual on occasions to overlook or forget threatening or uncomfortable situations, to see himself or others in a more satisfying way or to attack with enthusiasm obstacles that would otherwise be overpowering. However, the relief provided by defensive behavior is usually only temporary unless the underlying or precipitating causes are modified.

Neurosis: A relatively mild mental illness that is not caused by organic disease, involving symptoms of stress (depression, anxiety) but not a.(in nontechnical use), excessive and irrational anxiety or obsession.

Neurosis is a class of functional mental disorders involving distress but neither delusions nor hallucinations, whereby behavior is not outside socially acceptable norms.[1] It is also known as psychoneurosis or neurotic disorder, and thus those suffering from it are said to be neurotic. The term essentially describes an "invisible injury" and the resulting condition.

Psychosis: A severe mental disorder in which thought and emotions are so impaired that contact is lost with external reality.

Delusion: An idiosyncratic belief or impression that is firmly maintained despite being contradicted by what is generally accepted as reality, the action of deluding someone or the state of being deluded.

Culture: the quality in a person or society that arises from a concern for what is regarded as excellent in arts, letters, manners, scholarly pursuits, etc., that which is excellent in the arts, manners, etc, a particular form or stage of civilization, as that of a certain nation or period: Greek culture, development or improvement of the mind by education or training, the behaviors and beliefs characteristic of a particular social, ethnic, or age group: the youth culture; the drug culture.

Erotic: arousing or satisfying sexual desire: an erotic dance, of, pertaining to, or treating of sexual love; amatory: an erotic novel, subject to or marked by strong sexual desire.

Solitude: the state or quality of being alone or remote from others, a lonely or secluded place.

Isolation: the act of isolating, the quality or condition of being isolated.

Self-Concept: The organized, consistent set of perceptions and beliefs about oneself

Philosophy: The study of the fundamental nature of knowledge, reality, and existence, esp. when considered as an academic discipline, a set of views and theories of a particular philosopher concerning such study or an aspect of it.

Dissociation: The disconnection or separation of something from something else or the state of being disconnected.

Projection: An estimate or forecast of a future situation or trend based on a study of present ones.

Intuition: The ability to understand something immediately, without the need for conscious reasoning, a thing that one knows or considers likely from instinctive feeling rather than conscious reasoning.

Cognition: The mental action or process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses, a result of this; a perception, sensation, or intuition.

Dreams: A series of thoughts, images, and sensations occurring in a person's mind during sleep. Experience dreams during sleep: "I dreamed about her last night".

Fantasy: The faculty or activity of imagining things that is impossible or improbable. Imagine the occurrence of; fantasize about.

Osmosis: The tendency of molecules of a solvent to pass through a semipermeable membrane from a less concentrated solution into a more concentrated one. It is the process of gradual or unconscious assimilation of ideas, knowledge, etc.

Interaction: Reciprocal action or influence: "interaction between the two countries".

Get on:

1. To be or continue on harmonious terms: gets on well with the neighbors.

2. To manage or fare with reasonable success.

3.

a. To make progress; continue: get on with a performance.

b. To advance in years.

4. To acquire understanding or knowledge: got on to the con game.

Initiative: The ability to assess and initiate things independently. The power or opportunity to act or take charge before others do. Synonyms: enterprise - gumption – lead

Creativity: refers to the invention or origination of any new thing (a product, solution, artwork, literary work, joke, etc.) that has value. "New" may refer to the individual creator or the society or domain within which novelty occurs. "Valuable", similarly, may be defined in a variety of ways.

Bibliography

The Emotion Code, Bradley Nelson

Toxic Psychiatry, Peter Breggin

Love, Medicine and Miracles, Bernie Siegel.