

My Narcissist Trap

My Emotional Development

By

Hugh McGovern

© *Hugh McGovern, 2012*

Introduction

I lived in a perceived narcissistic world and had evolved strategies and behaviours to survive and exist in that world. My interpretations are emotively biased in favour of my narcissism. I looked at everyone else as being narcissist and interpreted other people as either striving for control or to relate. It is the ultimate in confirmation bias based my childhood lights.

I lived my life and aligned my life in respect to and in acceptance of the emotional bias of my upbringing. I could only conceive of the world as a narcissistic place and as a result I continually misinterpreted people as being narcissist and ultimately found it more comfortable and reassuring to be around people who are.

I was trapped therefore by his my emotional predicates. I could not escape and can know no other kind of world. My judgement and my insight was bias in favour of what seems most compelling to me.

The world is no particular complexion or bias – to me the narcissist I perceived in a way bias according to my experience and evolved beliefs.

In relatedness I was trapped in an unhealthy style of relating to other people. Being a co-narcissist or an inverted narcissist I only periodically asserted myself. And for the overt or controlling narcissist they are bound by need to be listened to and supported by the inverted narcissist.

One of the critical aspects of the interpersonal situation when one person is either narcissistic or co-narcissistic is that it is not, in an important sense, a relationship.

A healthy relationship is defined as an interpersonal interaction in which each person is able to consider and act on his or her own needs, experience, and point of view, as well as being able to consider and respond to the experience of the other person. Both people are important to each person. In a narcissistic encounter, there is, psychologically, only one person present.

As the the co-narcissist I disappeared for both people, and only the narcissistic person's experience was important.

My narcissists trap was in believing narcissism is the world.

A person who was raised by a narcissistic or a co-narcissistic parent tends to assume that, in any interpersonal interaction, one person is narcissistic and the other co-narcissistic, and often can play either part.

A high proportion of people in psychotherapy have adapted to life with narcissistic people and, as a result, have not been able to develop healthy means of self-expression and self-directedness.

Co-narcissistic people automatically and unconsciously assume that everyone is narcissistic. Co-narcissistic people are typically insecure because they have not been valued for themselves, and have been valued by their parents only to the extent that they meet their parents' needs.

One of the critical aspects of the interpersonal situation when one person is either narcissistic or co-narcissistic is that it is not, in an important sense, a relationship.

My Emotional Development

There are only two aspects to being me from a developmental perspective – love and the world.

Love comes from my mother. The world is the perception of my father. I adopted a relatedness style based on my mother. I overtly identify with (idealise) my mother and covertly identify (idealise) my father. With trauma my developmental road map became distorted. Perceived failure to love (relate) or progress in the world led to my depression and dependency on the formative environment.

Due to my double negative internalisation I was emotional instability and completely self-denial. This then led on to my psychosis and emotional overwhelm. I lost myself not once but many times. This was my extreme narcissism.

I could not be talked out of my internalisations. That's why people say patients can't be talked out of their depressions. Psychology doesn't work.

Formative Environment

Dysfunctional Family Model

Children growing up in a dysfunctional family have been known to adopt one or more of six basic roles:

- "The Good Child" – a child who assumes the parental role.
- "The Problem Child" – the child who is blamed for most problems, in spite of often being the only emotionally stable one in the family.
- "The Caretaker" – the one who takes responsibility for the emotional well-being of the family.
- "The Lost Child" – the inconspicuous, quiet one, whose needs are often ignored or hidden.
- "The Mascot" – uses comedy to divert attention away from the increasingly dysfunctional family system.
- "The Mastermind" – the opportunist who capitalizes on the other family members' faults in order to get whatever he/she wants.

Dysfunctional family members have common symptoms and behavior patterns as a result of their common experiences within the family structure. This tends to reinforce the dysfunctional behavior, either through enabling or perpetuation. The family unit can be affected by a variety of factors.

Symptoms of family dysfunction	Signs of unhealthy parenting	Parenting styles which cause family dysfunction
---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Unpredictability	<p>"Dogmatic or chaotic parenting" (harsh and inflexible discipline)</p> <p><i>Childlike (parents who "parentify" their children. They tend to be needy and incompetent. Usually allow the other parent to abuse children.) using physical means as consequences arbitrarily. Rule by fear. Conditional love</i></p>	Depriving (parents who control by withholding love, money, praise , attention, or anything else their child needs or wants.)
Stifled speech (children not allowed to dissent or question authority)	Cultlike (parents who feel uncertain and "raise their children according to rigid rules and roles".)	"Denial of an Inner Life" (children are not allowed to develop their own value system)
<p>Neuharth also includes these signs of unhealthy parenting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disrespect • Emotional intolerance (family members not allowed to express the "wrong" emotions) • Ridicule 	<p>Neuharth also includes these dysfunctional parenting styles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using (destructively narcissistic parents) • Abusing (parents who use physical, verbal, or sexual violence to dominate their children) • Perfectionist (parents who "fixate on order, prestige, power, and/or perfect appearances".) 	

Parenting

My parents played an important role in depression for me because I did not like my 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 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 repressed and is not innate. 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.

Repressions 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.

The thing is for a child its more or less unacceptable not to have a relationship with the parents. It has to be the child's fault. This is where the necessity for emotional repression becomes huge. The child completely internalizes the negative feelings from the relationship with the parents. That's why the parental relationship is so potentially destructive - and the parents can be grand - good citizens - well turned out - church goers - no problem - and their children are in bits. The developmental relationship is one way, not two-way. It always was and it always will be. The tail does not wag the dog.

Parental Identification

The crystal vision – Idealisation of Parents

The crystal vision is utopia – paradise lost with the parents. There was never paradise. Idealisation has always been a fiction.

Hating ones parents - Neg Identification Both Parents

If we negatively identify with both parents then we have a large schema or a large sub-conscious.

Having negative identification with both parents – results in a large schema that is highly unrealistic. This can give rise to the danger of losing oneself in one's own schema. This kind of negative identification complicates development for the emerging identity but on the plus side we do it our way.

When there is negative identification with both parents and a resultant schema that is unrealistic the individual is caught in a cycle of idealisation and rejection. They harbour a secret love for their parents which they feel is unrealised and unobtainable and that they have been unfairly denied. It is a type of highly internalised, stressful love-hate.

When the schema is negative on both parents the individual's emotional development is highly complicated and there is a high level of internalisation. This is both stressful and complicates the task of relatedness. The process of being born does not offend psychologically so the natural resting point for any adult is to forget about their parents and live their own lives.

Our dislike of parents is schema driven. Without the schema it doesn't matter what our parents are like. They are not us and having interacted with them does not permanently affect us. We can still be ourselves. Our emotional reactions to our parents are schema driven – because as an adult our parents are not relevant to us in fact they may be highly anachronistic. As children we have

to live with our parents but not so as adults. However with our schema we continue to live with the emotional impact they had upon us.

An overwhelming negative schema suggests a secret dislike of both parents. And this generally gives rise to a completely unrealistic schema on reality.

Neg Identification One parent

If it is a dislike of one parent then it is a partly negative, partly realistic schema.

Where positive identification occurs with one parent we have a partly realistic schema – instability is unlikely with this level of positive identification?

I think that children will idealise on parent and be dismissive of the other parent. To sustain their idealisation and to maintain the approval of the idealised parent they need to express themselves dismissively concerning the other parent.

Emotional Consequences

A severe incompatibility 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 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.

Lack of Emotional Security

The mother is the provider of emotional security to her children.

Lack of Financial Security

Traditionally the father is the provider of financial security to his children.

Abusive parent cannot be brought to account

Because we cannot negotiate or dismiss our parents we have to internalise how they make us feel. These are relationships that can never be brought to account. As a result we are forced to distort ourselves in order to relate to our parents. Developing as adult therefore entails dismantling this schema in order to be ourselves. When that is achieved our parents are no longer emotionally relevant to who we are.

Parents are our first exposure to the world of men and women. So they form a proxy or a pseudonym for what it is like and for what we can reasonably expect. As we venture out more into the world and become adults we learn and realise that our parents are human and have developmental issues of their own emotionally. So the experience of them may not really equip or inform us reliably in all scenarios and with all types of people.

Needy/Neurotic Parenting

This type of parent finds fulfillment for their need to control in their children. As adults they have very little control over their own lives so that when they become parents they find this very validating.

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.

WHO'S TAKING CARE OF WHOM?

Paradoxically, people who never let go of their parents are usually people who never had true parents in the first place. A true parent is someone who realizes it is their job to take care of their children, and that it is not the child's job to take care of their parents!

True parents enjoy taking care of their kids, and don't resent that their kids need them. And they want their kids to reach a truly independent adulthood with a good chance at happiness.

Don't want the kids to grow up

A needy parent doesn't want their child to grow up because they will lose that undivided attention and desired feeling of being at the heart of someone's life. This at least in part is the motivation for a needy parent to continually and unnecessarily involve themselves in their child life. They need to be needed. Children can be incredibly self-reliant from a young age but a needy parent will not allow this or accept it.

The fact is if a parent encourages a child to be self-reliant then the child no longer really needs the parent. They can operate successfully on their own. And so the needy strategy to prevent the loss of the relationship is to continually do everything for the child. Things the child is perfectly capable of doing on their own and handling on their own.

Overparenting

Teens NEED to make their own decisions and make their own friends. They even need to do a certain amount of risk-taking. The parents' job is to facilitate these developmental stages, not try to delay or prevent them. I have observed that when parents are overprotective, teens are over-rebellious.

Some parents are OVERINVOLVED with their children. The parents fail to learn the fine art of backing off and letting the child assume responsibility for consequences. Such parents constantly remind their children to do their homework or continuously ask, "Is your homework done?" or hover over the child to make sure the task is done right.

Some parents get overinvolved in their children's feelings. They can't stand the thought of any unhappiness in their child's life. If the child didn't get the lead in the school play or didn't get on the team these parents want to fix it for the child or try to make it up to the child in some way.

What's so bad about over parenting?

The hovering, overprotective parent gives two messages that can be harmful to children.

- 1. The first negative message is that the world is a scary place.*
- 2. The second, more destructive, message is that the parents don't trust their children to do what they are supposed to do whether it be learning to fall asleep on their own, figuring out how to safely climb a tree, or remembering to do the homework assignment. This message is especially harmful.*

“Children cannot believe in themselves if the most important people in their lives don't believe in them.”

Why would a parent over-parent? Some are afraid they won't be a good enough parent so they overdo it or try too hard. Some are meeting their own needs to be a perfect parent. *Some are trying to make up for their own deprived childhood. One couple I know had perfectly horrible childhoods and were determined from the time they married to be the best parents in the world.* They are always there for their children and have no life apart from the children. The youngest, age 10, still sleeps in the parent's bedroom.

Children can grow up to be scared adults who have never learned to master fears or uncommitted adults who have never learned how to make a decision. On the other hand, they may join the ranks of the “boomerang children,” who move straight back home. A recent survey found that fifty-five per cent of American men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, and fourteen per cent between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-four, live with their parents. Among the reasons cited are the high cost of housing, heavy competition for good jobs, and the burden of repaying college loans, but another factor may be sheer habit, even desire.

Marano and others believe that, while hovering parents say that their goal is to launch the child into the world successfully, the truth lies deeper, in some dark dependency, some transfer of the parent's identity to the child.

*As children explore their environment by themselves—making decisions, taking chances, coping with any attendant anxiety or frustration—their neurological equipment becomes increasingly sophisticated, Marano says. “Dendrites sprout. Synapses form.” If, on the other hand, children are protected from such trial-and-error learning, their nervous systems “literally shrink.” Such atrophy, Marano claims, may be undetectable in the early years, when over attentive parents are doing for the child what he should be doing on his own, but once he goes off to college the damage becomes obvious. Marano sees an epidemic of psychological breakdown on college campuses: “The middle of the night may find a SWAT team of counselors calming down a dorm wing after having crisis-managed an acute manic episode or yet another incident of self-mutilation.” Over parented students who avoid or survive college meltdowns are still impaired, Marano argues. *Having been taught that the world is full of dangers, they are risk-averse and pessimistic. (“It may be that robbing children of a positive sense of the future is the worst form of violence that parents can do to them,” she writes.)**

Helicopter Parenting

The motivation for helicopter parenting in part is an emotional dependency in the parents. Their children fulfil them in an unprecedented manner. Because they live in world where really they profess not to care about anyone except their kids this logic seems quite compelling. And that unfortunately is the reality for a lot of families that they are under siege in some sense. The other side of the coin is that helicopter parents struggle to relate well to adults of their own age. They put all their social frustrations into their kids. This is their one true and sincere relationship and nothing else matters – not even a consideration as to why they might think that.

Helicopter parents are often guilty parents. These are working mums who have to give their children away every morning to a stranger and pick them up after work. Most of the last generation were raised by stay at home mums so at least one parent was always present to take responsibility and to interact with the kids. Modern mums try to make up for this in those brief hours after work and at weekends – when the kids are showered with gifts and toys and unnecessary things they don't need.

For the children they grow up with the sense the world is a hazardous place where they would lack the skills to negotiate their own way. Their parents are there literally every step of the way. So they struggle to develop a sense of personal responsibility and often also accountability.

It isn't obvious to helicopter parents when their kids are young. Then they are wonderful parents – highly tactile – available – couldn't do enough for their own kids – interested in their education – driving them from football practise to home to wherever. It seems like it would be perfect.

But children are little people. They want to do it by themselves as soon as they are able. So the helicopter parents are parenting like that for themselves for their own agenda. They will tell you how hard life and how it's all for the kids etc. But there is a certain amount of self-deception in that. Kids are tough and they are survivors too. Plenty of kids grew up in orphanages and are more productive citizens the many over parented middle class children.

The world can be tough but the key skills for adulthood are that they learn to fight their own battles, that they develop a sense of personal responsibility.

Another worrying development in our modern culture is the loss of the generation gap. Children even small children are now “friends”. And this bizarre development is motivated by the blurring the divide between parent and child. There should be a gap of age and maturity. There certainly still is a gap of age. Children need to feel that is an evolution to their acceptance as an equal. They have to mature first. If they don't then they probably have needy parents.

However helicopter parents tend to over prioritize their kids so the kids get confused. Because their parents are being needy they lack credibility with their kids as disciplinarians. How can you lecture a child in one instance and then seek their emotional approval immediately thereafter? A child like any human being senses immediately that they have power. The helicopter parent's needs, craves their child's approval.

There was a sense in the past that the best place for children was around other children. Children would play in big groups, neighbours, siblings, extended family and so on. To put parents and

children together socially doesn't really work. The kids don't want to hang out with their parents. They want to hang out with other kids of their own age.

The options for urban, working parents are probably quite limited. They typically did not grow up where they live and work. There is no community spirit or sense of community.

It seems with parenting that the old adage less is more seems to apply. The obligation for parents is really to create a stable framework for their kids. Kids are bright and resilient. They will find their own way. But they have to be allowed to do that and they have to be allowed to be themselves – to make mistakes – to get it wrong – because that's what we all permit and allow in ourselves.

It would seem the challenge with parenting is to roll back that omnipresent parent as the child grows and allow for the emergence of an independent, self-reliant child. Children respond to their parents needs and if they are rewarded most often for being an emotional support and holding their parent's hand then they most likely will focus on doing that. This can give rise in later life to the regrettable scenario of the over parented adult child who struggles to take responsibility for their own life and doesn't feel accountable for their own actions.

This is when it becomes a big problem because the over parented individual can't function independently and on their own. They would tend to maintain an excessive relationship in terms of time and availability to their parents. They may struggle to form adult relationships of their own. In short being grown up is very problematic and difficult for them. They have not learned the skills to be an independent adult. They have not developed emotional independence.

Societally it tells us that we have created a lonely, unhappy society for parents to live in. We have lost our community spirit. And we have lost touch with our extended family.

So what can be done? Well to find balance in relatedness parents have to let go. And appreciate that kids want and need to chart an independent course for themselves and that this starts very early on and should be encouraged. The fundamental skill is letting children be. They don't need child psychologists and numerous toys and micro management. They need to explore and discover and find out for themselves. And they need to increase their autonomy and independence in a safe, appropriate way, appropriate to their age.

The irony of good parenting seems to be that it is not necessary for the parent to be there all the time and ultimately at all. Children can negotiate complex and difficult situations for them and should be encouraged to do so. A parent is really a leader and a coach not a friend to his kids. And they lead primarily by example. So if the parent gives bad example, pretty soon the child will be following that lead. And the tough side of leadership is that when you do your job right you are no longer needed. Then your children will say we can do it for ourselves. And they will also say we did ourselves. And they did. Children grow up all by themselves.

But there is nothing worse than boomerang kids and adult children who are convulsed by self-doubt and confusion. The sad fact with parenting is if it's done right then the parents probably won't see their adult children very often – because they will be independent, resourceful adults living their own lives. If it's done wrong then the parents can expect to see their adult children all

the time, as their children will lack the ability to function on their own. But to be fair to the home pigeon adult children – they are just giving their parents what they appear to want.

The Child Trap

Over-parented children typically face not just a heavy academic schedule but also a strenuous program of extracurricular activities.

We've all been there—that is, in the living room of friends who invited us to dinner without mentioning that this would include a full-evening performance by their four-year-old. He sings, he dances, he eats all the hors d'oeuvres. When you try to speak to his parents, he interrupts. Why should they talk to you, about things he's not interested in, when you could all be discussing how his hamster died? His parents seem to agree; they ask him to share his feelings about that event. You yawn. Who cares? Dinner is finally served, and the child is sent off to some unfortunate person in the kitchen. The house shakes with his screams. Dinner over, he returns, his sword point sharpened. His parents again ask him how he feels. It's ten o'clock. Is he tired? No! he says. You, on the other hand, find yourself exhausted, and you make for the door, swearing never to have kids or, if you already did, never to visit your grandchildren. You'll just send checks.

This used to be known as “spoiling.” Now it is called “over-parenting”—or “helicopter parenting” or “hothouse parenting” or “death-grip parenting.” The term has changed because the pattern has changed. It still includes spoiling—no rules, many toys—but two other, complicating factors have been added. One is anxiety. Will the child be permanently affected by the fate of the hamster? Did he touch the corpse, and get a germ? The other new element—at odds, it seems, with such solicitude—is achievement pressure. The heck with the child's feelings. He has a nursery-school interview tomorrow. Will he be accepted? If not, how will he ever get into a good college? Over-parenting is the subject of a number of recent books, and they all deplore it in the strongest possible terms.

Once the child goes to nursery school, the academic pressure begins. Gone are the finger paints. Even preschools, Marano tells us, have replaced playtime with reading- and math-readiness training. As the child progresses, the academic load becomes heavier, and his ability to carry it is now regularly measured by standardized tests, as mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Because the test results are rendered in numbers—and can thus be compared with the norm, the ideal, and the neighbor's kid—ambitious parents may, at this point, begin hiring tutors. According to Marano, there is now a four-billion-dollar tutoring industry in the United States, much of it serving elementary-school children. (Some of the coaches sent out by Princeton Review, a leading tutor-provider, charge close to four hundred dollars an hour.) If tutoring doesn't do the trick, enterprising parents can argue with the school that their children, because of special needs, should not be held to a time limit in taking standardized tests. In 2005, according to Slate, seven to nine per cent of students in Washington, D.C., were given extra time on their S.A.T.s. Their scores—which were sent out to colleges, with no notice of the dispensation, alongside the scores of students working against the clock—were, on average, well above those of others.

Overparented children typically face not just a heavy academic schedule but also a strenuous program of extracurricular activities—tennis lessons, Mandarin classes, ballet. After-school

activities are thought to impress college admissions officers. At the same time, they keep kids off the street. (In the words of one book, “You can’t smoke pot or lose your virginity at lacrosse practice.”) When summer comes, the child is often sent to a special-skills camp. Extracurricular activities and camps are areas where competition between parents, thought to be a major culprit in this whole business, is likely to surface. How do you explain to the other mother that while her child spent the summer examining mollusks at marine-biology camp, yours was at a regular old camp, stringing beads and eating s’mores?

Finally comes the Last Judgment: college applications. Admissions officers, it is said, don’t know what to make of application forms these days—many of them have so clearly been filled out by someone other than the applicant. If the parents don’t feel up to the job, they can turn to IvyWise, a service that, for a fee ranging from three thousand to forty thousand dollars, gives students a course in how to get into college. IvyWise’s offerings include “Application Boot Camp,” on how to complete the forms, and “Essay Writing Workshop,” on how to get the application essay into “optimal shape for submission.” Careful parents don’t have to wait for application time, however. IvyWise will also advise high-school freshmen and sophomores on which courses and extracurricular activities to choose, so that two or three years later, when the application process begins, they won’t make the awful discovery that they have been spending their time on classes and clubs that will not please admissions committees.

When the student goes off to college, overparenting need not stop. Many mothers and fathers, or their office assistants, edit their children’s term papers by e-mail. They also give them cell phones equipped with G.P.S. monitors, in order to track their movements. In Marano’s eyes, the cell phone, by allowing children to consult with their parents over any problem, any decision, any “flicker of experience,” has become the foremost technological adjunct of overparenting. Some parents, she adds, are not content with calling. They buy a second home in their child’s college town. According to a recent report on this trend in the Times, the child may protest, at the start. A student at Colorado College told the Times that when she found out that her parents, Maryland residents, were buying a four-bedroom house fifteen minutes from her school, she thought, “Are you kidding me? You’re following me across the country?” But then she came to like the arrangement: “I found myself not doing my laundry until my mom was in town.” I wonder if it was actually she who did the laundry.

Students provided with such benefits may study harder and, upon graduation, land a fancy job. *On the other hand, they may join the ranks of the “boomerang children,” who move straight back home.* A recent survey found that fifty-five per cent of American men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, and fourteen per cent between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-four, live with their parents. Among the reasons cited are the high cost of housing, heavy competition for good jobs, and the burden of repaying college loans, but another factor may be sheer habit, even desire. *Marano and others believe that, while hovering parents say that their goal is to launch the child into the world successfully, the truth lies deeper, in some dark dependency, some transfer of the parent’s identity to the child.*

One cause of the overparenting trend, Marano says, is the working mother. That seems paradoxical: if Mother is at the office, how can she hover over the child? Well, she can hover at night and on weekends. The rest of the time, she can hire someone else to do it—and secretly

install a “nanny cam” (one model is disguised as a smoke detector), to make sure it’s being done right. Marano believes, however, that the risk of overparenting is greater for a woman who quits her job in favor of full-time mothering while her children are young. Such a woman faces a huge loss of income—one source says a million dollars, on average, over the course of her career. It is no surprise that she might want child-rearing to be a project worthy of that sacrifice.

Marano thinks that the infant-stimulation craze was a scandal. She accepts the idea of brain plasticity, but she believes that the sculpting goes on for many years past infancy and that its primary arena should be self-stimulation, as the child ventures out into the world. While Mother was driving the kid nuts with the eight-hundredth iteration of “This Little Piggy,” she should have been letting him play on his own. Marano assembles her own arsenal of neurological research, guaranteed to scare the pants off any hovering parent. *As children explore their environment by themselves—making decisions, taking chances, coping with any attendant anxiety or frustration—their neurological equipment becomes increasingly sophisticated, Marano says. “Dendrites sprout. Synapses form.” If, on the other hand, children are protected from such trial-and-error learning, their nervous systems “literally shrink.”*

Such atrophy, Marano claims, may be undetectable in the early years, when over attentive parents are doing for the child what he should be doing on his own, but once he goes off to college the damage becomes obvious. Marano sees an epidemic of psychological breakdown on college campuses: “The middle of the night may find a SWAT team of counselors calming down a dorm wing after having crisis-managed an acute manic episode or yet another incident of self-mutilation.” Over parented students who avoid or survive college meltdowns are still impaired, Marano argues. *Having been taught that the world is full of dangers, they are risk-averse and pessimistic. (“It may be that robbing children of a positive sense of the future is the worst form of violence that parents can do to them,” she writes.)* Schooled in obedience to authority, they will be poor custodians of democracy. Finally—and, again, she stresses this—their robotic behavior will threaten “American leadership in the global marketplace.” That was the factor that frightened parents into hovering. And by their hovering they prevented their children from developing the very traits—courage, nimbleness, outside-the-box thinking—that are required by the new economic order.

He’s not the only one. Sooner or later, all critics of overparenting get to the problem of morals—the sheer selfishness of these parents and of the children they produce. Even the pragmatic Marano makes this point. Why, she asks, aren’t parents “manning the barricades,” demanding benefits for all children? Why do they care only about their own? And doesn’t it bother them that the extra help they can buy for their children—the college-admissions courses, the tutoring—is tilting the playing field? Hovering, as most of these books acknowledge, is largely the preserve of upper-middle-class parents, and these people want their children to prosper as they did, fairness be damned. The socioeconomics get special attention from Madeline Levine, whose 2006 book “The Price of Privilege” is now in paperback (Harper; \$13.95). Levine is a clinical psychologist, specializing in the treatment of adolescents, in California’s Marin County. In other words, she spends her days ministering to rich children, many with ambitious parents looming over them. She seems inured to the girls’ tales of giving blow jobs behind the gym, but she describes with real dismay her patients’ lack of any “conscience, generosity.”

When asked about reasons for going to college during the 1960s and early seventies, most students placed the highest value on “becoming an educated person” or “developing a philosophy of life.” A minority deemed “making a lot of money” as the main reason to attend college. Beginning in the 1990s, a majority of students say that “making a lot of money” has become the most important reason to go to college, outranking both the reasons above, as well as “becoming an authority in my field,” or “helping others in difficulty.”

In view of these writers’ reversion to the values of the sixties, they are strangely reluctant to cite the thinkers of that period. You could read most of these books without finding out that there was a progressive-school movement in the fifties and sixties, or that R. D. Laing ever talked about “inauthenticity,” or Abraham Maslow about higher-order needs.

Who’s Taking Care of Whom?

Paradoxically, people who never let go of their parents
are usually people who never had true parents in the first place.
A true parent is someone who realizes it is their job to take care of their children,
and that it is not the child’s job to take care of their parents!

True parents enjoy taking care of their kids,
and don’t resent that their kids need them.
And they want their kids to reach a truly independent adulthood
with a good chance at happiness.

If you had parents who never grew up themselves,
they probably insisted that you “behave” or “succeed” or “stay out of trouble”
just like all parents do.
But they thought you were supposed to do these things for them,
not for yourself.

It’s as if you were their parent,
and you were supposed to take care of them
as if they were needy children.

Parents who want a friend and a captive audience

Protective of the Parent

Protective of the parent is another sign of emotionally immature parenting. Immature parents parentify their children. Children become their emotional supports and sometimes custodians. It should be the other way around. Parents should emotionally support their children until they are adults and at no time should the children be emotionally supporting the adults – it should never arise and only does for emotionally immature parents.

Mother

We all have a mother. And it is to our mother’s that we are closest physically. We were closer to her than physically we can ever be close to someone in life. She bore us for nine months and it

was a certainty of relatedness that ends abruptly at birth. What impressions can we form of this connection – a connection that is prenatal, from conception to gestation and emergence?

Our mother is our first teacher of love. Is it hard to come by? Is it a struggle? Is it not to be trusted and to be expected?

For boys the mother schema is one of love. Mother is love and depending on our mother we might develop a schema concerning love that forms a developing template for relatedness to other women.

As children we need certain things we need an evolving environment of peace and stability but parents on only human so such an environment is not easily provided. It depends on so many things. So many things that may be beyond the control of our parents or in many cases parent, if only the mother is there to raise the child.

It is to our mother than in the greatest sense we lay the burden of the insecurities and uncertainties of life. Someone has to be responsible and she might be the only one to take that responsibility, accept it and bear it.

And so the initial dyad is formed between mother and child. She is the burden bearer of the new infant, the growing child. And she we hold accountable first and foremost. From her we learn our first lessons in love and nurture. This must assuredly be what it is like and what it ought to be like and what we can expect it will be like. But that is not necessarily so.

What she is like to us is not necessarily how other people will be. It is only a proxy. Not a definitive map of relatedness. That map we hold inside ourselves. And yet in the mother child dyad are the first lessons of how best to gain the love and nurture we as children require. We cannot survive without someone to look after us, and it will be a long time before we can fend for ourselves so for that time it comes down to our mother.

And if there is no mother then it must be the primary caregiver whoever that might be.

A bond is formed in this and the primary caregiving bond becomes the challenge, direction and impetus for our self-realization.

For mothers & sons it's about love.

Mother to sons is the first woman they love. And so as they develop through puberty they develop a repressed desire for their mother.

For mothers in relation to daughters it's about the world. It's about maternity. It's about raising children. How it was done? The whys and wherefores.

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

Adolescents who were rated as having an *insecure* (anxious-ambivalent) attachment with their mother as infants were twice as likely to develop anxiety disorders by late adolescence including social phobia.

Since their own life was pretty miserable, such a parent often lived for and through their children. That is, their quest for happiness and fulfilment revolved around the experiences of these children.

To please the parent, the child assumed the latter's aspirations, and their own needs became secondary. They learned that they must make sacrifices, repress their own desires, and behave passively toward authority. Whenever the child tried to contradict the parent by asserting their personality, the latter saw it as a sign of betrayal, and made the child feel guilty: "Is this what I deserve after all I have done for you?"

Father

For fathers and sons the schema is about the world. Father is a much more elusive, distant and uncertain dyad. He is never as omnipresent as mother. He seems to form a proxy for the world therefore and what lies beyond the realm of maternal care. If he is present he doubtless struggles to provide and if he is absent we may revile and dismiss him as unavailable to our needs.

He forms the guide to how we represent ourselves to the world. He is a sense of outreach and a proxy for what should be. In the sense that our maternal selves are what is, our paternal selves are what might be, what we would like to create, and provide, and instigate for others. The paternal side forms the agenda. It is what we stand for. How we would like to be known, how we would like people to think of us.

To impress father we must take on his struggle, become in effect the vindication of his life experience. His struggles strike us as the best of sense, the most noble and heroic of struggles.

It's about the world.

The nature of our relationship with the world – usually professionally – is performance related. We must compete. We must win. We must excel at something. But we do it for love of father. Because then father will approve and all will be well. Father's perceived disappointment in us forms the basis for present and future action. The struggle is on-going and must continue.

It is the essence of ourselves that we strive on an on-going basis to offer to others. It is how we project ourselves in an uncertain world. It is the risky and elusive aspect of ourselves that can only be confirmed by others. It is acting up, an aspiration. Our paternal side can never be guaranteed or established beyond doubt. It must ever be husbanded, protected, defended and if necessary fought for.

In this sense our maternal self is comforting, forgiving and accepting and yet biologically this is also the implicit imperative of the mother-child bond.

For daughter's father is about love. A daughter's first love is of course her father and to him she retains a repressed and unexpressed desire.

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

Sibling Rivalry

I think nothing can stop me from being myself – except me. Again I really don't think that how I feel has anything to do with the people around me – in any direct, obvious or connectable way and I should not bother trying to connect how I feel with other people.

Childhood

Children exist in a different emotional framework to adults. They perceive things differently emotionally. If they don't emotionally grow then they are going to experience significant difficulties as adults.

Young children develop schemas for two reasons to cope with the adults around them and because they are incapable of and lack the resources to process certain life events including loss and abuse. Children internalise that aspect of themselves, their emotional selves that they learn is unacceptable and unwelcome from their parents. This childhood internalisation gives rise to trapped feelings – or a sub-conscious of unresolved and unprocessed emotional experiences.

The child mind personifies painful emotional experience. It is usually gives it a name and parental behaviour which gives rise in children to insecurity or uncertainty are often labelled as being the bad parent and the good parent is the nurturing, stable parent. This personification stays with the young adult and the positive aspect of their schema is personified as being approved of by one parent, the negative aspect of their schema is personified as being approved of by the other parent.

Children internalise painful emotional experiences around their parents because they cannot bring their parents to account for these painful experiences. They are too young. They are too needy of their parents. They are not old enough to recriminate confidently or challenge their parents. So they internalise. Feelings get trapped and they stay with the individual as they grow older.

Children do not have the resources to process death or the experience of abuse. Children believe in the immortality of relationships. If these beliefs persist in them as adults they will remain uncomfortable the reality of uncertainty. To this extent they will secretly yearn for the lost innocence of their childhood, which really is a time when they false beliefs were not subjected to the challenge of reality. Childhood innocence is based on ignorance of the world.

Children really don't challenge their parents until they leave the family home for good. And even then it often for the good child would not happen. There would not be a challenge.

Parental relations can never be brought to account. There is no mechanism for such accountability. There is no possibility for redress – the solution is to mature out of childlike style of relatedness with parents, and to resolve one's schema in favour of the truth.

In fact the parental relationships contain all the necessary information for an individual to grow and to define themselves emotionally independently of their parents. The benchmark of being parented forms the basis and the guide for this effort. In identifying too strongly with one parent we inevitably become dismissive of the other. And that is a betrayal that does not sit easily. It

must ultimately be resolved in favour of the truth which is that we are the product of not one but two human beings.

Since in practise parental relationships tend often be lifelong or of very long duration immature, childish styles of relatedness can persist into adult life.

In practise a child's schema tends to have an obviously positive and negative aspect or phase to it. The positive phase is shown to the world and to all around and the negative phase is kept hidden and concealed from view.

In practise children normally identify strongly with one parent and this forms the positive identification of the schema and they identify negatively with the other parent. This forms a subconscious, negative for the other parent.

A conscious, positive identification with one parent and a subconscious but negative identification & desire for the other. That desire is repressed and hedged with guilt and uncertainty.

The childhood internalisations trap feelings which over time form the known or conscious aspect of the growing child. This would be side of the growing child they show to the world. This then becomes the positive aspect of the evolving child's schema. This becomes a style of execution and behaviour that the child grows very comfortable with. The growing child is rewarded for this behaviour and so they tend to repeat it. Enacted and implemented without worry or concern. This is the known self.

Childhood internalisations also trap feelings that form part of the child's negative schema. These are feelings are unprocessed, terrible and cannot be released or shown. There is no forum for this angst and so they remain repressed and buried. It is the negative aspect of our schema that contains the information concerning our emotional development and where it has been interrupted and prevented.

Depending on the nature and extent of the childhood schema, childish beliefs can be trapped and sustained well into adulthood or indefinitely. Such childish beliefs include a belief in immortality caused by a premature loss, a belief in one's own innocence caused by childhood abuse, a belief in one's own unconditionality. Such beliefs are common in children and not usual but do not have any place in the adult world and so adults with such childish beliefs usually struggle.

A developed schema gives rise to a distorted sense of self. The schema forces the individual to repress certain aspects of themselves that they have been told as children, or conditioned to believe are unacceptable. And yet these very constraints prevent the individual from being themselves.

This happened because the positive schema would have to give way to the negative schema which would overwhelm the conscious and then would be re-repressed.

My Child Mind

Virginal

No sexual agenda
Innocent
Fearful of God and highly religious
Imaginary Friends. Telepathy was my imaginary friend.
Solipsistic – the world was in my head.
Highly creative with a highly fantastic imagination
I believed in the bogey man or devil.
I personified everything in my conception.
Personified death as the devil.

Personality Traits

Keynotes

Our key personality traits are already obvious to the people around us but often we are unaware of them. Our keynotes are usually disrupted by our childhood environment. And so the schema evolves as a survival strategy. There is our schema and there is us. That is the internal dialogue. We are motivated by our keynotes – to be who we are. That is the “agenda” of who we are. We internalised our frustrations in that regard. Whatever advances the cause of being ourselves advances us. The big recriminations with self-occur when we deviate from our keynotes – who we are.

Reductionism/Thinker/Problem solver
Creative realist/Creating/Developing my ideas – **High levels of creative ideation**
To be creative doesn't require support or collective efforts or anything
Creative problem solving - emphasis on the practical
Placid/Peacemaker/Highly empathic
Negotiator/Game changer/Visionary
Pioneer/Fidelity/Consistency/Loyalty/Honor
Non-conformist/Rebel/Speculator

There is even the extent to which a "noble" self-concept will be upset, distressed and affected by things around them in a way that other types of self-concept will not be. They just not that sensitive. They don't notice. This clearly has a huge relevance to ideation and the potential for overwhelm.

The loving child clearly responds much better to the parents expectations and as they grow strives to fulfil those expectations. Is it any wonder that such a child would be the parent's favourite or could become that? Parents are after all only human. From an interactive perspective a loving child is much more tactile, affectionate and so on. It's much easier to dislike troublesome children who continually embarrass and annoy the parents. Siblings will join in this dislike also.

So I really not very complex in an emotive sense, I am placid and I am motivated to be placid. My parents and siblings lacked inner calm and I was motivated to address that.

My Unique Identification

Our parents are nothing to do with who we are or what we experienced. This is something we take on based on our unique internalisations. They are of course the first personifications but personification is the refuge of the child mind. So we are without personification.

Parents are the fundamental pillars of the schema but not of me, my identity, who I am. I could have been raised by nuns or priests. Once I was born I was a unique human being. I don't have a mother or father. I never did, the parental debate and dilemma are part of the schema. Not part of me. The schema is evolved by the child mind – so parents are an essential part of the schema because the child rightly regards them as essential relationships, non-negotiable and so on. But they are only essential for the child not the adult. For the adult all is negotiable. And he can choose his own way.

The schema is completely subjective because if I hadn't interacted or grown up around my parents I would never have the internalisations that I ended up having. If I hadn't met the people that affected me similarly those subjective internalisations could not have occurred.

Solipsism

We all have feelings. All our rationalisations are of how other people make us feel. Interacting with other people is trivial not major and there is no need to turn it into melodrama. Our emotional reactions should be proportionate to the context. In this we realise that everyone has suffered and everyone has feelings known only to them. So it's really a radically different perspective. We are solipsists emotionally. We think we are the only ones with feelings. The consequence of that is it very difficult to be empathic if even possible.

This is defined as the theory that only the self exists, or can be proved to exist. And also as extreme preoccupation with and indulgence of one's feelings, desires, etc.; egoistic self-absorption.

Developmental psychologists commonly believe that infants are solipsist, but that children eventually infer that others have experience much like theirs and learn to experience empathy. Children normally outgrow the solipsist stage and become empathetic by developing a working theory of mind by the age of 3 or 4. Failure to reach this stage of development is also known as mind blindness.

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

The enemy is me and the enemy is a friend.

Solipsism syndrome is a dissociative mental state. It is only incidentally related to philosophical solipsism. Solipsists assert that the lack of ability to prove the existence of other minds does not, in itself, cause the psychiatric condition of detachment from reality. The feeling of detachment from reality is unaffected by the answer to the question of whether the common-sense universe exists or not.

Emotional Solipsism in Adults

Schemas give rise to emotional solipsism – emotional isolation and this is a holdover state between being a child and becoming an adult. Many adults are not accustomed nor have they ever been to living by themselves or being comfortable with solitude. Children are vulnerable and very uncomfortable being alone for even short periods. They quickly reach out to end their sense of isolation. As adults we find we are alone. We are emotionally distinct. So an adult is only isolated if they choose to be. Isolation therefore is an adult choice.

Everyone has suffered and everyone has feelings known only to them. So it's really a radically different perspective. With schemas we are essentially solipsists emotionally. In terms of feelings we feel as if we are on our own. No one else has ever felt what we feel. Our feelings are unique and highly significant. Of course this is not reality.

The consequence of emotional solipsism is that it is very difficult to be empathic if even possible. Because we can never accurately assess how other people feel we don't know that they have feelings.

Beliefs

Beliefs that are perfectly acceptable as children are not at all acceptable in adults and constitute severe difficulties for any adult who continued to believe in them. There are some powerful childhood beliefs that can survive to adulthood and if they do they are very problematic.

The child mind is the frame of reference from which the schema is born. There are certain experiences children cannot process easily or at all.

The first would be a belief in one's unconditionality. Children are innocent and if their innocence is prematurely compromised by abuse they may retain the belief into adult life that they are still innocents. Children obviously have no sexual agenda and have no sexual awareness of their mother. Children can also believe in immortality and can sustain that belief if they are affected by loss.

Children are fearful of adult retribution and an emotionally trapped adult can retain a severe fear of punishment and retribution. Children are obedient and compliant to adults. They tend to be happy and want the people around them to be happy as well. They are sensitive to and upset by discord and conflict and move to resolve such issues if they can. They are upset by parental discord.

Children have a need for financial security. They have a need for security of their person. They need to be nurtured and esteemed by the people around them. Obviously they need to be loved and they have a need for attention and affection.

In terms of their consciousness – how they conceive of the world and themselves – they tend to rationalise things based on personification. They attach human characteristics to their feelings and interpret them in that. Again with an emotional trapped adult their ability to rationalise can be trapped in a personification mode. Children would tend to personify right and wrong as being attributes of certain people and not actions. They tend to believe in bad or the devil being a personality. And they personify things that happen to them that are bad.

In terms of imagination it is not usual for children to have imaginary friends, if that characteristic persists into adulthood it may be evidence of severe trapping of emotion and could lead to psychosis and mental disorder. Children are inclined to believe in their mental conversations with their personifications.

Children are much more solipsistic than adults. And they believe the world is part of their consciousness to a much greater degree. This solipsism should naturally diminish as the individual develops emotionally. Again if it doesn't it can give rise to mental ill-health and issues.

Childish Insistence

Loss of a loved one of course does seem very unfair and unjust but it is a connection I see now an adult can make much more readily than a child. So my dogmatic insistence is put into new context for me. I could never accept the unfairness of this event – “the injustices of the mortuary” as Kevin put it. But what does an immature, emotionally childish and pre-pubescent 12 year old know about life – not much really?

Innocence – Child Sexual Abuse

Children are innocent and if their innocence is prematurely compromised by abuse or some kind of sexual exploitation then they retain a childish belief in their own innocence into adulthood.

Immortality – Complicated Grief

Children believe in immortality. They believe that people live forever. They have no frame of reference for death and this only comes gradually and with time. When a child experiences loss or bereavement prematurely he or she can retain a belief in their own immortality.

Unconditionality

The fundamental philosophical flaw at the heart of our battles with reality is we believe ourselves either partly or completely to be unconditional. Of the difficulty there are two parts – either we believe ourselves to be unconditional which leads to identity instability or we know we are conditional but have an expectation of unconditionality based on a parent who made us feel that way? It is in effect a type of narcissism

The consequence of a personal belief in one's unconditionality is a struggle with emotional expression. Rather than emoting the individual represses their own feelings. They do this to relate, to survive around a parent who is indifferent to their feelings. Of course in practice feelings need to be expressed but the struggle internal with feelings once established – leads to bizarre and unpredictable outbursts, fits of rage and tantrums that cannot be easily or plausibly traced back to reality.

Notional unconditionality goes hand in hand with another regrettable feature of adult life - dismissiveness. Our believed unconditionality is our justification to dismiss. It can't be me. So it's the other party. We are all conditional. Everybody is. So there is no shame in that. Everyone is the same.

Believing ourselves to be unconditional means we think we are always right, and even if we are right sometimes, we are often wrong. And often the wrong times take over. We are not essentially good, or perfect or anything like that. So ultimately we withdraw more and more into ourselves and our own narcissism. We retreat from troublesome reality. Religiously we must accept that we can sin. In a more contemporary way we are wrong sometimes and right other times. We must focus on what's right.

At the heart of our notional unconditionality is our fundamental dogmatism – we are right. We are the injured party. We have been aggrieved and unjustly treated. This then inures us from compassion to the difficulties we create for others. If we only knew – we wouldn't do it.

Internalisation

Internalisations begin because parents are the world to a small child. There is no other authority on matters of love or worldly affairs. So the internalisations are highly believable and compelling. Only problem being that internalisations once formed are not lost but are retained.

False beliefs lead to internalisations and trapped feelings. Beliefs which are common in children do not evolve correctly into adult realisations including innocence, immortality and conditionality.

Internalisations are false beliefs usually formed in childhood that are not amenable to change or revision and interpret outcomes according to the false belief regardless of whether the outcome is favourable or unfavourable.

Inverted narcissists have an internalised belief that they are not loved. And that drives their social behaviour as a developing adult. They seek to relate always in order to convince themselves that they are approved of.

Overt narcissists also believe they are not loved but contrive a style of control to gain predictability in their environment as a developing adult.

Identification with Parent

As children we overtly identify with one parent and covertly identify with the other. As we progress through the developmental cycle we are known and accepted for our overt identification but we secretly prefer and wish to know the covert identification. Ultimately in being ourselves we choose the covert identification. Because being repressed it seems more compelling and appealing. We observe this identification from a safe distance.

Disruption of Child's Keynotes - Internalisation

Survival

Children must regard it as necessary for survival to put their parents emotionally before themselves. If they are not attentive to the needs of these caregivers – during the course of their development then their prospects for development are poor. Unfortunately this emotionally incorrect prioritisation remains with them all their lives no matter where they go, who they live with, if even their parents are dead, it makes no difference.

Internalisations are trapped feelings

Internalisations are not reality.

Big internalisations are highly probably in emotionally repressed environments and homes - because quite simply feelings cannot be expressed and addressed. And back to Sean's analogy the emotional pressure starts to build in such a scenario.

It's obvious to me that an internalisation is not reality because how I feel about something or someone is really so ephemeral and so dependent on an infinity of things that to bottle and lock that and keep it close to you is assassinating the truth really. Internalisations are trapped feelings. That's what they are. The level of entrapment or the depth of it is presumable based on the extremes of trauma - as would be the acting up behaviour on the flip side.

Leading to Representations

It's not possible to talk people out of their internalisations. That's why people say patients can't be talked out of their depressions. Psychology doesn't work.

I was completely and utterly wrong that the world was opposed to me. It was a fundamental, deeply held belief and so I blamed the world for my setbacks rather than learning from them. It's only today and yesterday that I actually finally and completely realised that I blamed the world for my setbacks. So it was never my fault which could hardly be the case and it was a loaded situation from the start which was never true. That is a sick philosophy on the world.

Internalisations make people highly subjective – even very intelligent people – it doesn't matter. These internalisations are nothing to do with associations – nothing to do with who you are with or where I work. It will never be right until the negative internalisations are discarded and then it's always right after that.

It seems to me that fundamental to the success of any venture in life is that it has to be driven by someone who is fundamentally positive. A negative person would never take on anything like that and would never be suitable. They wouldn't be able to stay the course with their negative internalisations.

So in my case I had to psych myself up to be positive – it was highly cyclical and ultimately and always the psyching up took so much out of me that I always opted for the safe, sure bet. I think I can do whatever I want – I can interact with whoever I want – and I have the positivity now to see things through and that's because root problem in my outlook on the world has been corrected.

Setbacks don't make people fail. It's the fact that they give up. That's when they fail.

Feelings

Positive Aspect/Conscious/Known Self/With One Parent

This is the aspect of self-pertaining to the positive identification with one parent. This the socially acceptable face of the individual and the one they are comfortable showing to the world and the people around them.

Negative Aspect/Sub-Conscious/Hidden Self/Other Parent

The negative of ourselves which is based on the dyad we have formed with the parent we do not identify with and of who we are openly dismissive leads us on in life. In effect we are in pursuit of ourselves through the medium of the negatively identified parent.

The negative dyad remains hidden at all times from view, known only to ourselves. These are the dyadic aspects of our experience which are trapped and repressed and we do not wish to show to anyone. We deem them bad and we expect to be rejected if they are known or worse.

This is the aspect of ourselves that we have deemed unacceptable in ourselves. And thus it has to be rigidly and rigorously repressed and dismissed. It is no good and that part of us we believe is no good.

We always would have expected to require forgiveness for our negative schema – but we also need to forgive ourselves for our positive schema because it is through this that we can hurt other people.

In some sense the cycle of idealisation and dismissal is one of guilt and atonement as we fight and struggle with our sense of badness and address it through renewed vigour in the positive aspects of our schema.

Success has nothing to do with being happy. Being yourself has everything to do with being happy. We cannot be truly happy until we are truly ourselves.

Undulation – The Natural Cycle of Feelings

It seems clear now that feelings cycle through positive and negative phases and these mood cycles are sufficiently extreme that one can slip from a positive to a negative mood quite easily without realising or with no obvious or particular trigger. In the negative phase of the cycle energy and time is expended trying to recover back to the positive phase.

Lewis talked about undulation being the natural state of man and that truths would only be sustained by faith lest Satan were to intrude and undermine such truth by which I think he meant that an insight obtained in the positive phase is then overturned and viewed with negativity in the negative phase. Lewis obviously had a very strong and unquestioned religious schema. So for him perhaps Satan was responsible for his bad moods?

If this is true then the most tranquil and best outcome would be a gentle shift from one phase into the next. This then would give rise to a high level of predictability and emotional stability in the individual.

I have no idea why my feelings or anyone's feelings cycle. It is one of those inevitable and unchangeable aspects of life which I must accept just like everyone else does. Of course because I struggled against the inevitability of my own feelings I was engaged in a titanic internal battle. But that is it - as ever I don't need to control my feelings - I need to accept them. Then balance is attained - but not by control - control does not result in balance.

I think I am confusing 2 different things - the cycle of my feelings which is natural, inescapable and healthy and good for me and control and dismissiveness which is my attempt to control my cycle and manipulate it for a variety of schematic reasons.

It is now clear to me that my feelings go through a natural cycle. My extremely negative phases are really just due to the fact that my mood cycles in an extreme way. This is perfectly naturally but can be distorted depending on one's level of emotional repression and trapped feelings. In the past phase shifts required a lot of rationalising to reverse the emotional conclusion reached which was invariably negative – obvious in extreme mood swings this could lead to a manic episode and psychosis.

The more dismissive a person is the more dismissive they are of their own feelings and hence everyone else's – this being the case the more extreme their phase shifts would be and the more extremely polarised their relatedness would be and the more pressure they would be exerting on the people around them. They would also tend to be much more highly controlling as a result.

Natural Phase Changes - Emotional Reversals

The significance of the schema is the way in which it affects the thought processes and the link between reason and emotion or feeling. The schema not only distorts this link and makes it difficult for individuals to work out how they feel or make emotive decisions but also it affects behaviour and of course relatedness. With schemas it is of course a question of degree also but all schemas entail some level of struggle.

This has to be the rationalising of the feelings away, that feelings don't need to be rejected or closed or dismissed. They need to be experienced and surrendered too. So suffering an emotional reversal is no more or less than asserting control over one's feelings and in so doing the feeling is trapped and suppressed.

When feelings are rationalised the significance of those feelings is usually lost. And the feelings become trapped not dismissed or resolved as is the hope.

Our schema forces us to experience extreme changes in our natural cycle of mood. These cycles are so extreme that no consistency of behaviour and relatedness is possible in the different phases - where we are inclined naturally to feel one thing and then the schema completely reverses that and presents us with effectively the opposite conclusion. This is also powerfully noticeable in a type of intellectual dyslexia where we intend to say one thing and write the opposite.

Our problem is really an intellectual disability which effectively prevents us from representing ourselves. So the schema thwarts effective intellectual representation by compromising our basic take on reality.

I sought intellectual freedom - mental freedom - but my schema prevented that. I wanted to express myself intellectually but my intellectual expression has been hijacked by my painful life experience and so was unavailable for any new intellectual challenges - so my current intellectual abilities were remedial or non-existent. In the case of emotional expression that was also reversed and so despite my desire to be in a relationship it was denied to me.

So I have solved some time my issues re emotional expression - love matters - but on matters of representation - that is now coming right.

I think one of the greatest challenges to you in the course of this therapy will be allowing yourself to be emotional and not trying to rationalize the feelings away. CR

In terms of love the schema was quite simple – repress my own feelings in order to relate.

In terms of phase changes – drama and passion was confused with love. And the absence of drama and passion was considered to be indifference or disinterest. But the truth was the opposite. No drama was love and compatibility and passion was schema mother love and unnecessary and stressful and ultimately anathema to me.

Unhealthy Process

The strategy has always been - by control I will maintain positivity. The new approach is that I don't need control to be positive - I just need to accept how I feel and go from there.

That's basically as much as I know about this unhealthy, unnatural process I developed or fell into to protect myself from emotional pain. In ceasing to be controlling and dismissive I allow myself to be myself. That's basically it. The cycle is on-going and forever.

When I changed slipped into a negative phase I always felt it was a failure on my part to control sufficiently. Now I know my feelings would change and cycle anyhow.

So in eschewing dismissiveness and control I can be myself always and consistently. That's it basically. Things such as addiction and bad habits - lack of exercise etc. are connected to this controlling mentality but not directly and probably not as strongly as I would have believed. Things such as disconnectedness, no social purpose or engagement and a lack of success etc. - are also connected but not so directly.

So for success as it was in my 20s a consistently presented outlook of positivity is required. Churchill calls this going from one crisis to the next with no loss of enthusiasm. Clearly my mood cycles from positive to negative and back again and for success positive and consistent on-going action is required despite this natural oscillation.

So that's it. Mystery solved. Successful people capitalise on their opportunities - miss no opportunities as they present themselves and are consistently positive in their approach and life philosophy.

Feelings Are Cyclical Not Linear

It is readily evident in my lifestyle – if we find that resistance to changing habits particularly bad ones and feel thwarted in our emotional development. Particularly if there is strong evidence of addiction or disillusionment with life – this is a sign of emotional stasis.

Particularly as negativity about life events begins to accumulate – this is particularly evident as we grow older, what we can assume in our youth will be resolved is harder to believe or sustain as we become middle aged and beyond. The much anticipated escape does not materialise. So time advances in a linear fashion in sequence but we remain emotionally trapped, unable to progress and develop emotionally. This is due to our trapped feelings

Of course our schema goes through a positive phase but it is ultimately negative. Trapped feelings cycle just as natural, healthy feelings do.

So when I felt bad – get depressed, get down, I was dismissing my own feelings and I associated that pressure to dismiss with certain people and places.

When I idealise someone else I am falling in love with my own reflection. I have no difficulty idealising myself and so my concept of love and passion is to idealise others. Then I dismiss all that contradicts that in me and struggle to maintain my idealisation.

This is evident in the feelings of lust because I don't put them in any realistic context so I tend more to dismiss the person who inspires them but really just continuing a cycle of idealisation and dismissal.

I assumed that other people felt the way I did. It forms the basis of my self-idealisation. I in no way questioned the validity or rightness or correctness of my own feelings. Without this conviction – then it is clear other people feel whatever way they feel – known only to themselves. There is no great connection to be made – soul mate to be found – all this shite.

Masturbation is a narcissist act of self-abuse - a bizarre expression of self-love. I was in love with his my reflection and guess what makes love to me as well. It totally fits.

The principal aspect of the cycle of idealisation is of course idealisation of me. I am just ordinary, a regular, typical guy. I am nothing special I suppose is the message. And I don't find other deluded people to tell me I am someone special.

Cycle of Ideation

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.

At a minimum such an unresolved divide in the self-concept will result in neurotic behaviour as the individual strives to unify their self-concept. Random and unexpected events will trigger

neurotic behaviour 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.

Childlike (parents who "parentify" their children. They tend to be needy and incompetent. Usually allow the other parent to abuse children.) using physical means as consequences arbitrarily. Rule by fear. Conditional love

Doublethink – Rational awareness/Emotional unawareness

To cope with trauma I instituted a type of internal double think or denial. Rationally I grasped what had happened. Emotionally I did not. An internal struggle commences between reality – the fact of my trauma and my known self-concept which has not integrated the event.

I simultaneously believed something to be true rationally whilst at the same time completely disbelieving it emotionally. So I can know I 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 me emotionally or had anything to do with them. I believed I was “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.

The battle is the killer

So it's in battling against my own feelings and struggling with them and trying to control them and suppress them – that's where the problem is. That's where the energy is going and that's always been the problem. So I don't do it anymore. Whatever I feel is right for now. The reason I lacked confidence is that I was always trying to ignore my own feelings. I was casted in grave doubt all the time. I mistrusted myself. It was terrible.

Intensity – Determined by Level of Repression

My feelings do become very intense and demanding when they are being dismissed or ignored. I should always accept my feelings. My emotional intensity was extremely high because there were a lot of unresolved feelings in my mind.

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.

*“The process of being brought up however well done - never fails to offend.” Lewis
Second, people with BPD experience very intense emotions, and this intensity makes it harder to accept them. People with BPD will often describe feeling that they are afraid their emotions will*

“overwhelm” or “destroy” them. As a result, many people with BPD feel very afraid of their emotions and are convinced that they cannot tolerate their feelings.

Anger

I had unexpressed anger. It often led to pathological expressions of anger, such as passive-aggressive behavior (getting back at people indirectly, without telling them why, rather than confronting them head-on) or a personality that seems perpetually cynical and hostile.

I was constantly putting others down, criticizing everything, and making cynical comments I hadn't learned how to constructively express my anger. Not surprisingly, I did not have many successful relationships.

Finally, you can calm down inside. This means not just controlling your outward behavior, but also controlling your internal responses, taking steps to lower your heart rate, calm yourself down, and let the feelings subside.

Some people really are more "hotheaded" than others are; they get angry more easily and more intensely than the average person does. There are also those who don't show their anger in loud spectacular ways but are chronically irritable and grumpy. *Easily angered people don't always curse and throw things; sometimes they withdraw socially, sulk, or get physically ill.*

People who are easily angered generally have what some psychologists call a low tolerance for frustration, meaning simply that they feel that they should not have to be subjected to frustration, inconvenience, or annoyance.

They can't take things in stride, and they're particularly infuriated if the situation seems somehow unjust: for example, being corrected for a minor mistake.

Research has also found that family background plays a role. Typically, people who are easily angered come from families that are disruptive, chaotic, and not skilled at emotional communications.

Psychologists now say that this is a dangerous myth. Some people use this theory as a license to hurt others. Research has found that "letting it rip" with anger actually escalates anger and aggression and does nothing to help you (or the person you're angry with) resolve the situation.

It's best to find out what it is that triggers your anger, and then to develop strategies to keep those triggers from tipping you over the edge.

Simply put, this means changing the way you think. *Angry people tend to curse, swear, or speak in highly colorful terms that reflect their inner thoughts. When you're angry, your thinking can get very exaggerated and overly dramatic.*

Try replacing these thoughts with more rational ones. For instance, instead of telling yourself, "oh, it's awful, it's terrible, everything's ruined," tell yourself, "it's frustrating, and it's understandable that I'm upset about it, but it's not the end of the world and getting angry is not going to fix it anyhow."

Be careful of words like "never" or "always" when talking about yourself or someone else.

Logic defeats anger, because anger, even when it's justified, can quickly become irrational. So use cold hard logic on yourself. Remind yourself that the world is "not out to get you," you're just experiencing some of the rough spots of daily life. Do this each time you feel anger getting the best of you, and it'll help you get a more balanced perspective.

Angry people tend to demand things: fairness, appreciation, agreement, willingness to do things their way. Everyone wants these things, and we are all hurt and disappointed when we don't get them, but angry people demand them, and when their demands aren't met, their disappointment becomes anger.

Angry people tend to jump to—and act on—conclusions, and some of those conclusions can be very inaccurate.

It's natural to get defensive when you're criticized, but don't fight back. Instead, listen to what's underlying the words: the message that this person might feel neglected and unloved. It may take a lot of patient questioning on your part, and it may require some breathing space, but don't let your anger—or a partner's—let a discussion spin out of control. Keeping your cool can keep the situation from becoming a disastrous one.

The underlying message of highly angry people is "things oughta go my way!" Angry people tend to feel that they are morally right, that any blocking or changing of their plans is an unbearable indignity and that they should NOT have to suffer this way. Maybe other people do, but not them!

It's true that angry people need to learn to become assertive (rather than aggressive), but most books and courses on developing assertiveness are aimed at people who don't feel enough anger.

Assertiveness

Responding with aggression you demand, threat. You become sarcastic and sometimes engage in physical violence. With aggression you stand up for yourself violating other's rights. When you are assertive you can stand up for yourself respecting other's right.

The last tip is to remain calm. If you are angry stop, let go of the anger and then approach the issue. And always make the different between interpretation and evaluation. Interpretation involves feelings. For example: He is saying that I am wrong, he wants to hurt me. Evaluation is neutral: He is saying that I am wrong.

Most of us are not used to expressing our feelings. We expect them to read our minds. If you expect them to read your mind you will live under other's assumptions. In addition, being assertive can also help boost self-esteem and earn others' respect.

Because it's based on mutual respect, assertiveness is an effective and diplomatic communication style. Being assertive shows that you respect yourself because you're willing to stand up for your interests and express your thoughts and feelings. It also demonstrates that you're cognizant of the rights of others and willing to work on resolving conflicts.

If your style is aggressive, you may come across as a bully who disregards the needs, feelings and opinions of others. You may appear self-righteous or superior. You may think that being aggressive gets you what you want. However, it comes at a high cost. Aggression undercuts trust and mutual respect. Others may come to resent you, leading them to avoid or oppose you.

If you communicate in a passive-aggressive manner, you may say "yes" when you want to say "no." You may be sarcastic or complain about others behind their backs. You may have developed a passive-aggressive style because you're unable to be direct about your needs and feelings. What are the drawbacks of this style? Over time passive-aggressive behavior damages relationships and undercuts mutual respect.

Use "I" statements. Using "I" statements lets others know what you're thinking without sounding accusatory. For instance, say, "I disagree," rather than, "You're wrong." Practice saying no. If you have a hard time turning down requests, try saying, "No, I can't do that now." Don't beat around the bush — be direct. If an explanation is appropriate, keep it brief. Rehearse what you want to say. Keep emotions in check.

As a communication style and strategy, assertiveness is distinguished from aggression and passivity. Passive communicators do not defend their own personal boundaries and thus allow aggressive people to harm or otherwise unduly influence them. Aggressive people do not respect

the personal boundaries of others and thus are liable to harm others while trying to influence them. They have control over their anger. It does not mean that they repress this feeling. It means that they control it for a moment and then talk about it later in a reasoning manner.

A popular technique advocated by assertiveness experts is the Broken record technique. Negative inquiry¹ consists of requesting further, more specific criticism. Negative assertion¹ however, is agreement with criticism without letting up demand. I statements can be used to voice one's feelings and wishes from a personal position without expressing a judgment about the other person or blaming one's feelings on them.

Generalization/Everyone feels the way I feel

Generalization is an effective ego defence 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.

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 co-dependent 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

Doubt

A united parental front leaves the developing child with no doubt about their guidance. Mother and father are united and one on what's best. Otherwise doubt and emotional uncertainty can develop quite readily. So a stronger identification with one parent gives rise to self-doubt in the developing child.

A stronger identification with one parent gives rise to a schema imbalance in that direction. If it's with the mother then the world is hazardous and if it's with the father then love and emotions are problematic.

Directionless

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

Unresolved Feelings

If feelings are unresolved then they cannot be met. It's too late for those feelings. What remains is an impression of the impact those feelings had upon us. It no longer constitutes an insight on reality in the same way as an old photograph no longer represents the people in the photograph. What stays with us is an impression of something we felt. In our schema we collect such impressions. They are usually things that resonant deeply with us. But behind such resonance is a deeply trapped and held impression of a feeling. It remains because we refuse to let go of the effect of that feeling upon us. There is usually a lot of pain associated with such emotional not letting go. We have resolved not to feel that. And so it becomes part of our schema of unresolved feelings.

Relatedness Style

Trauma

If trauma accentuates repression - which it does then narcissism is something we learn from our parents. So narcissism is apparently identification with one or other parent and an adoption of their relatedness style.

Narcissism is learned from parents and trauma is something that happens to people irrespective of their parenting. Trauma will determine the level of emotional repression.

In a simpler way I could say there is a mother and a father and there are sons and daughters. The sons adopt the father's style of relatedness – inverted narcissism and the daughters adopt the mother's style – which is overt narcissism. That would be the McGoverns.

Narcissistic Parenting

The overt narcissist parent will try to direct the feelings of the children whereas the inverted narcissist parent will strive to relate to the children. This set ups the narcissistic style of relatedness for the next generation and perpetuates a style of conditional relatedness.

To the extent that parents are narcissistic, they are controlling, blaming, self-absorbed, intolerant of others' views, unaware of their children's needs and of the effects of their behaviour on their children, and require that the children see them as the parents wish to be seen. They may also demand certain behaviour from their children because they see the children as extensions of themselves, and need the children to represent them in the world in ways that meet the parents' emotional needs.

These traits will lead the parent to be very intrusive in some ways, and entirely neglectful in others. The children are punished if they do not respond adequately to the parents' needs. This punishment may take a variety of forms, including physical abuse, angry outbursts, blame, attempts to instill guilt, emotional withdrawal, and criticism. Whatever form it takes, the purpose of the punishment is to enforce compliance with the parents' narcissistic needs.

Children raised by narcissistic parents come to believe that all other people are narcissistic to some extent. As a result, they orient themselves around the other person in their relationships, lose a clear sense of themselves, and cannot express themselves easily nor participate fully in their lives.

Both narcissism and co-narcissism are adaptations that children have made to cope with narcissistic parenting figures. To the best of my knowledge, every narcissistic and co-narcissistic person that I have encountered has had narcissistic parents, and the parents of their parents are reported to have been even more highly narcissistic.

Sons Identify with Father

We adopt the relatedness style of the parent of our gender. Sons adopt the relatedness style of their father and daughters adopt the relatedness style of their mother.

Daughters with the Mother

Self-Idealisation – Emergent Narcissist

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.

Self-Idealisation Leading to Romanticism

Adopted Style of Relatedness

Familial Style of Relatedness

My relatedness problems stemmed from the fact that I had only learned the skill set of how to relate to dysfunctional, conditional, immature adults and siblings. Outside of the family domain was hopelessly handicapped. So the brand of love I was brought up with was not right.

I had evolved social skills for a highly dysfunctional environment. They were not transferable and they offended and upset other adults. So the environment I emerged from was a bad proxy for what I could expect hence the difficulty and then in my distress and rejection I was thrown back on that dysfunctional environment so the depression persisted until the vicious cycle was broken.

Overt Narcissist

Inverted Narcissist

People Pleasing

*Do everything possible to heal your psychological wounds from childhood. **Because your people-pleasing patterns probably came into existence to help you reduce strong feelings of vulnerability with your parents**, to the degree that you can access those earlier hurt and scared parts of yourself, you can let them know that that part of your life exists now only as memory—that you're now grown up and have your own authority, and that your inner security no longer hinges on placating and "making nice" to others. If you can't seem to reach these early, recessive parts of yourself and resolve what, essentially, are their issues, I'd highly recommend you consider counseling with a therapist who specializes in inner child work (possibly using a modality such as EMDR, Lifespan Integration, or Internal Family Systems Therapy).*

Puberty/Sexuality

Mother/Venus Complex

The essence of my mentality with women was a mother complex. Where my mother is troubled and in distress emotionally and I am trying to fix her distress and resolve her upsets and then she will be happy and I can have a wonderful, close, relationship with her. That's the pathology of it. The problem is unavailable, unobtainable. I find the solution. She implements the solution – she is happy again and we can all be happy around her. With Liane it was the same thing. Can't live with her – off to America to find the answer. In the murky depths of Chicago I make this connection about child sexual abuse. This is Liane's problem. Can't wait to tell her – really believing that just by telling her she become this loving kind woman that I need her to be.

Obviously I was trying to connect with my own self-idealization based on an internalization of my relationship with my mother.

Lost Innocence of Libido

I was narcissistic about my sexual agenda. I didn't think that it smelled – but of course it always did. Plenty of really pretty girls were not remotely interested as I often discovered. That ties in the mother complex – because the mother is always interested, right? So the expectation of the mother forms the basis of the narcissistic womanizer.

What remains now is the libido without the innocence. What I miss is the innocence? But as teenager I can recall getting bad feedback in that area. I just glossed over my disappointments. When I was in my early 20s the older women wouldn't mind – it was cute and funny. But it isn't so funny when you are middle-aged – you are getting to be a dirty old man.

I became a sexual male without the loss of my emotional innocence. So that makes for a deadly combination. "Eyes like angels – his heart is cold."

Being Loved

Being loved gave me a confidence, particularly being loved by Karen and then later by Liane. My self-confidence, my ego just went up many notches as a result of those experiences.

Being Friends with Women

Regarding women and getting on with women which is allegorically role-played as sexual it really isn't. I was never able to be friends with women. I never had that approval. I find now that I can get on with women other than the woman I am with. It's a sign of emotional maturity. I was such a teenager that I looked at male-female relations as primarily sexual. I am just happy that I can get on with other women. This is a huge de-isolating developing. All those teenage guys can't be friends with girls including Mark the Gonzie boys, certainly the Mulcahy boys, Darren Elliot totally intimidated by women. This was a chronic problem for me in working with women and socially also.

Women require or expect an emotional response from men. When they can't have that they are disinterested in relating. Insecure teenage men can only respond in that way to someone they are involved with. It's implicit in the change in the way I relate to my sisters and mother moving it on to a more mature level then I begin to realize hang on I can get on with any woman. I get women. Any sensible reasonable woman will be friendly. So I was guilty of misinterpretation.

Maturity means having control and objectivity over one's libido.

Being Friends with Men

With the advent of sexuality being friends with the opposite sex becomes much more problematic. In the teenage phase the opposite sex is generally interpreted sexually and therefore relatedness is highly complicated.

The usual tendency is to idealise or dismiss the opposite sex and for the partner they exist in that cycle where they are periodically idealised and disapproved. Breaking the vicious cycle reveals the platonic nature of male female interactions. This is why pre-sexual children interact without any difficulty. So sexuality introduces a prohibited and complicated aspect to the interaction. But in maturity and individual becomes the master of their own libido not the slave. And then such relatedness is not difficult.

For the narcissist such society and interaction with the opposite sex is not really possible. They are too sexually idealised - so they then prefer the society of their own gender rather than couples society.

Fantasies

Libido – Sexual Fantasies – Begins as a Teenager

First of all everyone has a libido – male and female though doubtless men and women look at sex differently. Men would tend to infuse it with more notions of violence, aggression, domination and conquest. Men see it in more sexual terms. Women would see it more emotively. Women would see it more as capture, owing, belonging and so on. It is the case that everyone represses their libido. We all know it is largely unacceptable socially and the fact is that whereas marriage may be a wonderful institution and so on it does not cover me or anyone for the eventualities of imagination and curiosity.

What better excuse for emotional repression than a repression of sexual fantasy? Ordained by God is it not? Treating women like sisters or mothers is good advice, because it gives me an idea of how to behave with all women.

Sexual Fantasies – Thought crime & Immorality of Thought

Prior to their acceptance, sexual fantasies were seen as evil or sinful, and they were commonly seen as horrid thoughts planted into the minds of people by "agents of the devil." Even when psychologists were willing to accept and study fantasies, they showed little understanding and went so far as to diagnose sexual fantasies in females as a sign of hysteria. Prior to the early twentieth century, many experts viewed sexual fantasy (particularly in females) as abnormal. Many Christians believe that the Bible prohibits sexual fantasies about people other than one's spouse in Matthew 5:28.

"But I say this to you: if a man looks at a woman lustfully he has already committed adultery with her in his heart. If your right eye should cause you to sin tear it out and throw it away for it will do you less harm to lose one part of you than to have your whole body thrown into hell."

Matthew, 5, Verse 28

Others believe that St Paul includes fantasy when he condemns works of the flesh such as "immorality" or "uncleanness." Despite the Western World's relatively lax attitudes towards sexual fantasy, many people still feel shame and guilt about their fantasies. This may contribute to personal sexual dysfunction, and regularly leads to a decline in the quality of a couple's sex life, and an unhappy relationship.

That I have sinned through my own fault

In my thoughts and in my words

Thinking is not doing - emotional repression of forbidden feelings. Accepting those feelings ends the fascination. It's just an idle fantasy. No more and it does not matter.

The notion of thought crime was a prevalent one in the Catholic/Christian tradition. Yet another example of how unhealthy emotional repression is. The notion that one can sin in thought as well as deed is a disastrous error and is a basis for severe emotional repression. This gives strong religious and societal basis to schema development and maintenance.

Basically my aversion to my own sexual fantasies is basically a religious conviction. I regarded them as evil and sinful and satanic. This comes from my reading of Matthew's gospel – no doubt.

Everyone Fantasizes

Everyone fantasizes – particularly the emotionally repressed – it has to be worse for them – just like everyone has feelings – something I only recently realized – of course by inference it is obvious to me that everyone fantasizes also. Sexuality is deeply repressed and controlled in highly religious societies like Ireland. Quite simply an adult human is a sexual animal – therefore sexual ideation and fantasy is a part of that. So we are all the same in that way. We have nothing to be ashamed about. It is in repressing these feelings that they become demanding and difficult. We must accept the way we feel sexually.

Guilt and Jealousy

Guilt can be described as a self-imposed punishment for a moral infraction in which a person believes that they should have felt, thought, or acted differently in some situation. Guilt about sex is associated with guilt about sexual thoughts. While most people do not feel guilty or disgusted by their fantasies, a substantial minority do. In general, men and women are equally represented in samples of those who felt guilt about their fantasies. The most notable exception was found in a 1991 study that showed that women felt more guilt and disgust about their first sexual fantasies. In women, greater guilt about sex was associated with less frequent and less varied sexual fantasies, and in men, it was associated with less sexual arousal during fantasies. Women also reported more intense guilt than men; both sexes reported greater guilt if their arousal and orgasm depended on a fantasy.

Studies have also been carried out to examine the direct connection between guilt and sexual fantasy, as opposed to sex and guilt. One study found that in a sample of 160 conservative Christians, 16% of men and women reported guilt after sexual fantasies, 5% were unhappy with themselves, and 45% felt that their fantasies were "morally flawed or unacceptable." Studies that examined guilt about sexual fantasy by age have unclear results—Knoth et al. (1998) and Ellis and Symons (1990) found that younger people tended to feel less guilt about their fantasies, whereas Mosher and White (1980) found the opposite.

*A 2006 study examined guilt and jealousy in American heterosexual married couples. It associated guilt with an individual's fantasy ("How guilty do you feel when you fantasize about...") and jealousy with the partner's fantasy ("How jealous do you feel when your partner fantasizes about..."). Higher levels of guilt were found among women, couples in the 21–29 age range, shorter relationships and marriages, Republicans, and **Roman Catholics**; lower levels in men, couples in the 41–76 range, longer relationships, Democrats, and Jews. Higher levels of jealousy were found in women, couples in the 21–29 range, **Roman Catholics** and non-Jewish religious affiliations; lower levels were found in men, couples in the 41–76 range, and Jews and the non-religious.[*

PN/MB

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.

My Trauma – Cause of Extreme Repression

Trauma is experiential.

Abuse – Suspect Having Affected My Mother

Physical

Being pursued dreams

Places threat at the heart of the known self and impedes the natural development and evolution of the self-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

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.

Child sexual

Child abuse, including sexual abuse, especially chronic abuse starting at early ages, has been found to be related to the development of high levels of dissociative symptoms, which includes amnesia for abuse memories. The level of dissociation has been found to be related to reported overwhelming sexual and physical abuse. When severe sexual abuse (penetration, several perpetrators, lasting more than one year) had occurred, dissociative symptoms were even more prominent.

Child sexual abuse is a form of child abuse in which an adult or older adolescent abuses a child for sexual stimulation. Forms of CSA include asking or pressuring a child to engage in sexual activities (regardless of the outcome), indecent exposure of the genitals to a child, displaying pornography to a child, actual sexual contact against a child, or using a child to produce child pornography.

The effects of child sexual abuse include depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, propensity to re-victimization in adulthood, and physical injury to the child, among other problems. Sexual abuse by a family member is a form of incest, and can result in more serious and long-term psychological trauma, especially in the case of parental incest. Approximately 15% to 25% of women and 5% to 15% of men were sexually abused when they were children.

Dealing with Abuse

A lot of abused wives put up with and accept the abusive husband. Many women in that situation just internalised their mother's approach and dealt with it that way. It's not happening and it will be over soon. If a woman was the kind of women who had called the guards, or if it had been the era where wives stood up to abusive husbands –things would be different but it wasn't. Mother's encouraged daughters to love and accept abusive and violent fathers, because that is what they did.

Emotional

Complicated Grief/Bereavement

This placed fear of death at the heart of my known self-blocking the natural development and evolution of me. I clung to the notion that Brian was not actually dead even though I knew he had died. I was in a crisis of loss. It was an existential crisis. How will I survive without him? How will I find meaning again without that person?

I now believe the excessively traumatic nature of Brian's death was due to my vulnerability in terms of being only 12.

Complicated grief was my inability to integrate the loss into my life. I became in effect a bereaved personality. Because of my unresolved loss I had an on-going mental presentiment of my own demise. At times of acute stress this activates my primal taboo of death or survival. The "fight or flight" physiological response was triggered.

Deceased Becomes Idealised/Immortalised

Because Brian died suddenly and unexpected and the loss was not integrated then Brian was idealised and all kinds of attributes and abilities and personality traits were given to his memory. In much the same way as rock stars that die young are idealised by their followers, something that would not happen if they had lived.

Utopia: Paradise lost/Must be regained/Saving the world

I idealised the time before the loss and before I had to deal with or understand death became idealised and I pursued this as a return to utopia before my belief about immortality was shattered.

The world must change

I became insistent that I would not accept Brian's death and so I demanded that the world change instead.

Circular Loop of Ideation

In this sense I re-enacted the ritual of my feelings concerning Brian's death over and over again.

So the question became obvious – how would I cope with death when I hadn't ever actually dealt with it. It was a question which I posed to myself periodically but could never answer simply because there is no answer except acceptance. So the insistence drove the quest for answers but the answer is obvious – there is no answer – only acceptance. It is a circular logic. In seeking an answer to death an endless loop is created for there is no expiation. The quest to know why is the denial of the experience and so it never ends.

So it seems to me that depression is therefore an unresolvable loop of ideation. It can't resolve itself and so it goes round and round. It is a circular logic. The premise to be resolved is unresolvable. There is no answer and so it continually crashes the intellectual process. There is no freedom from the reality of death and only childhood innocence is unaware of this. A la *recherché du temps perdu*.

Trauma Responses

Responses To Loss/Grief

Children and Death

- *Feeling guilty- Children may believe that they are somehow responsible for the death.*
- *Physical pains and aches sometimes similar to those experienced by the deceased are common.*
- *Sad, repetitive play with toy ambulances, dolls, burying in sand, dark paintings.*
- *For older children, the theme of death may be seen in school essays, choice of songs.*
- *Aggressive destructive play.*
- *Nightmares, fear of the dark.*
- *Separation anxiety, possibly refusal to go to school.*
- *Bedwetting, thumb sucking, poor concentration.*
- *Death is seen as temporary and reversible*
- *May ask the same questions over and over again to make sure nothing has changed.*
- *Can be clingy, regress in their behaviour, demonstrate separation anxiety and experience sleeping difficulties.*
- *Tend to express their thoughts and feelings through their play.*
- *Understand that death is irreversible.*
- *Think you can escape it.*
- *Don't believe it could happen to them.*
- *Might show aggressive behaviour, have difficulty sleeping and fear being alone.*
- *Death shatters their view of immortality.*
- *Might engage in risk taking behaviours, in an attempt to test the limits of their immortality.*
- *Might not share their thoughts or feelings with other family members.*
- *Prefer to be with their peer group.*
- *One child believed her deceased mother could be restored with 'band-aids', and children often see death as curable or reversible, more as a separation.*
- *Children do not have the resources or experience to integrate loss into their world.*
- *Children may feel they are somehow responsible for the death.*
- *Children personify death and think of it as the "bogyman"/devil or a ghost or a skeleton.*
- *Brian was so key and the effect on my parents and family so profound that I didn't accept the finality of what had happened.*
- *A child who experiences death of a loved one loses her innocence quickly. She learns that life doesn't hold guarantees and that makes her feel she can't count on anything.*

Adolescence and Death

Adolescents may respond by delinquency.

Parents losing a child

- There is an increased risk of marital breakup following the death of a child.
- The death of a child is the most intense form of grief. This loss also bears a lifelong process: one does not get 'over' the loss but instead must assimilate and live with the death.

Physical and emotional effects

- Feelings of unreality, depersonalization, withdrawal, and an anesthetizing of affect. The person feels unable to come to terms with what just occurred
- Grief puts a great stress on the physical body as well as on the psyche, resulting in wear and tear beyond what is normal.

Avoidance Behaviour

- *You might fear bumping into someone you know and becoming overwhelmed with emotion. It's hard not to notice all the other happy couples or families.*
- *Avoid alcohol – to numb the pain and comfort eating.*
- *Many people avoid certain rooms in their house, favourite restaurants, visiting the loved one's grave or talking to others about death. You may fear losing control of your emotions and putting yourself in certain situations. Unfortunately the problem with avoidance is while it may ease your pain in the beginning, it will only make your grief worse in the long run.*
- *Avoidance behaviour can hold you hostage.*
- *Love is not mutually exclusive. Loving again does not mean you didn't love in the first place or that you have forgotten your loved one who died.*
- *It is generally advisable not to jump into another relationship too soon after the death of a loved one. The logic behind this advice is that you risk making a decision based on emotion rather than fact..*
- *Resist the urge to tell someone what to do. (On subject of giving advice!)*
- *Death is one of those events in life over which we have no control. Grief knows no timetable.*
- *The experience of grief is best described as following a wave like pattern. The wound analogy is one most find helpful.*

Complicated Grief

Complicated grief is grief where the story of the loss is in some ways difficult to tell. *Deaths such as suicides and other sudden, unexpected deaths can result in complicated grief due to the sudden shock. The surprise makes it difficult to integrate the "story" of the loss, so the person struggles with an initial task of simply believing that the loss has occurred. This is my psychic shock – my PTSD.*

Overall he concluded that I had problems with feelings. He planned to focus on that for 4 sessions. He confirmed difficulty knowing who I was since 1982. I suffered the loss of security of family environment and the loss of a stable identity. Such a feeling of security and well-being never recovered. I mentioned difficulty with commitment. He confirmed that. I mentioned difficulty relating to the world. He confirmed that also.

He told me that because I had unresolved grief from my first bereavement that probably made the second (Dad's death) worse and exacerbated the grief and problem of it. I would say that is not unlikely. Also he thought I should stay with the grief and change myself, not try to change the world. He said that "changing the world" sentiments were commonplace amongst the bereaved

and it was a smokescreen that distracted me the individual from my own feelings. If I set off on another tangent to change the world he told me the grief would stay with me.

*Not changing the world is huge because I was all set to embark on some other "great" project convinced that now I done so much work on myself I really would change the world and have the Midas touch. I see that the best thing is just to "stay with grief" as he said and see it through. **The world doesn't need to change. I do.***

- *The experience of grief feelings is wavelike. It comes over me again and again. It's not once off closure experience. Those waves keep coming and it's not clear when they are going to stop.*
- *I have to consciously engage with the process of my grief. Rather than just periodically paying attention to it I have to deliberately stay with it.*
- *Fear of the feelings seems to be the biggest feature of it. Each realization is preceded by fear – don't feel that – you'll regret it.*
- *Fear has to be pretty bad or otherwise it would already be released. So it's tough enough going.*
- *As Sean said stay with the loss - If I set off on another tangent to change the world he told me the grief would stay with me. He said in 2009 and that's exactly what happened – the loss has stayed with me. So I am making a very deliberate conscious decision to stay with my loss.*

Positives on Death & Dying - Rinpoche

Everybody is worried about dying, the Tibetan teacher Sogyal Rinpoche said. "But to die is extremely simple. You breathe out, and you don't breathe in."

He came to believe that much of what is wrong in Western society arises from the denial of death.

"I feel this denial of death actually complicates problems that exist in Western society," Rinpoche said in the interview. "It is why there is no long-term vision, not very much thought for the consequences of actions, little or no compassion."

"People see death as terrible, as tragic. Because they want to live, they see death as the enemy of life and therefore deny death, which then becomes even more fearful and monstrous."

Beneath this fear of death lies "the ultimate fear . . . the fear of looking into ourselves," he said.

But death can be a friend, he told the crowd at Interface. "Death holds the key to the meaning of life," which is why Trappist brothers regularly greet each other with the Latin phrase *memento mori*, "remember you are dying," Rinpoche said.

"Remembering . . . brings life into focus . . . It sorts out your priorities, so you do not live a trivial life . . . It helps you take care of the most important things in life first. Don't worry about dying; that will happen successfully whether you worry about it or not."

*"This dying forces you to look into yourself. **And in this, compassion is the only way. Love is the only way.**"*

Responses To Child Sexual Abuse

Historical Responses to CSA

It occurs to me as well that our ancestors must have had creative and elaborate explanations for pregnancies in families, unexpected pregnancies.

This idea of incubus and succubus would cover people in small community from the obvious allegation that somebody impregnated someone they shouldn't have. Instead it was this supernatural intervention which couldn't be blamed on anyone.

Parents were right. Children were wrong. And nobody listened to children. Children didn't have rights. Parents could kill their own children. Sexual abuse was minor in comparison to that. This to me is how events like Salem happened. Children's rights today are in their infancy. And in the 3rd world are probably non-existent so long way to go.

Memory Loss

Participants reporting any type of childhood abuse demonstrated elevated levels of dissociative symptoms that were significantly higher than those in subjects not reporting abuse. Higher dissociative symptoms were correlated with early age at onset of physical and sexual abuse and more frequent sexual abuse. A substantial proportion of participants with all types of abuse reported partial or complete amnesia for abuse memories. For physical and sexual abuse, early age at onset was correlated with greater levels of amnesia.

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

Posttraumatic stress disorder (also known as post-traumatic stress disorder or PTSD) is a severe anxiety disorder that can develop after exposure to any event that results in psychological trauma.

*By definition, acute stress disorder is the result of a traumatic event in which the person experiences or witnesses an event that causes the victim/witness to experience extreme, disturbing or unexpected fear, stress, (and sometimes pain) **and** that involves or threatens serious injury, perceived serious injury (usually to someone else), or death.*

Acute stress reaction is a variation of [Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder](#) (PTSD) *and is the mind's and body's response to feelings (both perceived and real) of intense helplessness. Symptoms may include anxiety, impaired judgment, confusion, detachment and depression.*

The symptoms show great variation but typically they include an **initial state of "daze"**, with some constriction of the field of consciousness and narrowing of attention, inability to comprehend stimuli, and disorientation. This state may be followed either by further withdrawal from the surrounding situation (to the extent of a **dissociative stupor**), or by **agitation and over-activity**. Autonomic signs of panic anxiety (**tachycardia, sweating, flushing**) are commonly present. The symptoms usually appear within minutes of the impact of the stressful stimulus or event, and disappear within 2–3 days (often within hours). Partial or complete amnesia for the episode may be present.

Common symptoms sufferers of acute stress disorder experience are: numbing; detachment; derealization; depersonalization or dissociative amnesia; continued re-experiencing of the event

by such ways as thoughts, dreams, and flashbacks; and avoidance of any stimulation that reminds them of the event. During this time, they must have symptoms of anxiety, and significant impairment in at least one essential area of functioning. Symptoms last for a minimum of 2 days, and a maximum of 4 weeks, and occur within 4 weeks of the event.

Dissociation & Depersonalisation

I became dissociated and depersonalised from my feelings of grief. I repressed and denied that I had these feelings. Outwardly I remained calm but internally I was devastated.

My Trapped Internalised Feelings

Internalisations

Trapped feelings concern self-dismissal of feelings. The feelings are being self-repressed. This is to do with the negative dyad with the parent with whom the child identifies negatively. This is also forms what is popularly referred to as the sub-conscious.

It is the avoidance of emotional pain as children that lead to the creation of our schemas. We have internalised feelings that hurt us very badly.

Feelings become trapped with the childhood internalisation of how our parents make us feel. Because emotional expression is often denied, restricted or forbidden to children the result is often that such feelings become internalised. In a long standing relationship like that with a parent such internalisations are fairly inevitable and are difficult to correct or change once established.

Trapped feelings are feelings that cannot be resolved and are instead internalised. This arises in relation to parent child relatedness where the relationship cannot be brought account and the child is forced to internalise their feelings concerning the abusive parent. It can also arise in environment where feelings are not openly shared and must again be internalised. And it can arise in regards to highly traumatic experiences such as abuse or loss where the traumatic event or events can be processed or expressed and so are internalised.

Our internalisations becomes an outlook – a philosophical outlook determined by interacting with parents and repressing aspects of that experience in an attempt to relate better to parents. This is because the parental relationship is non-negotiable for the developing child and parents cannot be taken to account so painful emotional experiences from parents are internalised.

We develop our internalisations for two reasons as a strategy to be loved and a means of obviating and dodging emotional pain.

Emotional pain cannot be obviated only accepted. Trapped feelings cause emotional pain. And releasing trapped feelings results in catharsis. We devise our schemas on reality to avoid emotional pain. In schema relatedness we seek to be liberated from our pain by styling ourselves as the liberator or saviour of another's pain. When we discover as we invariably do that we cannot liberate another person from their own pain we often become frustrated and dismissive. They just become too much for us and a conditional style of relatedness results. This can result in a vicious cycle of recrimination known these days as irreconcilable differences.

The strategy always is to maintain the repression of unresolved feelings. The strategy is in place to prevent the unresolved feelings being processed and particularly the emotional pain being experienced. So scenarios are always evaluated according to whether or not they will result in emotional pain, even relatively trivial scenarios.

The repression is an attempt to obviate future pain, so that pain will never be experienced. The individual is enacting a strategy to prevent feeling hurt.

Children have needs of their parents and it is not the needs that are met that constitute their schema of unresolved need but rather those needs that have not been met or have yet to be met. It is their disappointment therefore that forms the basis of their insistence. It is the things that should have happened that didn't. It is the things they should have gotten that they didn't get.

It is these unresolved childhood needs that form the basis then of the representations to the world as adults. The process of parenting childhood inevitably offends. It is this offense that constitutes the representations of the adult. And so the resolution is born and develops to address these deficiencies and yet they are the deficiencies of vulnerable children who grow to be adults with unresolved vulnerabilities.

Parents reward their children for those aspects of their children they approve of. And they criticise those aspects they disapprove of. We find therefore that our schema cannot be met because it is simply out of date. The emotional needs of children cannot be resolved in the adult world. It is too late. And so we get on and we construct our adult lives on the basis of addressing our perceived deficiencies.

We are influenced by our parents but we are not defined by them. We define ourselves. There may be much that is good about our parents, perhaps not, but it is never perfect. How could it be? If we feel wronged by them then we must forgive them to be free. Parents provide a roadmap to what the world might be like beyond the confines of the family home. We as children are realists and engage for survival we trade love and affection. If the deal goes bad then we might feel inclined to withhold such feelings from others.

Reality is not something we create. It is something we participate in. How we participate can depend on our schema but it doesn't have too. And schemas only ever distort reality they do not really inform us as to how reality is. To know reality we have to know ourselves and in so doing we discard our schema in favour of the truth.

To know ourselves we must understand our schema. We must accept and forgive the perceived wrongs that compel us to distort reality. We are travelling through life on the emotional dysfunction that is our schema. It is all those things we couldn't control that have hurt us, that we have resolved in adult life never to permit again. It is those unacceptable, unbearable aspects of life that caused us emotional pain.

Repression is an ego defence because by repression I protected my ego from my parents. When I showed my feelings to my parents they weren't interested, they couldn't handle them or offer me

any support so I learned to repress how I felt. It made me more popular especially with my Mum and I just carried on like that. The motivation to repress is self-protective. These feelings are dynamite bury them deep.

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

Circular Logic of Trapped Feelings

Depression is Internalization not Association

Dreams/Nightmares

A dream therapist stated the dreams concerned "health & wholeness" and that they are implications for an individual and the world.

Emotional Suppression

Many people with depression will report that they spend a lot of time and energy suppressing emotions. Have you ever had a really intense thought or feeling that you just didn't want to deal with? Did it feel like it would overwhelm you if you let it stay in your head? Did you try to just push it away or not think about it? This is called emotional suppression, and lots of research shows that not only is it ineffective in eliminating thoughts and feelings, but it may even worsen the situation.

How Feelings Get Trapped

We dismiss our own feelings as children because they are too painful, will not find acceptance in our environment, maybe disapproved of by our parents. As a result they become trapped and are in effect unresolved feelings.

With trapped feelings however there is no emotional growth. It is in effect interrupted. It becomes depressing because how we feel starts to deviate more and more from reality.

When we dismiss our own feelings we do not allow for our emotional growth. So therefore we don't know how we feel about the interaction and as such it stays with us. Dismissing leads to the entrapment of our feelings. The feelings are dismissed from the conscious mind - and the individual just keeps dismissing. And on they go. And they trap more feelings.

Dismissiveness really offends other adults. It's off putting. It in effect terminates abruptly and possibility of relatedness. And others will do nothing for us if they are dismissed. It doesn't matter if we come crawling back – a pattern of conditional relatedness is established. There can't be any healing with dismissiveness.

We don't have to conquer other people's indifference – we have to conquer our own.

Emotional Expression Forbidden/Very Restricted

Children need to be able to express themselves emotionally. When this is denied in their environment or denied to them by adults they internalise and repress how they feel. When opportunities for emotional expression are limited or very restricted then an internal struggle and conflict starts to build up in the child. This then severely complicates the task of emotional maturation.

Children may also deny emotional expression to themselves in the conviction that this will make them more appealing to the adults around them.

If both parents discourage emotional expression in the child or are disinterested in the child's emotional responses then a high level of internalisation is probably inevitable for the child. This encourages the child therefore to repress their own feelings around their parents. Repression gives rise therefore to trapped feelings.

Children develop a schema about their parents – a form of idealisation – wherein they believe their parents really love them. But the truth might be very different, and parents can have children and easily struggle to raise them and care for them. The great disillusionment of the schema is in essence my parents don't care about me. And that's quite probably true – they don't care. Parents have children but they care themselves more than their children – which is quite natural.

Even if the truth of our parents loving us is different from reality it is not luxury we as children can indulge. Vulnerability and neediness only decrease as the child grows older. So children are adept survivors also and staying in with their primary caregivers is a vital part of that survival strategy.

Suppressing Emotions - A Definition

What exactly does “suppressing emotions” mean? Essentially, emotional suppression is a type of emotion regulation strategy — these are strategies that we use to try to make uncomfortable thoughts and feelings more manageable. There are many different emotion regulation strategies, and some are more helpful than others. For example, some people turn to alcohol or drugs to get rid of painful emotions. While this may work as an emotion regulation strategy in the short term, it definitely has bad long-term consequences.

Suppressing emotions, or just trying to push emotional thoughts and feelings out of your mind, is an emotion regulation strategy many people use. And, when used from time to time, it doesn't have dramatic negative consequences like drug or alcohol use. But, there is reason to believe that if you try to push emotions away all the time, emotional suppression could lead to problems.

Consequences of Suppressing Emotions

So what does this research mean for you? Well, it means that if you frequently try to push away thoughts and feelings, you may be making more trouble for yourself. In fact, it is possible that this is setting up a vicious cycle: You have a painful emotion. You try to push it away. This leads to more painful emotions, which you try to push away, and so on.

Some researchers believe emotional suppression may, in part, be a reason that people with psychological conditions such as BPD, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) struggle with so many painful thoughts and emotions.

Heart Walls

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 behaviour ceases. There is no necessity to reinvent the wheel yet again.

Heart Wall

The Heart-Wall is made of trapped emotions, but the subconscious mind no longer categorizes them as such. These emotions are now part of a wall and are inaccessible until you ask if there is a Heart-Wall. You have to get the mind body to admit that there is a wall, before you can get to the trapped emotions that are creating it. Once you do that, the trapped emotions once again become recognizable to the subconscious mind as trapped emotions, and therefore, are vulnerable to being released. As you release them, one by one, the wall will come down.

This is a reference to how people accumulate repressed emotions until they gain almost a critical mass – they become solid almost. The emotions have become bundled together. They end up forming a narrative and this story is then periodically told and depending on the complexity of the story – the level or severity of the emotional repression – this determines which of the stable states the individual finds themselves in. The other aspect of this of critical importance is that this story is the individual's personal narrative. It is only a bundle or repressed emotions but buried beneath that is the real self.

The Heart-Wall is made of trapped emotions, but the subconscious mind no longer categorizes them as such. These emotions are now part of a wall and are inaccessible until you ask if there is a Heart-Wall. You have to get the mind body to admit that there is a wall, before you can get to the trapped emotions that are creating it. Once you do that, the trapped emotions once again become recognizable to the subconscious mind as trapped emotions, and therefore, are vulnerable to being released. As you release them, one by one, the wall will come down.

How things get accumulated

The pillars of our schema are of course our parents but as we progress through life we trap more and more experiences based on our schematic outlook. It tends to be the things that go wrong that remained trapped and unprocessed. Unprocessed feelings about mother or father can lead to

generalised angst and anxiety about cultural and social issues very far at a remove from the individual.

It is in this way that we experience feelings that due to entrapment have become very generalised and non-specific. Of course our feelings pertain to us as individuals so the closer we relate them back to our formative experiences and relationships the better.

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. 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.

Over time a highly repressed individual will build up a whole infrastructure of repressed feelings. They have to be deconstructed often piece by piece. It's certainly not easy.

Time does not heal emotional wounds

Time may heal physical wounds but emotional wounds do not heal automatically, in fact they tend to fester.

“The attempt is based on the belief that reality never presents us with an absolutely unavoidable either-or, that, granted skill and patience and above all, enough time some way of embracing both alternatives will be found; that mere development or adjustment or refinement will somehow turn evil into good without our being called on for a final and total rejection of anything we would like to retain. This belief I take to be a disastrous error.”

“I do not think that all those who choose the wrong road perish; but their rescue consists of being put back on the right road. A wrong sum can be put right, but only by going back till you

*find the error and working it afresh from that point, never by simply going on. Evil can be undone, but it cannot develop into Good. **Time does not heal it. The spell must be unwound bit by bit.** It is still “either-or”. If we insist on keeping Hell (or earth) we shall not see Heaven. If we accept heaven we shall not be able to retain even the smallest and most intimate souvenirs of Hell.”*

Being A Narcissistic Adult

Definition

The narcissist suffers from excessive love or admiration of oneself and is characterized by self-preoccupation, lack of empathy, and unconscious deficits in self-esteem.

Narcissism, a psychological state rooted in extremely low self-esteem, is a common syndrome among the parents of psychotherapy patients. Narcissistic people are very fearful of not being well regarded by others, and they therefore attempt to control others' behaviour and viewpoints in order to protect their self-esteem.

The underlying dynamic of narcissism is a deep, usually unconscious, sense of oneself as dangerously inadequate and vulnerable to blame and rejection. The common use of the term refers to some of the ways people defend themselves against this narcissistic dynamic: a concern with one's own physical and social image, a preoccupation with one's own thoughts and feelings, and a sense of grandiosity.

Narcissists have an evolved concept of themselves based on childhood experience. This is the self-concept they seek to validate and implement in the course of their adult lives. In the pursuit of this validation they fundamentally lack authenticity and self-awareness. Their frustrations therefore as adults hinge on the extent to which they can validate their self-concept. Their representations are congruent with their evolved model of themselves.

Only in emotional maturity can they relinquish their self-concept and truly be themselves. In this state they no longer conceive of themselves and rather are themselves without interpretation or self-justification. They no longer find themselves lost in translation. Only then do they find themselves free of their own emotional bias.

Narcissistic behaviour is concerned with strategies to obviate rejection and fear. It is contingent on a high level of emotional repression and entails the fact that a narcissist feels pain in relatedness in a generalised and non-specific way. There is dissociation therefore from the feelings of hurt and rejection. The narcissist does not appreciate that such feelings are internalised and believes them to be caused by association.

Narcissistic strategies to alleviate their pain and fear of rejection include dismissing their own needs to relate, creating safe control zones wherein they are psychologically omniscient and an extreme level of sensitivity and inclination to take things personally.

A narcissist seeks to create an emotional space for themselves where they feel safe and where they can be in control. A narcissist will put their own feelings before relating which makes the

narcissist highly controlling. Both types of narcissism are self-idealising and self-dismissing. Outside the boundaries of narcissistic relatedness all is dismissed. Both types of narcissist are highly repressed emotionally.

Inverted narcissists must assert their feelings whereas overt narcissists seek to direct the feelings of others.

Narcissists like to interpret and direct the feelings of others. They enjoy conversations about other people's feelings. The comfort zone for a narcissist consists of the people they control and the comfort zone for an inverted narcissist is the people they relate to. Outside of this zone the narcissist is fearful and unsure.

The narcissistic hypothesis is quite simple that they are not loved and they must engage in complex social interplay to reassure themselves that they are lovable. However they must love themselves first. So the narcissist suffers from deficits of self-esteem and self-love and these deficits are unconscious. In extreme narcissism which can result in depression and other serious manifestations which is caused by trauma as a child the

The thing about narcissism is that people never achieve or find anything of meaning by being narcissistic because they are actually looking for themselves. They already have themselves. However a narcissist is never prepared to take responsibility for how they feel, they always blame someone else. It's the essence of narcissism. This is because the narcissist is fundamentally incapable of addressing their own needs and has contrived an adult persona that incorporates their deep-seated insecurities and esteem issues.

What everyone really wants is to address and actualize their own needs. Narcissism prevents this from happening and invariably leads to frustration and disillusionment. This is the narcissist trap. Much energy, time and money is expended but the result is not achieved. The result is not achieved because the narcissist fundamentally sabotages themselves by externalizing the satisfaction of their needs and placing those needs outside of themselves.

In the narcissist passion they enact a dyad or role play between themselves and their conception of their needs. It is an externalization of their inner conflict. Only by resolving inner conflict can the narcissist develop a better sense of self and then address and actualize their needs.

The extent to which a narcissist is disassociated from their own needs is contingent on their experience and their internalizations. Extreme dissociation can lead to depression.

Fixated thinking

What's unhealthy is fixated thinking and that results from trapped feelings for a certain feeling or idea. When the feeling is trapped and not accepted and released then the thinking gets stuck or fixated on that topic. How many times have I been around the issue of an internet business?

In the end I don't care so much about the business as I would like to be cool and free from the pressure of the fixated thinking. The only way to do that is accept the feeling that I am a bum for not getting a business together aged 43. And how is it possible that I lack the confidence to even consider it let alone implement it and find myself naturally inclined to knock someone else's

optimism. What's that all about? I must be a negatron, right? Am I a coward or do I just lack self-belief or both?

Is this the negative philosophical outlook I have identified in action? Or am I just being sensible and identifying obvious difficulties and things Urns hasn't thought of? I think being sensible – which is always a good thing. So self-idealisation is not a business – or not a viable one.

Overt Narcissist – Controlling – My Mother

- *Self-righteous*
- *Emotionally withdraws from people he/she can't control*
- *Adopts a tiered approach to relatedness with an inner and outer circle*
- *Establishes an area of control with himself at the centre of it.*
- *Provides a forum in which he is comfortable and in control.*
- *Rationalises his feelings with a view to control*
- *Masks his insecurities by avoidance strategies.*

Overt narcissists have a childhood terror of humiliation and shame and their social strategies as adults are to obviate humiliation or embarrassment. Overt narcissists are very shy and unsure outside of their own domain.

Overt narcissists tend to identify with a demeaning parent – a parent who would tend to demean and criticise their children if they disapprove of them. They are encouraged from childhood to repress their own feelings, knowing that their demeaning parent will be dismissive and tend to ridicule their feelings.

Overt narcissists must maintain control over their environment by a complex web of social negotiations and agreements. An overt narcissist tends to form a principal dyad.

Overt narcissists are very shy and they won't risk coming out of their comfort zone so they tend to be quite isolated. They have had a humiliating parent so they hate being made fun of and are very sensitive to any kind of criticism.

Overt narcissists admire the social skills and comfort of the inverted narcissist. Since the inverted narcissist doesn't attempt to control other people their ability to interact with people they don't know is far superior.

Overt narcissists are dismissive of those outside the realm of their control or those they deem uncontrollable or unmanageable and not amenable to their will. Overt narcissists will contrive to place themselves at the centre of their world and will covertly dismiss or ridicule people they disapprove of. Overt narcissists do not reveal their feelings to others.

For the overt narcissist they withdraw from the people they interact with that they can't control. Overt narcissists do not appear needy in relatedness because they are already in control.

It is shattering to the inverted narcissist to be disapproved of and it is shattering to the overt narcissist to be dismissed. The inverted narcissist will never bear disapproval and the overt narcissist will never allow themselves to be dismissed.

An overt narcissist struggles around people they can't control if that fails they ignore and shut them out. They aim to create a circle of control around them and maintain that circle.

Overt narcissists will ignore people they disapprove of. They never openly express their disapproval it much more subtle and they find a third party to discuss the troublesome relationship with. They never want to reveal their own feelings to the other party in the relationship to they much prefer to work through other more circuitous means to get what they want.

The overt narcissist needs to be in control and established a sub-culture of control around them.

Control - Regulation Strategies

Avatar

Cognition

Cognitive therapy seeks to help the client overcome difficulties by identifying and changing dysfunctional thinking, behavior, and emotional responses. This involves helping clients developing skills for modifying beliefs, identifying distorted thinking, relating to others in different ways, and changing behaviors. Treatment is based on collaboration between client and therapist and on testing beliefs. Therapy may consist of testing the assumptions which one makes and identifying how certain of one's usually-unquestioned thoughts are distorted, unrealistic and unhelpful. Once those thoughts have been challenged, one's feelings about the subject matter of those thoughts are easier subject to change. Beck initially focused on [depression](#) and developed a list of "errors" in thinking that he proposed could maintain depression, including [arbitrary inference](#), [selective abstraction](#), [over-generalization](#), and magnification (of negatives) and minimization (of positives).

A simple example may illustrate the principle of how CT works: Having made a mistake at work, a person may believe, "I'm useless and can't do anything right at work." Strongly believing this, in turn, tends to worsen his mood. The problem may be worsened further if the individual reacts by avoiding activities and then behaviorally confirming his negative belief to himself. As a result, an adaptive response and further constructive consequence becomes unlikely, which reinforces the original belief of being "useless." In therapy, the latter example could be identified as a self-fulfilling prophecy or "problem cycle," and the efforts of the therapist and client would be directed at working together to change it. This is done by addressing the way the client thinks and behaves in response to similar situations and by developing more flexible ways to think and respond, including reducing the avoidance of activities. If, as a result, the client escapes the negative thought patterns and dysfunctional behaviors, the feelings of depression may, over time, be relieved. The client may then become more active, succeed and respond more adaptively more often, and further reduce or cope with his negative feelings.

Beck came to the conclusion that the way in which his clients perceived and interpreted and attributed meaning—a process known scientifically as [cognition](#)—in their daily lives was a key to therapy.

Control is an illusion

We must distinguish between being in control rationally and knowing oneself. They are not the same. We feel judged as adults when we demonstrate a lack of rational control. Emotional expression is largely forbidden in adult life and considered a sign of weakness and we all buy into that. This leads to the dichotomy between our adult selves and our feelings. The more we resolve this dichotomy the happier we become.

Control is an illusion in every sense. There is only consequence resultant from action. We can all and do appreciate the predicates of adult life but it doesn't mean they sit well with us. The evidence of history is that the less control people are subjugated to the happier they are. Collectively we favour democracy over dictatorship.

Life is not an evaluation. Experience is not the boss of us. The judge of how good or bad or indifferent we were. Life doesn't judge. We judge ourselves. Metrics cannot be not should be applied to people. Life is journey. That's what it is. In sequent toil all forwards do contend. Life is not a succession of hoops to jump through. Sooner or later we will trip and fall. Our worst enemy is always ourselves.

Control - An adult response to fear

Unresolved fears led to the imperative of control. We seek to obviate fear by anticipation of unfavourable life events. Logical as it may seem it is unforgiving for the people around us. If we fear rejection we might just reject first. If we fear dying of a serious illness we might obsess about our health. If our childhood lacked security for us we will be determined to ensure that we suffer or provide no such insecurity as an adult.

Why We Fear Letting Go

We fear letting go because we don't want to feel the pain of what we have refused to accept. To be free of it we have to let go of the hurt. But we know if we let go we will change. And it is what we might become that scares us. But in truth we will just become more ourselves. We have in effect postulated within us a separation between ourselves and our own feelings. Those impossible unacceptable feelings are evil, bad, wicked, sinful, destructive and utterly alien to us. And yet these are our feelings. We have in effect demonised an aspect of ourselves – of our emotional selves.

It is a coping strategy with very difficult and painful experience. Our emotional refusal has become a wicked thing. And so we debate internally, endlessly with this aspect of ourselves that we utterly repudiate.

The feelings are bad because they are so destructive of the schema engineered calm. One has achieved certain stability in life – why permit such powerful forces to undermine that stability? Does the individual own their life to their conception of reality? Without it they are naked and exposed. Perhaps it entails being emotional in a way that was never permitted – or that individual deemed unacceptable.

It seems like there is a lot to lose and nothing to gain. Better the devil we know. Than the one we might become.

However, because of the unresolved feelings and resultant schema the cycle cannot complete and is attenuated. The individual imposes rational closure on their feelings and rationalises the outcome in a way that absolves them of personal responsibility and then they strive again. But they are striving to complete the cycle of their own feelings.

However the cycle can only complete through personal reflection and catharsis - doing things will not complete the cycle, so all schema driven efforts ultimately end in failure. They do not deliver the desired result which is peace.

We Try To Control How We Feel

At the heart of our fear of letting go is our desire to control how we feel. This is an aspect of experience where we developed control as children to interact with adults who were unsympathetic to how we felt. To be accepted by our parents, by our teachers, by other adults we had to demonstrate self-control. The bad child in us was not rewarded and only ever reprimanded. If ours was an environment where feelings were not shared or shared poorly then control is a likely result.

However now we are adults. We don't have to control ourselves in ways that our parents might approve of. We are free to express whatever emotions we care to express and to accept the responsibility of that expression. But therein lies the risk because we have internalised someone else's normality and their conception of what is acceptable.

The internalisation forms part of the schema. It does not sit well, because in point of fact it is alien. It is a learned behavioural strategy. We yearn for the freedom to express ourselves but we don't allow it.

Inverted Co-Narcissist - Controlled - Me

- *Self-righteous*
- *Dismisses people he cannot relate too*
- *Establishes a comfort zone or circle of people he can relate too.*
- *Represses his own feelings in order to relate*
- *Is happy to be directed by the overt narcissist most of the time*
- *Rationalises his feelings in order to relate*

An inverted narcissist puts aside their own feelings in order to relate and would be of the view that relating is more important than their own feelings and that relating comes first.

Inverted narcissists in their periodic bouts of expressiveness will express all their feelings and disapprovals.

Inverted narcissists admire overt narcissists for their calm and their tight control and management of their environment. The inverted narcissist has no control over their environment and has to perform, people please and ingratiate in order to feel they are liked and loved.

Inverted narcissists often appear needy in relatedness because they are generally unsure if they are approved of or loved. An inverted narcissist harbours a deep-seated childhood fear that they are not loved and that they would never be accepted for who they are.

Inverted narcissists will be verbally expressive of their feelings. Inverted narcissists will be dismissive in order to assert themselves and then will try to re-establish relations after being dismissive. They will tend to downplay their feelings in the interests of relatedness.

An inverted narcissist tries to relate to everyone and if they fail in that effort they will dismiss the difficult relationship. The inverted narcissist aims to live in a world of people they can relate too and they strive to maintain that.

An inverted narcissist will always find control offensive because they do not try to control anyone else. An overt narcissist finds dismissal very upsetting and offensive because they would never dismiss anyone.

The inverted narcissist they dismiss people they find it impossible to relate too.

It is shattering to the inverted narcissist to be disapproved of and it is shattering to the overt narcissist to be dismissed. The inverted narcissist will never bear disapproval and the overt narcissist will never allow themselves to be dismissed.

Inverted narcissists can be dismissive and they are quite sensitive and will assume that people who are unresponsive to them don't like them. And then they will dismiss those people.

Why I Dismissed Others

Dismissing is a childhood means of eliciting sympathy and attention from parents. It is type of emotional manipulation. It is an attempt to control another party by making them feel bad and rejected. Children withdraw affection from adults because they know that has a powerful effect on them. It really doesn't work with adult interaction because it just creates indifference. Other adults are not locked into the same committed relatedness as parents are to children so they are not amenable to childish manipulation. When a dismissive child becomes a dismissive adult he or she tends to struggle a lot in relatedness. Dismissing people is an attempt to get what we want in relatedness. If we withdraw then the other party should by all accounts come running, give in, do what we want. Of course they can be dismissive too and then a vicious cycle of dismissiveness is established in the relatedness.

Don't Dismiss

Dismissing is teenage, punitive and unnecessary. It was an attempt to control people. It creates doubt and uncertainty. All is cast into doubt and then must be recovered leading of course to conditional relatedness.

Avoid the cycle of immature relatedness: Judgmental (self-righteous) leading to judged, dismissive and contemptuous leading to dismissed and contemptible, conditional acceptance leading to powerlessly striving, confused and needy.

The fact is that dismissing is a learned behaviour There are no circumstances where it makes sense. People come together only if they are supposed to. There is no need to tell people off. Dismissing has no effect. No one can really be manipulated. So if someone dismisses them they don't care. It may have worked on parents.

Romance

The inverted narcissist does not believe he is loved and that's essentially his fundamental problem and all his energies are devoted to the task of winning, pursuing and keeping love.

My Dyadic Relatedness

Dyadic relatedness arose for me because it was really a partnership of deficiencies. In dyadic relatedness I fulfilled my shortcomings by associating with someone who does not have that shortcoming. So the inverted narcissist is highly socialised, and in theory tries to relate to everyone around them. The overt narcissist is shy and needs a domain of control so a dyad between the two is mutually rewarding.

I define a relationship as an interpersonal interaction in which each person is able to consider and act on his or her own needs, experience, and point of view, as well as being able to consider and respond to the experience of the other person. Both people are important to each person. In a narcissistic encounter, there is, psychologically, only one person present. The co-narcissist disappears for both people, and only the narcissistic person's experience is important.

It is powerfully healing for the patient to experience a relationship that is not based on narcissism. Co-narcissistic people are therefore greatly helped by the therapist's embodiment of Carl Rogers' principles of accurate empathy, interpersonal warmth and positive regard, and personal genuineness. These behaviours by the therapist provide a direct contradiction to the experiences that have caused their problems. Patients will seek to determine how safe they are not to accommodate their behaviour to the therapist's imagined needs, but to be able to experience and express themselves freely. The patient will carefully observe the therapist's behaviour and make judgments about how much the therapist is able to consider the needs of the patient and how open he or she is to the patient's experience. The patient will also want to see that the therapist is not co-narcissistic, so that the patient can use the therapist as a model who shows by example that she or he believes it is safe to be assertive and not to orient oneself around another's needs. The patient will therefore observe the therapist for signs of how assertive he or she is, and also pay attention to examples the therapist may provide from his or her own life to assess how free of co-narcissism the therapist may be.

Dyads therefore are undermined or improved into better relationships by the co-narcissist becoming more assertive but not dismissive and the overt narcissist also changes their game, adjusts their world-view and admits to their experience an individual who is assertive and self-reliant with whom they can relate. The overt narcissist feels or believes they can only relate when they are centre stage.

In the dyadic world of the narcissist therefore contravention of world view is absent and so emotional convictions remain unchallenged. This is the narcissist trap. Their experience suffers from confirmation bias and emotional growth is absent.

The cycle is broken by positive regard, genuine and empathy. These are emotions unknown to the narcissist. They have not experienced them.

Depression is the failure to relate and to create an emotional circle around oneself independent of the family of origin.

Dyadic relatedness is what results between overt narcissists and inverted narcissists. The inverted narcissist allows himself to be controlled emotionally and does not object or is even aware of it often.

In this style of relatedness competition is inevitable and the dyadic nature of the relatedness means that in family context narcissistic children will compete for the attention of parents. Each will try to assert their individual dyad with the parent leading to a highly competitive environment emotionally.

To regard people as controlling or dismissive is missing the point about them because really what they want is to be loved only they go about it covert or an unusual way. The method however irritating is still hoping to achieve the result we all desire.

Beyond narcissism human emotions gain a greater consistency and stability and that means relatedness becomes more stable and consistent.

Narcissists do love and the effectiveness of that all depends on how extremely they are narcissistic. Narcissism is a distortion of love but it is still love.

In dyadic relatedness the premise is established that the relationship begins. The inverted narcissist suppresses their feelings in order to relate and the overt narcissist strives to control the situation.

The inverted narcissist only periodically asserts themselves and this has a disquieting effect on the overt narcissist who tries to manage and control the relationship within acceptable boundaries for them. So if the inverted narcissistic partner is too unmanageable the overt narcissist withdraws but does not dismiss. If the overt narcissist is too controlling to the inverted narcissist then he will become dismissive.

The Narcissist Trap

The narcissist trap is that it doesn't matter what they do, who they associate with, where they go that never convince them that they are lovable or worthy of love. That comes from within and they have to find it in themselves. And when they do, they can comfortably let go of the narcissistic strategies to relate.

Love is not externalised and this is what happens to children who internalisations concerning whether or not they are loved. Love is out there not inside. They tend just as I did set off on an adventure to find love. One thing that seems to be consistent for everyone with serious depression is that they are single and alone. But it is also the case that people who externalise love are vulnerable to dyadic and abusive relationships which can also be very depressing.

It's better than being dismissive because dismissive says I just going to reject people who trigger my fundamental insecurity and internalisation that I am not loved. And I will prioritise people who salve my ego to the extent that I feel they do like me or love me. The dismissive approach determines the world of the inverted narcissist. His realm of possibilities is so constrained.

So fundamentally my depression was based on the fact that I didn't love myself.

My Passion - Romanticism

Why Does It Hurt So Much?

If someone inspires great passion in us then it has to be right. And the dissipation of that passion conversely is an indication that the relationship no longer has meaning. However the strong passion we feel about someone else is usually because they supply a deficiency in ourselves that we believe we can meet by being around someone. In practise this strategy however logical is not effective.

Ultimately however the schema will lead us to disappointment and it really won't be the fault of the other party in the relationship. It leads to disappointment because it pertains to unresolved feelings, feelings that can never be met or known by another adult. So though we might be inclined to believe initially that we can meet them in relatedness to someone else we invariably find ultimately that it is not possible. For our feelings to be comprehensible to another party they must be purely grounded in reality. This is why schema driven relatedness is invariably regarded as unfair and unreasonable by other parties. They quite literally can't understand it.

We must bear in mind that our schemas are a dyad with ourselves not anyone else, so that our narcissism is not meaningful to other people. Why should they care? How can they be expected to relate to feelings that are dead and unresolved, and that pertain to people before they even met us? They can't and they don't. Our schemas don't even make sense to us and really the best thing is to get rid of it if at all possible.

The dyad of schema passion therefore can be activated romantically

The fact is if we are not emotionally whole then only we can do something about it by ourselves alone.

Rationalising My Fears

Fear is emotional pain. Through the lens of our schema we perceive our world. What we draw from this experience confirms us in our fear. If it already happened to us it can happen again. And yet what do we know of fear only how it made us very afraid. In a neutral world we latch on to those events and that information that justifies us emotionally. The world is beyond such sentiment but we are not. And yet in these compelling evidences is the clue to the unresolved hurt. To fear something we must first feel it and if we never felt it we don't fear it. If we fear it we haven't let it go. And what do we fear?

Our principal fear in life is dying. That we conceive is the worst thing that can happen to us. If we fear it profoundly then we have lost someone.

If we don't fear dying we may fear being abused, assaulted, attacked, that our body might be assailed in some way. If we fear it profoundly then it may already have happened.

So rationally we contrive not to be hurt again. In the extremes of fear we are capable of anything. We are capable of believing anything, of doing anything to end the fear.

My Efforts to End Hide My Fears

We strive to eliminate fear from our lives but without accepting the reality of our worst fears we only ever hope for moments, periods of calm and peace and in our schema distorted world we strive to engineer those moments. We may associate such calm with people we know or knew or times we remember when fear was absent. We may associate it with habits that bring relief. It may be substances and the consumption of certain things in excess that is the safety valve or necessary release for fear.

To eliminate fear we enact and re-enact the positive aspects of our schema. This is the side of ourselves the world accepts and knows and may even approve of and admire.

It can be the remembrance of lost times, times before the fear - the good old days when life was happy, free and simple. It may be in excess of devotion for the religious that they find their escape. But there is no escape from self.

Being Myself

To be ourselves most overcome personal fears. Put aside the schema – drop it in effect. To liberate oneself from the schema we must work through it. And complete the cycle of feelings for both parental impressions.

In our schema driven reality we experience on-going dissatisfaction and unhappiness with our lives. This unhappiness is a call for change, personal change. And it should continue until we reach the point of self-acceptance. This is a turning point wherein we accept ourselves. Once we have accepted ourselves we require no further necessity for self-change.

We have grown to like and love ourselves and we like who we are. We have achieved balance between reality and ourselves. We can be ourselves.

We mistrust and are disbelieving that such balance is attainable but it is possible for anyone. When we achieve balance in ourselves our relationship to all other things achieves balance also.

Self love is internal. It cannot be externalised. It's the feeling that nothing needs to be accomplished in order to be myself. It's a realisation of reality. Obvious reality.

This answers the mystery of post-schema lack of passion. The passion was the passion of self of course and that was driving this process. I was passionate about my right and entitlement to be myself and that's why it seemed like an imprisonment. I was imprisoned by my own schema and clamouring to be set free.

The schema only obscures self and even then temporarily – who I was and who I am was always immutable.

I Was Highly Subjective

Ones subjectivity of feelings is a function of one's trauma. Highly subjective people have experienced high levels of trauma and as a result they are excessively guided by their feelings in relatedness. The more objective someone is the more readily they will surrender to consensual viewpoint and adopt and accept that consensual viewpoint.

Denials - Sustains Subjectivity

Denials are short term coping strategies when faced with traumatic situations.

I don't believe denial to be a conscious or premeditated response to unacceptable events; it is as much environmentally driven as it is an individual choice. In an environment where feelings are not shared there is no forum for expressions of loss. So its survival. That's a pretty rational motivation. And if in later life that is incredibly difficult to reconstruct that only reflects the fact that they survived.

Denial is a defence mechanism postulated by Sigmund Freud, in which a person is faced with a fact that is too uncomfortable to accept and rejects it instead, insisting that it is not true despite what may be overwhelming evidence. The subject may deny the reality of the unpleasant fact altogether (simple denial), admit the fact but deny its seriousness (minimization) or admit both the fact and seriousness but deny responsibility (transference).

Where denial occurs in mature minds, it is most often associated with death, dying and rape.

Elisabeth Kübler-Ross used denial as the first of five stages in the psychology of a dying patient, and the idea has been extended to include the reactions of survivors to news of a death. Thus, when parents are informed of the death of a child, their first reaction is often of the form, "No! You must have the wrong house, you can't mean our child!"

Unlike some other defence mechanisms postulated by psychoanalytic theory (for instance, repression), the general existence of denial is fairly easy to verify, even for non-specialists. On the other hand, denial is one of the most controversial defence mechanisms, since it can be easily used to create unfalsifiable theories: anything the subject says or does that appears to disprove the interpreter's theory is explained, not as evidence that the interpreter's theory is wrong, but as the subject's being "in denial".

A commonly-cited example of spurious denial is the psychologist who insists, against all evidence, that his patient is homosexual: any attempt by the patient to disprove the theory (as by pointing out his strong desire for women) is evidence of denial and thus evidence of the underlying theory. This tension can become serious, especially in areas such as child abuse and recovered memory. Proponents often respond to allegations of false memory by asserting that the subjects are genuine victims who have reverted to denial. Critics reply (some seriously, some less so) that it is the proponents who are in denial about the tenuousness of their theories.

The concept of denial is important in twelve-step programs, where the abandonment or reversal of denial forms the basis of the first, fourth, fifth, eighth and tenth steps. The ability to deny or minimize is an essential part of what enables an addict to continue his or her behaviour in the face of evidence that, to an outsider, appears overwhelming. This is cited as one of the reasons that compulsion is seldom effective in treating addiction — the habit of denial remains.

Understanding and avoiding denial is also important in the treatment of various diseases. The American Heart Association cites denial as a principal reason that treatment of a heart attack is delayed. Because the symptoms are so varied, and often have other potential explanations, the

opportunity exists for the patient to deny the emergency, often with fatal consequences. It is common for patients to delay mammograms or other tests because of a fear of cancer, even though this is clearly maladaptive. It is the responsibility of the care team and of the nursing staff in particular, to train at-risk patients to avoid such behaviour

Denial of cycle

Many who use this type of denial will say things such as, "it just happened." Denial of cycle is where a person avoids looking at their decisions leading up to an event or does not consider their pattern of decision making and how harmful behaviour is repeated. The pain and harm being avoided by this type of denial is more of the effort needed to change the focus from a singular event to looking at preceding events. It can also serve as a way to blame or justify behaviour (see above)

Denial of fact

In this form of denial, someone avoids a fact by lying. This lying can take the form of an outright falsehood (commission), leaving out certain details to tailor a story (omission), or by falsely agreeing to something (assent, also referred to as "yessing" behavior). Someone who is in denial of fact is typically using lies to avoid facts they think may be painful to themselves or others.

Denial of responsibility - Blaming

This form of denial involves avoiding personal responsibility by blaming, minimizing or justifying. Blaming is a direct statement shifting culpability and may overlap with denial of fact. Minimizing is an attempt to make the effects or results of an action appear to be less harmful than they may actually be. Justifying is when someone takes a choice and attempts to make that choice look okay due to their perception of what is "right" in a situation. Someone using denial of responsibility is usually attempting to avoid potential harm or pain by shifting attention away from them.

Denial of impact

Denial of impact involves a person's avoiding thinking about or understanding the harms his or her behaviour has caused to self or others. Doing this enables that person to avoid feeling a sense of guilt and it can prevent him or her from developing remorse or empathy for others. Denial of impact reduces or eliminates a sense of pain or harm from poor decisions.

Denial of awareness

This type of denial is best discussed by looking at the concept of state dependent learning. People using this type of denial will avoid pain and harm by stating they were in a different state of awareness (such as alcohol or drug intoxication or on occasion mental health related). This type of denial often overlaps with denial of responsibility.

Denial Inversion

I think I could always see this in my journaling. I would write a sentence and then have to back and correct it because I left the negative or what I had written was the opposite of what I intended to write. I think this is the essence of denial turning the lie into truth but also turning the truth into a lie.

Inevitably to me denial inversion leads to great self-doubt. I would not have the confidence of my own views and feelings. And so I would never believe myself to be right – I would have no conviction.

Consequences

Denial inversion leads to an inability to interpret thoughts and feelings so the individual doesn't know what they want. They can make no sense of their thoughts and feelings and so they create no personal domain for themselves. Hence therapy and depression are very probable. The individual feels the need to be guided as to how they are and feel.

Denial inversion must lead to profound inner conflict as the individual struggles mightily to make sense of themselves and their thoughts and feelings. Lasting conclusions are really almost impossible in this scenario. With denial inversion ideation overwhelm is very possible particularly as the individual experience more life scenarios that are difficult or impossible to integrate.

But with denial inversion the conclusion is inverted, reversed, the agenda being to sustain the denial and the delusion. So any information that is unfavorable to the denial is reversed and dismissed and only circumstances and situations that support the denial are entertained and pursued. So the best way to maintain a denial is by being isolated, interacted with very few people and certainly not interacting with people who would challenge the denial.

My Personal Conspiracy Theory

This is the nature of the conspiracy - the nature of being revealed. It is the conscious self-stumbling on the unconscious denial. Truth vs. the lie. Sets up the cycle of idealisation and rejection. Idealisation of myself and rejection and dismissal of myself. Accepting the truth of what has happened what I have experienced ends the cycle of self-idealisation and self-dismissal.

My Perception of Reality

Our perception of reality is two things at the same time. What we are really like and there is the person we think we are. In reality is where life happens and people interact so other people appraise as we are – not as we think we are.

So at any given point in our emotional development we are partly interfacing with reality and partly perceiving reality through our schema. Obviously the greater the schema the less the individual perceives reality and as the schema diminishes the individuals grasp on reality improves.

When we are being ourselves we navigate through reality without incident or issue. No one has a difficulty with someone who knows themselves. It's the people who don't know themselves well enough that create the debate and uncertainty around them because that debate and uncertainty exists within themselves also.

We don't question reality – we question ourselves as to why we feel the way we feel. Why do the simple issues of life therefore appear or become so complicated? The fact is they don't. We are complicated. Life isn't. And that complexity we have engineered in our development is our schema. In being ourselves our lives know no complexity. Then there is no problem.

My Predicting the Future

The predictive power of trapped feelings is negative. It's like looking into the past. It can only show the past. The thing has already happened. Also it gives this illusion of long term predictability but it's just wrong. So I won't look behind today socially really. Those who have knowledge don't predict. Those who predict don't have knowledge. The schema is not insight.

With unresolved feelings we project these unresolved feelings into the future for the simple reason that we know their resolution has been postponed but the nevertheless is inevitable. We cannot escape from our own feelings. So from an emotive perspective all we can expect is that we will at some time in the future resolve them.

However with the schema the part of us that is in control actively prevents or strives to maintain the repression. In effect we have internalised these unresolved feelings and we battle to maintain our own personal censorship.

Me The Traumatized Narcissist

Extreme Narcissism

Narcissism is almost entirely about control. It is a primitive and immature reaction to life circumstances in which the narcissist (usually in his childhood) was rendered helpless. It is about re-exerting one's identity, re-establishing predictability, mastering the environment - human and physical.

ALL narcissists idealize and then devalue. This is THE core of pathological narcissism.

At the heart of our narcissism therefore is hurt. And the greater the love that was lost or betrayed the greater is the hurt. Our schemas have distorted our sense of right and wrong. And it is that part of us for which we fundamentally do not feel accountable. After all we didn't do it we just suffered it.

Overt Narcissistic Personality Disorder

These comments pertain to someone who was seriously traumatized which for me means abuse or loss at some vulnerable age.

The narcissist exploits, lies, insults, demeans, ignores (the "silent treatment"), and manipulates, controls. All these are forms of abuse.

Narcissists are hypochondriacs (and difficult patients) because they are afraid to lose control over their body, its looks and its proper functioning.

The narcissist is a solipsist. He carries the whole universe in his mind. To him, nothing exists except himself. Meaningful others are his extensions, assimilated by him, internal objects - not external ones. Thus, losing control of a significant other - is equivalent to the loss of control of a limb, or of one's brain. It is terrifying. It is paradigm-shattering.

Independent or disobedient people evoke in the narcissist the realization that something is wrong with his worldview, that he is not the center of the world or its cause and that he cannot control what, to him, are internal representations.

Unpredictability

The narcissist acts unpredictably, capriciously, inconsistently and irrationally. This serves to demolish in others their carefully crafted worldview. They become dependent upon the next twist and turn of the narcissist, his next inexplicable whim, upon his next outburst, denial, or smile. Because he is assumed to be the only one intimately acquainted with his self -he becomes the source of certitude and veracity. In other words: the narcissist makes sure that HE is the only reliable existence in the lives of others - by shattering the rest of their world through his seemingly insane behavior. He guarantees his stable presence in their lives - by destabilizing their own.

Disproportional Reactions

One of the favourite tools of manipulation in the narcissist's arsenal is the disproportionality of his reactions. He reacts with supreme rage to the slightest slight. Or he would punish severely for what he perceives to be an offence against him, no matter how minor. Or, he would throw a temper tantrum over any discord or disagreement, however gently and considerately expressed. Or, he would act inordinately attentive, charming and tempting (even over-sexed, if need be). This ever-shifting code of conduct coupled with the inordinately harsh and arbitrarily applied "penal code" are both of the narcissist's design and unbeknownst to the "offenders". Neediness and dependence on the source of all justice meted - on the narcissist - are thus guaranteed.

Dehumanisation and Objectification (Abuse)

*People have a need to believe in the empathic skills and basic good-heartedness of others. By dehumanizing and objectifying people - the narcissist attacks the very foundations of the social treaty. This is the "alien" aspect of narcissists - *they may be excellent imitations of fully formed adults but they are emotionally non-existent, or, at best, immature. This is so horrid, so repulsive, and so phantasmagoric - that people recoil in terror. It is then, with their defenses absolutely down, that they are the most susceptible and vulnerable to the Narcissist's control.* Physical, psychological, verbal and sexual abuse is all forms of dehumanization and objectification.*

Impossible Situations

*The narcissist engineers impossible, dangerous, unpredictable, unprecedented, or highly specific situations in which he will be sorely needed. The narcissist, his knowledge, his skills or his traits become the only ones applicable, or the most useful to resolving them. *The narcissist contrives his own indispensability. It is a form of control by proxy.**

Control By Proxy

If all else fails, the narcissist recruits friends, colleagues, mates, family members, the authorities, institutions, neighbours - in short, third parties - to do his bidding. He uses these them to cajole, coerce, threaten, stalk, offer, retreat, tempt, convince, harass, communicate and otherwise manipulate his target. He controls these unaware instruments exactly as he plans to control his ultimate prey. He employs the same mechanisms and devices. And he dumps his props unceremoniously when the job is done.

*Another form of control by proxy is to engineer situations in which abuse is inflicted upon another person. *Such carefully crafted scenarios involve embarrassment and humiliation as well as social sanctions (condemnation, opprobrium, or even physical punishment). Society, or a social group become the instruments of the narcissist.**

Ambient Abuse

This is the fostering, propagation and enhancement of an atmosphere of fear, intimidation, instability, unpredictability and irritation. There are no acts of traceable explicit abuse, nor any manipulative settings of control. Yet, the irksome feeling remains, a disagreeable foreboding, a premonition, a bad omen. This is sometimes called "gas lighting". In the long term, such an environment erodes one's sense of self-worth and self-esteem. Self-confidence is shaken badly. Often, the victims adopts a paranoid or schizoid stance and thus renders himself or herself exposed even more to criticism and judgment. The roles are thus reversed: the victim is considered the mentally disordered component of the dyad and the narcissist - the suffering soul.

Inverted Narcissistic Personality Disorder

Also called "covert narcissist", this is a co-dependent who depends exclusively on narcissists (narcissist-co-dependent). If you are living with a narcissist, have a relationship with one, if you are married to one, if you are working with a narcissist, etc. - it does NOT mean that you are an inverted narcissist.

In all likelihood, the partner is an inverted Narcissist, a suppressed one, or a latent one - in the limited sense that his psychological make-up and formation are identical to those of the Narcissist. This deep-rooted, deep-seated identity fosters the frequent follies-a-deux which is the Narcissistic couple. Upon the break-up of the relationship, the partner (and the Narcissist) engage in a tortuous and drawn out post mortem. But the question who really did what to whom (and even why) is irrelevant.

Inverted narcissism is a God complex - messianic delusions are common place. The inverted narcissist is the eternal victim - "always giving" in his own mind. Sorely misunderstood and underappreciated. His mission to save the world in order to save himself. A stable dyad can be formed between a narcissist and an inverted narcissist either through relationship or through friendship also.

Inverted narcissists adopt a persecutory view of the world and have a deep-seated conviction that it is fundamentally unfair. They are God complexed but in a salvatory way. Their mission is to save the world and they often feel martyred as though the world is pulling out of them. They find it almost impossible to say no to the demands of the narcissist and can often form dyads with narcissists, which are stable but dysfunctional. The inverted narcissist is fundamentally a dependent and lacks capacity for self-reliance.

An inverted narcissist places no limits or boundaries on his or her interactions. He is fundamentally open to the world. He feels he is motivated by his "love" for the world. And that the world fails to understand him. He places no expectation on himself to comprehend and expects always to be understood. Grandiosity, a sense of entitlement, a lack of empathy, and overweening haughtiness usually hide gnawing insecurity and a fluctuating sense of self-worth.

Extreme Idealisations

Neurotic People Pleaser

I think the idea I have that I hold other people's feelings in my hand is not true. Their feelings are not dependent on me. And it is probably some idea I developed with my parents that it was very important to respond to their feelings all. Whatever they wanted - that's what mattered. I guess it is a type of people pleasing.

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.

Burden Bearer of Others

Other people's feelings not my responsibility

I am only responsible for how I feel. Even if I were a parent I wouldn't be responsible for my children's feelings. That's not to say I wouldn't be concerned about how they felt but I certainly couldn't claim or assume ownership for those feelings. This is an end to the caretaker role.

My Physiological Responses

During this phase the subject will experience intense physiological symptoms. These include acceleration of heart and lung action, paling or flushing, or alternating between both, inhibition of stomach and upper-intestinal action (digestion slows down or stops), general effect on the sphincters of the body, constriction of blood vessels in many parts of the body, liberation of nutrients (particularly fat and glucose) for muscular action, dilation of blood vessels for muscles, inhibition of the lachrymal gland (responsible for tear production) and salivation, dilation of pupil (mydriasis), relaxation of bladder, inhibition of erection, auditory exclusion (loss of hearing), tunnel vision (loss of peripheral vision), acceleration of instantaneous reflexes & shaking.

My Breakdowns

My Breakdowns - Temporary loss of self

Depression occurs to people who are dissociated from their own needs. They have always been this way and they strongly disassociated with their own needs. As a result they are highly

vulnerable to life's vicissitudes - because their sense of their needs is externalized and placed it in the realm of their environment not in themselves. They are overly dependent on their relationships even when they are unhealthy.

The depression begins in their lives when they realize they are unable to meet their own needs. This is the point at which they may come to the attention of health services.

For an individual to have a breakdown it has to be the case that self is highly denied. The main thing about breakdowns is that it is evidence of extreme trauma. This results in extreme self-idealisation and as a result relatedness is extremely problematic.

That is, a psychotic episode *can be seen from a Jungian perspective as the "rest" of the psyche overwhelming the conscious psyche because the conscious psyche effectively was locking out and repressing* the psyche as a whole.

In a breakdown an individual's ego defences are completely overwhelmed and the individual loses touch with reality. Further the individual's ego defences are defeated 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.

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.

Co-narcissists are much more vulnerable to losing themselves in relatedness because they are inclined to put aside their own needs in order to relate. They can either dyadic relate to an overt narcissist or become a loner.

The overt narcissist establishes a comfort zone where they are psychologically omniscient – only a breakdown of the comfort zone would place the overt narcissist in a destabilising position. This is unlikely because an overt narcissist always has a few inverted narcissists present in their comfort zone and can readily recruit more.

This also means that the overt narcissist is highly unlikely to take responsibility for relatedness problems. The co-narcissist will usually blame themselves for relatedness issues and more

readily engage in therapy under the assumption that they are responsible for relatedness problems.

The roles are however fluid and narcissists can play either role depending on the circumstances. They are much more inclined however to continue with childhood conditioned role until such time as they gain sufficient self-awareness to cease being narcissistic.

Co-narcissistic children of narcissistic parents find in practise that their parents needs remain an unquestioned aspect of their adult lives. Their parent's needs are omniscient and co-narcissistic adult will readily devote their energies to resolving their perception of their parent's needs. The overt narcissist of narcissistic parents will establish or attempt to establish their own control zone.

My Mania

In the manic phase the co-narcissist completely disregards the limitations of their emotional map and becomes very self-idealised. In effect their childish self-concept becomes temporarily realised.

A developing narcissist is constrained by their emotional profile but in mania that constraint is lost sight of and someone who is manic will reach out in all directions regardless of consideration or limitation.

My Terror

Because of my trauma I reached a terrifying conclusion that I couldn't relate to anyone. The collapse of my inverted narcissist world. It was never true and never will be true and doesn't matter anyway. It was just an internalisation. It was the realisation for me of a deep-seated childhood terror. It just a childish fear. Because of the nature of my trauma the depths of this terror were immense for me. My world at the time had collapsed down to me alone. And I wasn't ready or able to be alone. But I am now.

That terror after Brian died was tremendous because I felt completely emotionally isolated around my family. They couldn't meet my needs. They were all suffering in silence. There was no one for me. For the first time in my life in Chicago I was living alone. I had no friends except Niall really.

For a child abandonment and rejection is terror. Brian I idealised and then he died.

My Emotional instability

I wonder if emotional instability is not a product more of not feeling loved than that the world is opposed to one. Did I not for example feel in Elavon that no one liked me? Was that not the issue? And not feeling loved therefore is the cause of emotional instability not the difficulties with the world.

Appear also to be the case that I basically did not love myself and believed I was unlovable so when I entered an environment like Dell or Elavon and I didn't get on well with the people around me this triggered the internalised belief that no one loved me and this led on to emotional instability? But of course the office is not the world and ironically I wasn't even interested in an office job so why would leaving it be destabilising? I think it constituted a proxy for the world.

It is so ridiculous to me that I would even have cared about Dell or Elavon – I never liked being there?

The Root of my Depression

So fundamentally my depression was based on the fact that I didn't love myself.

Karen Carpenter was an extreme inverted narcissist. Because when her whirlwind romance fell apart she fell apart.

This has to be the driver because in relation to the family origin also there was long exposition on the same topic. Do they love me? Do I love them? It went on and on.

There has to be an intellectual basis for de-stabilisation. I am unlovable therefore I am excessively dependent on the relationship I do have and highly needy too.

Me - The Sick Man

When I had a negative outlook about relatedness I just ended up alone all the time. With a negative attitude to the world I remained unsuccessful, blaming and embittered. The double whammy points to complete isolation of self. For the developing adult that is devastating. I can't see how that would not be depressing and clinically depressing at that.

I think ending up alone for the developing adult is more than they can handle. If in their own representations they only find complete isolation then they are depressed. The only reason someone in their 20s would feel alone is if they always felt alone – were always isolated emotionally and the hope of the development is that they would resolve that aloneness. So when they find that proved to be false then they are never going to connect with anyone is the conclusion.

My Fear of Losing Self

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 defence that the loss has occurred.

My Psychosis – My Subjectivity trades places with Objectivity

This is the point at which someone becomes psychotic because they have become completely subjective and their objectivity is lost or repressed. When I say subjective I am of course talking about the trapped feelings which are then in the ascendant.

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. And an internal (telepathic/voices) debate ensues.

My Voices – Childish Personifications

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

Telepathy *describes the purported transfer of information on thoughts or feelings between individuals by means other than the five classical senses. A person who is able to make use of*

telepathy is said to be able to read the thoughts and stored information in the brain of others. In addition, the notion of telepathy is similar to two psychological concepts: delusions of thought insertion/removal and psychological symbiosis. This similarity might explain how some people have come up with the idea of telepathy. Thought insertion/removal is a symptom of psychosis, particularly of schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder.

Psychiatric patients who experience this symptom falsely believe that some of their thoughts are not their own and that others (e.g., other people, aliens, or conspiring intelligence agencies) are putting thoughts into their minds (thought insertion). Some patients feel as if thoughts are being taken out of their minds or deleted (thought removal). Along with other symptoms of psychosis, delusions of thought insertion may be reduced by antipsychotic medication.

Psychological symbiosis is a less well established concept. It is an idea found in the writings of early psychoanalysts, such as Melanie Klein. It entails the belief that in the early psychological experience of the child (during earliest infancy), the child is unable to tell the difference between his or her own mind, on one hand, and his or her experience of the mother/parent, on the other hand. This state of mind is called psychological symbiosis; with development, it ends, but, purportedly, aspects of it can still be detected in the psychological functioning of the adult.

Psychiatrists and clinical psychologists believe and empirical findings support the idea that people with schizotypal personality disorder are particularly likely to believe in telepathy.

When people hear voices inside their heads, it is as if their inner thoughts are no longer alone. The new voices can talk to each other, talk to them, or comment on the person's actions. The majority of the time the voices are negative.

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

My Imaginary Friends

Because of my imaginary friends childish mentality that I never grew out of I fundamentally believed in telepathy which was essential talking to the various personalities of the schema. I would give personalities to feelings in a creative way and assume that was what that person was like. Whether it was true or not I didn't know.

I part lived in my creative fantasy and part lived in reality. But for emotional growth clearly the fantasy was in the way.

The schema was a discrete experience for me. It would start or kick off, it would get more and more intense and ultimately I would lose control of myself and then there would be a medical intervention and medication would help to re-repress the unresolved feelings.

Over time the schema reduced as more and more of the unresolved feelings were resolved.

God as I have already said is not in my brain. He is outside - above and beyond. Satan is not in my head either. Who knows where he is. I should not give personalities to my feelings. That is a mistake. Childish but still a mistake.

My Thought crime

Thought crime is any kind of deviant thinking concerning repressed emotions and the necessity for that repression. The developing self 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.

My 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.

My Mental Illness

In the psychotic state the schema becomes completely connected. Some refer to this as a emotional overwhelm. When an individual has repressed and controlled their unresolved feelings they can interface better with reality. They can work and they can lead a stable existence, perhaps with the assistance of on-going medication. However the difficulty with having a lot of unresolved feelings is that it makes us unhappy. So medication serves to numb or suppress unresolved feelings but doesn't resolve them.

What previously were impressions became certainties. I had global paranoid delusions so my solution to that would lead to global acknowledgement and renown so I felt - in the schema. This is a reflection of my creative thinking process. I connect things intuitively - creatively. I think this only applies to the mentally ill.

Depending on the schema determines the experience of the mental illness. Those with negative schemas can become extremely depressed and feel they can no longer function. Those with very positive schemas can become manic or some combination of both.

Mental illness is the evidence of an extreme deviation from self. The closer the individual grows to self and to better self-awareness and self-knowledge the fewer the symptoms and the greater the stability. A counsellor or therapist job is to direct their patients always in the direction of reality. However anyone can accept reality and move in the direction of greater realism.

We must remember that instability and unhappiness is caused by a dichotomy in ourselves between reality and who we think we are. Closing that gap yields ever greater benefits.

My Sanity

Sanity therefore is only ever an approximation or an evaluation or an opinion. A doctor or therapist can only ever guide an individual in the direction of reality. So an individual can assess and be confident in their mental capacities by being mindful of reality.

My Neologisms

In psychiatry, the term neologism is used to describe the use of words that only have meaning to the person who uses them, independent of their common meaning. This is considered normal in

children, but a symptom of thought disorder (indicative of a psychotic mental illness, such as schizophrenia) in adults.

Mental Delusions

Delusions

Karl Jaspers was the first to define the three main criteria for a belief to be considered delusional in his book *General Psychopathology*. These criteria are:

- certainty (held with absolute conviction)
- incorrigibility (not changeable by compelling counterargument or proof to the contrary)
- impossibility or falsity of content (implausible, bizarre or patently untrue)

Delusions do not necessarily have to be false or 'incorrect inferences about external reality'. In other situations the delusion may turn out to be true belief. In practice psychiatrists tend to diagnose a belief as delusional if it is either patently bizarre, causing significant distress, or excessively pre-occupies the patient, especially if the person is subsequently unswayed in belief by counter-evidence or reasonable arguments.

Delusions can be ranked after severity in three different stages, and as either mood-congruent or mood-incongruent.

In the mildest form the affected person perceives the concrete reality flawlessly, but has difficulties in perceiving what other people feel about herself/himself. (i.e. sees people talking and is convinced to be gossiped about). This borders with thinking in healthy people, and is not considered pathological unless it causes problem in daily life. With worsening reality perception the delusions can be categorized as either non-bizarre or bizarre.

A non-bizarre delusion is one whose content is definitely mistaken, but is at least possible; an example may be that the affected person mistakenly believes that he or she is under constant police surveillance.

A bizarre delusion is a delusion that is very strange and completely implausible for the person's culture; an example of a bizarre delusion would be that aliens have removed the affected person's brain.^[1]

Delusion of control: This is a false belief that another person, group of people, or external force controls one's thoughts, feelings, impulses, or behavior. A person may describe, for instance, the experience that aliens actually make him or her move in certain ways and that the person affected has no control over the bodily movements. Thought broadcasting (the false belief that the affected person's thoughts are heard aloud), thought insertion, and thought withdrawal (the belief that an outside force, person, or group of people is removing or extracting a person's thoughts) are also examples of delusions of control.

Nihilistic delusion: A delusion whose theme centers on the nonexistence of self or parts of self, others, or the world. A person with this type of delusion may have the false belief that the world is ending.

Delusional jealousy (or delusion of infidelity): A person with this delusion falsely believes that his or her spouse or lover is having an affair. This delusion stems from pathological jealousy and the person often gathers "evidence" and confronts the spouse about the nonexistent affair.

Delusion of guilt or sin (or delusion of self-accusation): This is a false feeling of remorse or guilt of delusional intensity. A person may, for example, believe that he or she has committed some horrible crime and should be punished severely. Another example is a person who is convinced that he or she is responsible for some disaster (such as fire, flood, or earthquake) with which there can be no possible connection.

Delusion of mind being read: The false belief that other people can know one's thoughts. This is different from thought broadcasting in that the person does not believe that his or her thoughts are heard aloud.

Delusion of reference: The person falsely believes that insignificant remarks, events, or objects in one's environment have personal meaning or significance. For instance, a person may believe that he or she is receiving special messages from the news anchorperson on television. Usually the meaning assigned to these events is negative, but the "messages" can also have a grandiose quality.

Erotomania: A delusion in which one believes that another person, usually someone of higher status, is in love with him or her. It is common for individuals with this type of delusion to attempt to contact the other person (through phone calls, letters, gifts, and sometimes stalking).

Grandiose delusion: An individual exaggerates his or her sense of self-importance and is convinced that he or she has special powers, talents, or abilities. Sometimes, the individual may actually believe that he or she is a famous person (for example, a rock star or Christ). More commonly, a person with this delusion believes he or she has accomplished some great achievement for which they have not received sufficient recognition.

Persecutory delusions: These are the most common type of delusions and involve the theme of being followed, harassed, cheated, poisoned or drugged, conspired against, spied on, attacked, or obstructed in the pursuit of goals. Sometimes the delusion is isolated and fragmented (such as the false belief that co-workers are harassing), but sometimes are well-organized belief systems involving a complex set of delusions ("systematized delusions"). A person with a set of persecutory delusions may believe, for example, that he or she is being followed by government organizations because the "persecuted" person has been falsely identified as a spy. These systems of beliefs can be so broad and complex that they can explain everything that happens to the person.

Religious delusion: Any delusion with a religious or spiritual content. These may be combined with other delusions, such as grandiose delusions (the belief that the affected person was chosen

by God, for example), delusions of control, or delusions of guilt. Beliefs that would be considered normal for an individual's religious or cultural background are not delusions.

Somatic delusion: A delusion whose content pertains to bodily functioning, bodily sensations, or physical appearance. Usually the false belief is that the body is somehow diseased, abnormal, or changed. An example of a somatic delusion would be a person who believes that his or her body is infested with parasites.

Indicators of a delusion

The following can indicate a delusion

1. The patient expresses an idea or belief *with unusual persistence or force*.
2. That idea *appears to exert an undue influence on his or her life, and the way of life is often altered to an inexplicable extent*.
3. Despite his/her profound conviction, there is often a quality of secretiveness or suspicion when the patient is questioned about it.
4. The individual tends to be humorless and *oversensitive*, especially about the belief.
5. There is a *quality of centrality*: no matter how unlikely it is that these strange things are happening to him, *the patient accepts them relatively unquestioningly*.
6. *An attempt to contradict the belief is likely to arouse an inappropriately strong emotional reaction, often with irritability and hostility*.
7. *The belief is, at the least, unlikely, and out of keeping with the patient's social, cultural and religious background*.
8. *The patient is emotionally over-invested in the idea and it overwhelms other elements of his or her psyche*.
9. *The delusion, if acted out, often leads to behaviors which are abnormal and/or out of character*, although perhaps understandable in the light of the delusional beliefs.
10. *Individuals who know the patient will observe that his or her belief and behavior are uncharacteristic and alien*.

Features

The following features are found:

1. It is a primary disorder.
2. *It is a stable disorder characterized by the presence of delusions to which the patient clings with extraordinary tenacity*.
3. *The illness is chronic* and frequently lifelong.
4. *The delusions are logically constructed and internally consistent*.
5. *The delusions do not interfere with general logical reasoning* (although within the delusional system the logic is perverted) and there is usually no general disturbance of behavior. If disturbed behavior does occur, it is directly related to the delusional beliefs.
6. *The individual experiences a heightened sense of self-reference. Events which, to others, are non significant are of enormous significance to him or her, and the atmosphere surrounding the delusions is highly charged*.

Delusions of Sub-Culture

The current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders states that a person cannot be diagnosed as being delusional if the belief in question is one "ordinarily accepted by other members of the person's culture or subculture"

Historical Delusions - Ghosts

Ghosts are quite obviously emotionally repressed feelings. That's what they are - that's all they are. Chris said one time he thought I was haunted. I think it was a quite apt description.

Paranoid delusions

Other psychological side effects include the following. The most common type of delusion or false beliefs is paranoid delusions. These are persecutory in nature and take many forms - overpowering, intense feeling that people are talking about you, looking at you, overpowering, intense feeling you are being watched, followed, and spied on (tracking devices, implants, hidden cameras), thinking that someone is trying to poison your food, thinking people are working together to harass you, thinking that something is controlling you- i.e. an electronic implant, thinking that people can read your mind/ or control your thoughts, thinking that your thoughts are being broadcast over the radio or TV

Delusions include but are not limited to:

Delusions of reference

This is thinking that random events convey a special meaning to you - an example is that a newspaper headline or a license plate has a hidden meaning for you to figure out, that they are signs trying to tell you something.

Religious delusions

This is the belief that you are Jesus, God, a prophet, or the antichrist.

Religious Apparitions (Moving Statues)

The moving statue phenomenon occurred during the summer of 1985 in Ireland, where statues of the Virgin Mary were reported to move spontaneously. In Ballinspittle, County Cork in July 1985, an observer claimed to have seen a roadside statue of the Virgin Mary move spontaneously. Similar occurrences were reported shortly afterward in Mount Mellory, County Waterford and in other locations. Thousands gathered at statues to pray. The Catholic Church remained reticent and skeptical on the matter. The Ballinspittle statue was damaged by protesters against idolatry (or Mariolatry), but it was repaired. The moving statues are now mostly forgotten or dismissed as a case of mass hysteria. Other considered that the visions happened near twilight when eyesight can be deceptive. The head of the statue is surrounded by small electric bulbs in the form of a halo. The site is about a mile (1.6km) along the Ballinspittle to Kinsale road.

The God Delusion

In The God Delusion, Dawkins contends that a supernatural creator almost certainly does not exist and that belief in a personal god qualifies as a delusion, which he defines as a persistent false belief held in the face of strong contradictory evidence.

It is very easy to see how a belief in God can become a personal or indeed global delusion when the mind is thought disordered. In this frame of mind the subject dialogues endlessly with God. Prayer groups and other get-togethers illustrate the point. On balance it is clear that faith alone is insufficient to permit an intelligent perception of self and reality. God sits beyond human reasoning and its capacities and in the grand workings of the universe his role is evident. God is not to blame for human misunderstanding.

Apocalypse

An Apocalypse (Greek: *ποκάλυψις* Apokálypsis; "lifting of the veil" or "revelation") is a disclosure of something hidden from the majority of mankind in an era dominated by falsehood and misconception, i.e. the veil to be lifted. In a rather common-sensical way the term is associated with an eschatological final battle, the Armageddon, and the idea of an end of the world due to out of time. This perceptions may better be related to the phrase apokalupsis eschaton, literally "revelation at [or of] the end of the æon, or age". In Christianity the Apocalypse of John is the Book of Revelation, the last book of the Bible.

Armageddon

According to some pre-millennial Christian interpretations, the Messiah, the "Lamb", will return to earth and defeat the Antichrist, the "Beast", in the battle of Armageddon. Then Satan will be put into the bottomless pit or abyss for 1,000 years, known as the millennial age.

Aliens (UFOS)

Unidentified flying object (commonly abbreviated as UFO or U.F.O.) is the popular term for any aerial phenomenon whose cause cannot be easily or immediately identified. Studies have established that only a small percentage of reported UFOs are actual hoaxes, while the majority are observations of some real but conventional object—most commonly aircraft, balloons, or astronomical objects such as meteors or bright planets—that have been misidentified by the observer as anomalies. A small percentage of reported sightings (usually 5%–20%) are classified as unidentified flying objects in the strictest sense.

More specifically aliens are believed to offer insight on self and self-worth. Hence the 20th century preoccupation as to whether we are “alone” or not. Clearly in the 21st century it is apparent that no-one is alone and further than we really sought communion with ourselves and not beings from other worlds who could tell us very little about ourselves that we don’t know already. So the alien belief is highly delusional and pernicious.

Delusions of grandeur

This is a strong belief that you have an important mission, special purposes, or are an unrecognized genius, or famous person.

Centrality of feeling and relevance

Delusions that one is at the centre of intense global and personal focus. That one’s personal actions and omission have greater significance than is appropriate.

Hallucinations

As many as 70% hear voices, while a lesser number have visual hallucinations.

Auditory hallucinations

They can be either inside the person's head or externally. When external, they sound as real as an actual voice. Sometimes they come from no apparent source, other times they come from real people who don't actually say anything, other times a person will hallucinate sounds.

Visual hallucinations

They operate on a spectrum. They start with the over acuteness of the senses, then in the middle are illusions, and on the far end are actual hallucinations. The following symptoms overlap with many other diseases such as bipolar disorder, major depression, the various kinds of personality disorders (specifically paranoid and schizotypal personality disorders), and other problems such as brain tumours and temporal lobe epilepsy.

Personal delusions

Megalomania

A psychopathological condition characterized by delusional fantasies of wealth, power, or omnipotence - an obsession with grandiose or extravagant things or actions.

Omnipotence

Between people of different faiths, or indeed between people of the same faith, the term omnipotent has been used to connote a number of different positions. These positions include, but are not limited to, the following: An individual is able to do anything that is logically possible for it to do. An individual is able to do anything that it chooses to do. An individual is able to do anything that is in accord with its own nature (thus, for instance, if it is a logical consequence of an individual's nature that what it speaks is truth, then it is not able to lie).

Egomania

Egomania is an obsessive preoccupation with one's self and applies to someone who follows their own ungoverned impulses and is possessed by delusions of personal greatness and feels a lack of appreciation. Someone suffering from this extreme egocentric focus is an egomaniac. The condition is psychologically abnormal and has been attributed to various historical figures and celebrities.

Erotomania

Erotomania is a type of delusion in which the affected person believes that another person, usually a stranger, is in love with him or her. The illness often occurs during psychosis, especially in patients with schizophrenia or bipolar mania.

Centrality of reference and feeling

Researchers have begun documenting what they dub the "Truman syndrome," a delusion afflicting people who are convinced that their lives are secretly playing out on a reality TV show. Scientists say the disorder underscores the influence pop culture can have on mental conditions.

My Clinical Depression

The whole thing about depression is the emotional connection or realization has already been lost. The individual doesn't know why they feel the way they feel – they just do. An emotionally healthy person can with relative ease trace the way to feel back to certain trigger points and certain scenarios which are perhaps not to their liking. But the depressed person can make no such connection or inference. Basically depression arises because people don't know how they feel. It is clinical if their ego is highly unrealistic and it's neurotic if their ego is partly realistic.

Depression is Internalisation not Association

Everybody loves only some are better at it than others. We all want the same thing. We try to get it by virtue of our associations rather than pondering our internalisations.

Considering our associations is a clue to our own feelings but questioning our internalisations is really the heart of the matter. It's our internalisations that inform us about what we refuse to feel.

In this process of self-realisation I was most often learning by association rather than consideration of internalisations which really came at the end. I don't think depression is anyone's fault but I do think it's avoidable. Only emotionally immature adults are clueless in these areas and let a situation develop that is entirely avoidable. It is a type of incompetent parenting.

Theories on Depression

It occurs to me that a lot of the population is much more comfortable with the genetic theory of depression because for parents of depressed children it lets them off the hook. They can maintain their conviction that they are no way responsible for their children's problems. In fact they would be hostile to any implication that their actions or omissions had any impact on the way their children feel. Narcissistic parents have no awareness of their children's needs.

The genetic argument is preferred because it's simple. And it's easily implemented and it gives clinicians control over difficult patients. I think the results are more uniform. Most people respond to medication. Depression medication is also mega-bucks and there are large profits to be made from encourage doctors to proscribe more medication. There is a highly recidivistic tendency with clinical depression. The same faces re-appear all the time. Other reason why clinicians would believe it's genetic and incurable.

Psychology could have very mixed results in the short term. Further the patient is vulnerable to relapsing if returned to the environment that caused their depression.

The point about depression is it is an emotional disorder caused by unhealthy environments and relationships and driven by unhealthy relatedness styles. Depression is not contagious. It's not an illness. It's environmental in the sense that it is a result of negative internalizations in the formative environment but it is even more pernicious because the depressed individual carries those internalizations around with them for their whole lives unless they work them out somehow.

So the environment causes the developing child and adult to develop a highly inaccurate self-concept. By which time they may be abstracted from their environment but still will have tendency to be depressed.

Beck

Beck's Schema Theory

According to Beck's theory of the etiology of depression, depressed people acquire a negative schema of the world in childhood and adolescence; children and adolescents who suffer from depression acquire this negative schema earlier. Depressed people acquire such schemas through a loss of a parent, rejection by peers, criticism from teachers or parents, the depressive attitude of a parent and other negative events. When the person with such schemas encounters a situation that resembles in some way, even remotely, the conditions in which the original schema was learned, the negative schemas of the person are activated.

Cognitive Bias

Beck also included a **negative triad** in his theory. A negative triad is made up of the negative schemas and cognitive biases of the person. A cognitive bias is a view of the world. *Depressed people, according to this theory, have views such as "I never do a good job." A negative schema helps give rise to the cognitive bias, and the cognitive bias helps fuel the negative schema. This is the negative triad. Also, Beck proposed that depressed people often have the following cognitive biases: arbitrary inference, selective abstraction, overgeneralization, magnification and minimization. These cognitive biases are quick to make negative, generalized, and personal inferences of the self, thus fueling the negative schema.*

Types of Depression

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.

Bipolar Disorder

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.

Evidence suggests that environmental factors play a significant role in the development and course of bipolar disorder, and that individual psychosocial variables may interact with genetic dispositions. There is fairly consistent evidence from prospective studies that recent life events and interpersonal relationships contribute to the likelihood of onsets and recurrences of bipolar mood episodes, as they do for onsets and recurrences of unipolar depression. There have been repeated findings that between a third and a half of adults diagnosed with bipolar disorder report traumatic/abusive experiences in childhood, which is associated on average with earlier onset, a worse course, and more co-occurring disorders such as PTSD

Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD)

There are a few reasons why people with BPD, in particular, have trouble accepting emotions (although, it is important to note that everyone has trouble accepting emotions sometimes).

First, people with BPD were often raised in emotionally invalidating environments. These are environments where feelings are not accepted. Sometimes people with BPD were punished for expressing feelings, or sometimes they were told that they were weak for having feelings. This can lead a person with BPD to have trouble accepting their own emotions in adult life.

Second, people with BPD experience very intense emotions, and this intensity makes it harder to accept them. People with BPD will often describe feeling that they are afraid their emotions will "overwhelm" or "destroy" them. As a result, many people with BPD feel very afraid of their emotions and are convinced that they cannot tolerate their feelings.

The *disorder* typically involves unusual levels of instability in *mood*; "black and white" thinking, or "*splitting*"; chaotic and unstable *interpersonal relationships*, *self-image*, *identity*, and *behavior*; as well as a disturbance in the individual's *sense of self*. In extreme cases, this disturbance in the sense of self can lead to periods of *dissociation*.

*One finding is a history of childhood trauma (possibly child sexual abuse), although researchers have suggested diverse possible causes, such as a genetic predisposition, neurobiological factors, environmental factors, or brain abnormalities.^[7] The prevalence of BPD in the United States has been calculated as 1 percent to 3 percent of the adult population, with approximately 75 percent of those diagnosed being female. It has been found to account for 20 percent of psychiatric hospitalizations. Common *comorbid* (co-occurring) conditions are mental disorders such as substance abuse, depression and other *mood*, and personality disorders. BPD is one of four diagnoses classified as "*cluster B*" ("dramatic-erratic") personality disorders typified by disturbances in impulse control and *emotional dysregulation*, the others *being narcissistic, histrionic, and antisocial personality disorders*.*

Today BPD is considered a relatively stable personality disorder and is used more generally to describe non-psychotic individuals who display emotional dysregulation, splitting and an unstable self-image. Individuals with BPD are at high risk of developing other psychological disorders such as anxiety and depression. Other symptoms of BPD, such as dissociation, are frequently linked to severely traumatic childhood experiences, which some put forth as one of the many root causes of the borderline personality. BPD has many similar characteristics to emotionally unstable personality disorder, subtype borderline; and complex post-traumatic stress disorder

The *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-IV-TR), defines BPD as: "*a pervasive pattern of instability of interpersonal relationships, self-image and affects, as well as marked impulsivity*

- 1. Frantic efforts to avoid real or imagined abandonment. [Not including suicidal or self-injuring behavior covered in Criterion 5]*
- 2. A pattern of unstable and intense interpersonal relationships characterized by alternating between extremes of idealization and devaluation.*
- 3. Identity disturbance: markedly and persistently unstable self-image or sense of self.*

4. **Impulsivity** in at least two areas that are potentially self-damaging (e.g., **promiscuous sex, eating disorders, binge eating, substance abuse, reckless driving**). [Again, not including suicidal or self-injuring behavior covered in Criterion 5]
5. Recurrent **suicidal behavior**, gestures, threats or **self-injuring behavior** such as cutting, interfering with the healing of scars (excoriation) or picking at oneself.
6. **Affective** instability due to a marked reactivity of **mood** (e.g., intense episodic **dysphoria**, irritability or **anxiety** usually lasting a few hours and only rarely more than a few days).
7. *Chronic feelings of emptiness, worthlessness.*
8. *Inappropriate anger or difficulty controlling anger (e.g., frequent displays of temper, constant anger, recurrent physical fights).*
9. *Transient, stress-related paranoid ideation, delusions or severe dissociative symptoms*

Individuals with BPD can be very sensitive to the way others treat them, reacting strongly to perceived criticism or hurtfulness. Their feelings about others often shift from positive to negative, generally after a disappointment or perceived threat of losing someone. Self-image can also change rapidly from extremely positive to extremely negative. Impulsive behaviors are common, including alcohol or drug abuse, unsafe sex, gambling and recklessness in general. Attachment studies suggest individuals with BPD, while being high in intimacy- or novelty-seeking, can be hyper-alert^[20] to signs of rejection or not being valued and tend toward insecure, avoidant or ambivalent, or fearfully preoccupied patterns in relationships.^[26] They tend to view the world generally as dangerous and malevolent, and themselves as powerless, vulnerable, unacceptable and unsure in self-identity.

Individuals with BPD are often described, including by some mental health professionals (and in the DSM-IV), as deliberately manipulative or difficult, but analyses and findings generally trace behaviors to inner pain and turmoil, powerlessness and defensive reactions, or limited coping and communication skills

At least one researcher believes BPD results from a combination that can involve a traumatic childhood, a vulnerable temperament and stressful maturational events during adolescence or adulthood.

Childhood abuse, neglect or separation

*Numerous studies have shown a strong correlation between child abuse, especially child sexual abuse, and development of BPD. Many individuals with BPD report having had a history of abuse, neglect or separation as young children. Patients with BPD have been found to be significantly more likely to report having been verbally, emotionally, physically and sexually abused by caregivers of either gender. They were also much more likely to report having caregivers (of both genders) deny the validity of their thoughts and feelings. They were also reported to have failed to provide needed protection, and neglected their child's physical care. *Parents (of both sexes) were typically reported to have withdrawn from the child emotionally, and to have treated the child inconsistently.* Additionally, women with BPD who reported a previous history of neglect by a female caregiver and abuse by a male caregiver were consequently at significantly higher risk for being sexually abused by a noncaregiver (not a*

parent). It has been suggested that children who experience chronic early maltreatment and [attachment](#) difficulties may go on to develop borderline personality disorder.

Otto Kernberg formulated the theory of Borderline Personality based on a premise of failure to develop in childhood. Writing in the psychoanalytic tradition, Kernberg argued that failure to achieve the developmental task of psychic clarification of self and other can result in an increased risk to develop varieties of psychosis, while failure to overcome splitting results in an increased risk to develop a borderline personality.^[62]

There is evidence for the central role of family in the development of BPD, including interactions that are negative and critical rather than supportive and [empathic](#), with parental and family behaviors transacting with the child's own behaviors and emotional vulnerabilities, although no prospective studies have been conducted.^[63]

Schizophrenia

Schizophrenia is defined as a mental disorder characterized by abnormalities in the perception or expression of reality. It most commonly manifests as auditory hallucinations, paranoid or bizarre delusions, or disorganized speech and thinking with significant social or occupational dysfunction. Onset of symptoms typically occurs in young adulthood, with around 0.4–0.6% of the population affected. Diagnosis is based on the patient's self-reported experiences and observed behaviour. No laboratory test for schizophrenia currently exists.

In the thought disordered phase the subject exhibits some if not all the characteristics as defined in the textbooks. What is less well known is that this “divided self” is common to all in the developmental phases of a person’s existence. At times of stress the intensity of the psychic divide deepens. An individual can become completely swamped by their own internal representations and lose objectivity. This however is temporary and not permanent. Only at times of stress is the divided self-apparent or in situations of great stress and moment.

If the individual confidently addresses their fears then thought disorder recedes and the individual gain’s self-knowledge and moves on.

Unipolar Depression

Major depressive disorder (also known as clinical depression, major depression, unipolar depression, or unipolar disorder) is a mental disorder characterized by an all-encompassing low mood accompanied by low self-esteem, and loss of interest or pleasure in normally enjoyable activities. Unipolar depression was characterized by low feelings, lacking of self worth, incapacity and primarily the inability of the subject to believe that he or she can satisfy her own needs.

Current 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

Drug therapy has successfully superseded other forms of therapy for modern psychiatry. Modern psychoactive drugs suppress the emotive or so-called "sub-conscious" of the psyche. As a result they promote the conscious rational part of the psyche but at the expense of the individual's needs.

The patient's psyche has been effectively sedated. Whereas a patient on a drug regime can function and behave in a rational way drug therapy does not assist in satisfying their needs which is their driving motivation. In fact it helps to prolong the state of needs dissatisfaction.

Antipsychotics

Drug therapy a species of emotional repression

Common conditions with which antipsychotics might be used include schizophrenia, mania, and delusional disorder. They might be used to counter psychosis associated with a wide range of other diagnoses, such as psychotic depression. The original antipsychotic drugs were happened upon largely by chance and were tested empirically for their effectiveness.

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.

Psychiatry vs. Psychology(Psychological Models)

Trauma models of mental disorders (alternatively called trauma models of psychopathology) emphasize the effects of psychological trauma, particularly in early development, as the key causal factor in the development of some or many psychiatric disorders (in addition to post-traumatic stress disorder).

Trauma models are typically founded on the view that traumatic experiences (including but not limited to actual physical or sexual abuse) are more common or more serious than thought in the histories of those diagnosed with mental disorders. Such models have traditionally been associated with psychoanalytic approaches, notably Sigmund Freud's early ideas on childhood sexual abuse and hysteria.

John Bowlby, who developed attachment theory, also describes many forms of mental illness as based on early childhood trauma. In addition there is significant research supporting the linkage between early experiences of chronic maltreatment and later problems.

In the 1960s trauma models also became associated with humanist and anti-psychiatry approaches, particularly in regard to understanding schizophrenia and the role of the family.

Personality disorders have also been a focus, particularly borderline personality disorder.

Extreme versions of trauma models have implicated the fetal environment and the trauma of being born, or have been associated with recovered memory controversies.

More generally, trauma models highlight particularly stressful and traumatic factors in early attachment relations and in the development of mature interpersonal relationships. They are often

presented as a counterpoint to a psychiatry claimed to be too focused on genetics, neurochemistry and medication.

In the 1940s, '50s, '60s and '70s some mental health professionals proposed trauma models to understand schizophrenia: Harry Stack Sullivan, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, Theodore Lidz, Gregory Bateson, Silvano Arieti, R.D. Laing and others.

They held that schizophrenia is induced by experiences in profoundly disturbed families, or by attempts to cope with a damaging society. In the 1950s Sullivan's theory that schizophrenia is related to interpersonal relationships was widely accepted in the United States.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, or DSM, does not claim that the specific etiology of schizophrenia and other serious psychoses has been established. However, the psychogenic models proposed by these early researchers are no longer in vogue in the psychiatric profession.

Since the 1960s pharmacological treatments became the increasing focus of psychiatry, and by the 1980s the theory that the family dynamics could be implicated in schizophrenia became a taboo in many quarters.

Before his death in 2001, aged ninety, Lidz, one of the main proponents of the "schizophrenogenic" parent's theory, expressed regret that current research in biological psychiatry is "barking up the wrong tree". Like Lidz, Laing maintained until his death that the cause of both schizoid personalities and schizophrenia was influenced by family relationships. In 1975 Silvano Arieti won the American National Book Award in the field of science for his book, Interpretation of Schizophrenia, which advances a psychological model for understanding all the regressive types of the disorder.[6] According to more recent research, child abuse at home plays a causal role in depression, PTSD, eating disorders, substance abuse and dissociative disorders.[7]

The more severe the abuse the more probability symptoms will develop in adult life.[8] In the psychiatric field it is hypothesized that child abuse is less related to the most serious psychoses, such as schizophrenia.[verification needed] However, some mental health professionals maintain that the relationship is stronger in psychoses than neuroses.[9]

Critics of the model, such as August Piper Jr., argue that the logic of the claim that childhood trauma causes insanity demonstrates a serious flaw. If the claim were true, critics contend, the abuse of millions of children over the years should have caused many cases of insanity; but no evidence exists.[10]

Arieti had addressed this line of argumentation, stating that the only persons before whom young human beings are vulnerable are the ones to whom they are emotionally bonded in childhood. A passage of Interpretation of Schizophrenia, originally published in 1955, sheds light on the heart of the trauma model:

"First of all we have to repeat here what we already mentioned [...], that conditions of obvious external danger, as in the case of wars, disasters, or other adversities that affect the collectivity, do not produce the type of anxiety that hurts the inner self and do not themselves favor schizophrenia. Even extreme poverty, physical illness, or personal tragedies do not necessarily lead to schizophrenia unless they have psychological ramifications that hurt the sense of self. Even homes broken by death, divorce or desertion may be less destructive than homes where both parents are alive, live together, and always undermine the child's conception of himself.

Other Problems

Addictions

With substance abuse we seek to gain respite from our emotional pain however temporary that may be. Obviously with unresolved, trapped feelings there is an on-going cycle of emotional pain this has probably been there for a very long time.

Accept a drink if it's offered to be polite. Accept a smoke if someone has a pack and doesn't mind. But never buy them. They are lethal.

Change from being a proactive drinker and smoker - seeking out ever new opportunities to drink and smoke to being passive - if it comes our way that could be okay. Never be proactive in damaging our own health. That's the deal. That's self-abuse and we only feel stupid if we do that.

Don't be alone when drinking. That can never feel right. And the only I start doing is contacting other people when I am drunk. So stop being a proactive drinker - that knocks the home drinking on the head completely - and that's about 90% of it. Again with the smoking avoid.

Obviously with a lot of emotional pain an addiction problem is probably inevitable. It's always important to realise that alcohol affects different people in different ways. Some people have a lot of emotional pain but managed to avoid addiction. Some can't. Alcohol has its own power. It's deceiving. It promises to take away the emotional pain but then it comes back afterwards. And if alcohol or a boozy life is the preferred option then the solution is always out of reach.

Addiction does not moderate by itself – we must change our habits with alcohol to get that moderate solution.

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

Hangovers are not hangovers. They are emotional uplifts followed the next day by emotional repression. When I am drinking first of all I am relaxed. I forgive everyone who may have hurt me. I started to that irrepressible joie de vivre, goodwill toward all men and women and I start to believe it. So something is actualized in me by drinking. I think it's the fundamental aspect of everyone's self-concept which is in the Catholic locus the universal brotherhood of man and woman. Because in a pub we are all friends - no matter what. So something is getting actualized that is usually repressed.

Drinking Alone Don't do it!

So perhaps the new rule is no drinking alone. I don't notice when I am with other people that I drink faster than them. There are rounds. That's it. You're in a round. But alone I find I drink very fast - get very drunk very quickly and there is no joy of companionship. So it is a lonely and unrewarding experience. I would guess the 2 Marks never drink alone. And Martin I doubt it. Me yes sometimes I do.

What's fun about drinking is not being on your own drinking. That's a pretty empty experience. It's being around other people and enjoying the good cheer that results having said that the hangovers are still crushing. But I think my next phase with drinking is not to drink alone and not to buy any beer to drink by myself. And maybe have a glass of wine with Urns. But from now no drinking alone, going to pubs to drink alone, have a coffee if you are in a pub during the day. And don't drink at home at all really. Save the units for social occasions.

I do believe as well that panic sets in with drinking on your own. The elusive buzz is being chased. And so drink faster, drink more. And would guess the hangovers are worse because it's really miserable the next day.

The answer is emotional. What's depressing is considering being alone in a pub a social event. It's not. That's a depressing interlude with oneself. Most women appreciate that their relationships are the most important things to them. Some men have difficulty with that. What The insight here is that drinking alone or going to a pub alone is not a time of good cheer – it's not an emotionally rewarding experience – and the only time drinking really makes any sense is when there are friends and family around.

So there was a time when drinking alone made sense to me, in fact may even have been quite important – necessary. But that time is passed, so time to let be in the past. I think men of my age drink alone because they are lonely. And they don't relate well to other people. So there is definitely the perception that the pub is a place of lost dreams and sadness. And it can be that place. I do think there is nothing better than a group of people out enjoying themselves and having a few drinks.

Addiction is defined as the compulsive, physiological need for and use of a habit forming substance. It is characterized by tolerance and well-defined physiological symptoms upon withdrawal. All addictive drugs produce a reward system in the brain. Using addictive drugs gives us a feeling of well-being and alleviates bad feelings. After using a drug for a period of time, users frequently develops a tolerance to the drug (they need more of the substance to accomplish the same feeling as when they began using the substance.)

*Unresolved events from the past
Beliefs you hold that are inconsistent with the truth
Inability to cope with current conditions*

Drinking in a way that is disconnected from other people, drinking I suppose regardless of what the people around are doing is a lonely, isolated affair. But in my family context people are so critical that it's hard to imagine how I could be on other's people wavelengths in that way. If John drinks he drinks alone and if Mark drinks he wants to be around his friends. There certainly no context for familial drinking. There never was. It was always frowned upon and discouraged.

I think drink actually makes it harder to change because it affirms the flawed self-concept. It essentially is saying things are okay when they really are not okay. So rather than change I will drink. So alcohol is a trap and is the enemy of personal growth and certainly complicates it. There is also the relax – it's fun right. There is two sides to being anally retentive - the one side is yes people drink too much - but drinking with friends for good cheer - is that a decent thing to do?

Drink is a powerful argument for the status quo - may even make the status quo acceptable. But then again maybe the status quo is okay - not too bad. Alcohol is a dichotomy - because it is on the one hand a trap and other hand liberation. So which is it? Well it's neither. That depends. I don't think there is an answer to that - at least not one I know. Teetotalers are probably dry alcoholics - depressing people. Lushes are a disaster - can't get anything together.

There was a time when I would really beat up on myself for having 8 cans but now I don't. Now I am cool enough with myself to be cool with what I do.

Eating Disorders

Clearly the emotional eating follows on from the drinking. So caution gets thrown to the wind. With less drinking there will be less eating.

Eating to feed a feeling, and not a growling stomach, is emotional eating.

"Emotional eating is eating for reasons other than hunger," says Jane Jakubczak, a registered dietitian at the University of Maryland. "Instead of the physical symptom of hunger initiating the eating, an emotion triggers the eating."

1. Emotional hunger comes on suddenly; physical hunger occurs gradually.

2. When you are eating to fill a void that isn't related to an empty stomach, you crave a specific food, such as pizza or ice cream, and only that food will meet your need. When you eat because you are actually hungry, you're open to options.

3. Emotional hunger feels like it needs to be satisfied instantly with the food you crave; physical hunger can wait.

Even when you are full, if you're eating to satisfy an emotional need, you're more likely to keep eating. When you're eating because you're hungry, you're more likely to stop when you're full.

Emotional eating can leave behind feelings of guilt; eating when you are physically hungry does not.

When eating becomes the only or main strategy a person uses to manage emotions, explains Jakubczak, then problems arise -- especially if the foods a person is choosing to eat to satisfy emotions aren't exactly healthy.

"If you eat when you are not hungry, chances are your body does not need the calories," says Jakubczak. "If this happens too often, the extra calories get stored as fat, and too much fat storage can cause one to be overweight, which may present some health risks."

"The first thing one needs to do to overcome emotional eating is to recognize it."

Eating too fast

The best solution would be to eat smaller meals more often. This policy I have always had of binging and then trying to starve myself later never works. Order a small quantity of food and eat it slowly and then be prepared to eat again at some later time also slowly. I was in pain today after my lunch which I ate in five seconds flat and I keep thinking I am going to have a heart attack when really it is just constant heart burn. Completely unnecessary and avoidable.

Heavy carnivores were the exception, most ate a semi-vegetarian diet. They followed the ¾ rule. Stop eating when they are ¾ full.

They ate smaller meals more frequently. Eat most at breakfast. Eat meat the weekends. Fresh fruit less salt drink tea, drink glass of wine per day, garlic, eat fish, apples, brown rice, berry, sea weed, broccoli, oats, soup, chew 30 times, nuts and seeds, sesame oil, vinegar, honey, mushrooms, burdock root, tomato – lower risk of cancer, sea salt, water, cherries good for diabetes, olive oil good for blood p, carbonation – bad for bones, contains phosphoric acid, avoid caffeine, orange peel, overeating very bad for heart,

Commercial feed for animals is full of growth-stimulating hormones. The meat comes from diseased animals raised in stressful, inhumane conditions.

Physical Evidence

All the signs I ignore of gluttony which are incredibly obvious - such as flatulence, burping, farting, indigestion, diarrhea, sometimes constipation. These are all clear indications that too much food and drink and not the right kind of food is going into the system. The system is merely reflecting what is put into it. So now I realize of course that it has always been incredibly obvious. And I always ignored it.

So it's no mystery and I don't need to be Einstein to figure it out. Those physical indications are what stop people from overindulging because are a physical reminder to stop and a physical reminder of the consequences of not stopping. They are also unpleasant reminders of over-indulgence – sometimes painful in the case of indigestion.

Heartburn, also known as pyrosis, cardialgia, or acid indigestion is a burning sensation in the chest, just behind the breastbone or in the epigastrium. The pain often rises in the chest and may radiate to the neck, throat, or angle of the jaw.

Heartburn is usually associated with regurgitation of gastric acid (gastric reflux) which is the major symptom of gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD). It however may also be a symptom of ischemic heart disease, though this is true for only 0.6% of those experiencing heartburn.

Small Portions

With eating the necessity is to eat enough so that I don't starve. That's the only reason for eating - because I need to. What I doing is eating far more than I need. I am eating very fast. Sometimes standing up. I am eating a lot of same type of food which is not recommended. And I have all these unpleasant side effects, bloating, gas, indigestion, heartburn. I feel awful afterwards. Think about eating only when I am hungry. Not about eating because I haven't eaten in while, because its dinner time. Eat when you are hungry. You will never be fat.

The thing about it is I may be a little bit hungry when I go to eat and eating something small would satisfy that and rather than trying to skip meals and so on just eat a little and stop. And if I do that I won't feel like eating more.

Stress Related Illnesses

Hypochondria – Fear of Heart Attack

This debilitating condition is the result of an inaccurate perception of the body's condition despite the absence of an actual medical condition. Hypochondriacs become unduly alarmed about any physical symptoms they detect, no matter how minor the symptom may be. They are convinced that they have or are about to be diagnosed with a serious illness. Often, hypochondria persists even after a physician has evaluated a person and reassured them that their concerns about symptoms do not have an underlying medical basis or, if there is a medical illness, their concerns are far in excess of what is appropriate for the level of disease.

Many hypochondriacs focus on a particular symptom as the catalyst of their worrying, such as gastro-intestinal problems, palpitations, or muscle fatigue.

Hypochondriac Syndrome is categorized as a somatic amplification disorder—a disorder of "perception and cognition"—that involves a hyper-vigilance of the body's situation and a tendency to react to the initial perceptions in a negative manner that is further debilitating. Hypochondriasis manifests in many ways. Some people have numerous intrusive thoughts and physical sensations that push them to check with family, friends, and physicians.

Other people are so afraid of any reminder of illness that they will avoid medical professionals for a seemingly minor problem, sometimes to the point of becoming neglectful of their health when a serious condition may exist and go undiagnosed. Yet others live in despair and depression, certain that they have a life-threatening disease and no physician can help them. Some consider the disease as a punishment for past misdeeds.

Hypochondriasis is often accompanied by other psychological disorders. Clinical depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), phobias, and somatization disorder are the most common accompanying conditions in people with hypochondriasis, as well as a generalized anxiety disorder diagnosis at some point in their life.

Many people with hypochondriasis experience a cycle of intrusive thoughts followed by compulsive checking, which is very similar to the symptoms of obsessive-compulsive disorder. However, while people with hypochondriasis are afraid of having an illness, patients with OCD worry about getting an illness or of transmitting an illness to others. Although some people might have both, these are distinct conditions.

Patients with hypochondriasis often are not aware that depression and anxiety produce their own physical symptoms, and mistake these symptoms for manifestations of a non-psychological disorder or disease. For example, people with depression often experience changes in appetite and weight fluctuation, fatigue, decreased interest in sex and motivation in life overall.

Intense anxiety is associated with rapid heartbeat, palpitations, sweating, muscle tension, stomach discomfort, dizziness, and numbness or tingling in certain parts of the body (hands, forehead, etc.). It is common for serious illnesses or deaths of family members or friends to trigger hypochondria in certain individuals. This is what I associate with ego death.

Similarly, when approaching the age of a parent's premature death from disease, many otherwise healthy, happy individuals fall prey to hypochondria. These individuals believe they are suffering from the same disease that caused their parent's death, sometimes causing panic attacks with corresponding symptoms.

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

Suicide (Latin suicidium, from sui caedere, to kill oneself) is the intentional taking of one's own life. Many dictionaries also note the metaphorical sense of "willful destruction of one's self-interest"[1] (e.g., "political suicide"). Suicide may occur for a number of reasons, including depression, shame, guilt, desperation, physical pain, emotional pressure, anxiety, financial difficulties, or other undesirable situations.

The Abrahamic religions consider suicide an offense towards God due to religious belief in the sanctity of life. In the West it was often regarded as a serious crime.

Japanese views on honor and religion led to seppuku, one of the most painful methods of suicide, to be respected as a means to atone for mistakes or failure, or as a form of protest during the samurai era. In the 20th century, suicide in the form of self-immolation has been used as a form of protest, and in the form of kamikaze and suicide bombing as a military or terrorist tactic.

Sati is a Hindu funeral practice in which the widow would immolate herself on her husband's funeral pyre, either willingly, or under pressure from the family and in-laws.

Medically assisted suicide (euthanasia or the right to die) is currently a controversial ethical issue involving people who are terminally ill, in extreme pain, and/or have minimal quality of life through injury or illness. Self-sacrifice for others is not usually considered suicide, as the goal is not to kill oneself but to save another.

The predominant view of modern medicine is that suicide is a mental health concern, associated with psychological factors such as the difficulty of coping with depression, inescapable suffering or fear, or other mental disorders and pressures.

A suicide attempt is sometimes interpreted as a "cry for help" and attention, or to express despair and the wish to escape, rather than a genuine intent to die. Most people who attempt suicide do not complete suicide on a first attempt; those who later gain a history of repetitions have a significantly higher probability of eventual completion of suicide.

In the Western world, males die much more often by means of suicide than do females, although females attempt suicide more often. This pattern has held for at least a century.[citation needed] Some medical professionals believe this stems from the fact that males are more likely to end their lives through effective violent means (guns, knives, hanging, etc.), while women primarily use more failure-prone methods such as overdosing on medications.

In the United States, individuals who express the intent to harm themselves are automatically determined to lack the present mental capacity to refuse treatment, and can be transported to the emergency department against their will. An emergency physician will determine whether inpatient care at a mental health care facility is warranted. This is sometimes referred to as being "committed".

In most forms of Christianity, suicide is considered a sin, based mainly on the writings of influential Christian thinkers of the Middle Ages, such as St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas; suicide was not considered a sin under the Byzantine Christian code of Justinian, for instance.

Judaism focuses on the importance of valuing this life, and as such, suicide is tantamount to denying God's goodness in the world. Despite this, under extreme circumstances when there has seemed no choice but to either be killed or forced to betray their religion, Jews have committed individual suicide or mass suicide (see Masada, First French persecution of the Jews, and York

Castle for examples) and as a grim reminder there is even a prayer in the Jewish liturgy for "when the knife is at the throat", for those dying "to sanctify God's Name". (See: Martyrdom).

Resolving My Trapped Feelings

Releasing Trapped Feelings

Acceptance

Acceptance of my own feelings is at the heart of resolving my trapped feelings. My feelings were trapped because they were denied, and because there was internalisations concerning the consequences of acknowledging my feelings.

Strategies for Releasing Trapped Feelings

- *Always remember this: There are no bad or wrong feelings. Everything you feel is exactly what you need to feel right now.*
- *If your feelings seem too overwhelming to allow you to function as you need to, try setting aside specific times every day to allow whatever feelings you have to come up. Once your feelings know you're willing to have them, they'll usually be quite happy to come and go quickly, a little bit at a time. **It's when you're fighting them that things can get really bad.***
- *Let yourself express your feelings physically. Cry, shout or scream if you need to. Find something to pound on or break. Go sit in the closet if you need to get away from people. Emotions are designed to move you to do something, and if you leave out the "doing something" part, you're not fully expressing the feeling. Just be sure there's no one else on the receiving end who could be hurt—or who might be inclined to call the police because you're acting a little strangely.*
- *Don't try to talk or reason yourself out of your feelings. **Instead, try to have a conversation with them, as if you were talking to someone else. Ask them where they're coming from, what they're about, and what they are trying to tell you.** Keep a private journal where you have these conversations with your feelings that you never share with anyone else. That way, you won't have to worry about subconsciously censoring yourself.*

Counseling – A Guide to Reality

Sometimes the simple process of being able to vent one's feelings — that is, to express them to a concerned and understanding listener, is enough to relieve frustration and make it possible for the frustrated individual to advance to a problem-solving frame of mind, better able to cope with a personal difficulty that is affecting his work adversely.

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.

Journaling – An Outlet for Repressed Feelings

Writing about difficult, even traumatic, experiences appears to be good for health on several levels – raising immunity and other health measures and improving life functioning.

Deep disclosure improves mood, objective and subjective health, and the ability to function well. Classic studies by psychologist James W. Pennebaker, PhD and his colleagues have proved the health value of personal disclosure. In a classic 1988 study by Pennebaker, Kiecolt-Glaser and Glaser, 50 healthy undergraduates were assigned to write about either traumatic experiences or superficial topics for four days in a row. Six weeks after the writing sessions, students in the trauma group reported more positive moods and fewer illnesses than those writing about everyday experiences. Furthermore, improved measures of cellular immune-system function and fewer visits to the student health center for those writing about painful experiences suggested that confronting traumatic experiences was physically beneficial.

Findings like these underscore that writing is an easy, inexpensive, independent and relatively universal way for people can resist the mental and physical ravages of stress and disease.

Research findings that disclosure aids learning and even improves grade-point average highlight the practical value of disclosure in some form.

Anyone who has benefited from keeping a diary or a journal can further justify the time and effort, secure in the knowledge that disclosing innermost thoughts and feelings – even or especially about bad experiences -- is good for health. Therapists increasingly encourage patients to undertake writing exercises outside of the clinical setting. Meanwhile, bookstores do a brisk business in selling blank journals and there are books and even a magazine that guide people through the process.

Liberate Repressed/Trapped/Subconscious Feelings

Mary never formed part of this process. She was not a repressed feeling. MF was for example. But not Mary. That clearly makes the point that this is about repressed feelings. Otherwise I should have on-going internal representations but I don't. It's all historical.

All the trapped feelings are contained in the repressed, sub-conscious. The resolution is that the repressed aspect of my self is ultimately integrated and overall positivity is then regained.

It occurs to me also that why would I not be negative about my past life? I was trapped in a type of work I didn't like and I didn't get on with the people around me. I was single. It was pretty negative and also in my 20s when I felt I was getting some place I was just as positive as I am now. So naturally I experienced repeated negative setbacks and disappointments.

Complete the cycle of trapped feelings then I adjust my behaviour accordingly and the feeling is gone. It no longer arises. So in that sense by listening to myself I correct these imbalances of feeling that I have always had.

There are no right or wrong feelings. Feelings are not demonic or wicked. They tend to be much more insistent and demanding when they are being ignored or we are trying to suppress them or rationalise them. They do tend to form a type of personification particularly trapped feelings from childhood.

Emotional Acceptance

What Is Emotional Acceptance?

Many people with borderline personality disorder (BPD), and other psychiatric disorders that involve intense emotional experiences, have trouble accepting emotions. It's very hard to accept

emotions that are painful, extreme and sometimes even scary; however, accepting emotions can actually help improve your emotion regulation and lead to less mood swings and more emotional balance.

Often, when we have an uncomfortable feeling, such as sadness, fear or shame, our first reaction is to reject that feeling. We may tell ourselves that the feeling is a “bad feeling” that we do not want to have. *Next, we may do something to try to get rid of the feeling, such as trying to push the feeling away or using drugs or alcohol to feel better.*

Certainly, no one wants to walk around feeling emotional pain all of the time, but when we reject our emotions, we may actually make things worse for ourselves (see this article on problems associated with suppressing emotions). And often, emotions arise because they give us helpful information about the world. So sometimes getting rid of emotions is not the best idea.

An alternative is learning to accept your emotional experiences. Accepting means that you practice allowing your emotions to be what they are, without judging them or trying to change them. Acceptance means letting go of attempts to control your emotions and learning that emotions themselves cannot harm you (although, the things we do to try to get rid of emotions, i.e., using alcohol, can harm you).

Accepting Emotions Is Not Resigning Yourself to Pain

It is important to make the distinction between acceptance and resignation. Accepting emotions do not mean that you resign yourself to always feeling terrible or wallowing in pain. It also doesn't mean that you hold on to painful emotions or try to push yourself to experience emotional pain. Acceptance simply means being aware of your emotions and accepting them for what they are right now.

As a metaphor for acceptance, imagine that you are a soldier who has fought a long battle with your emotions. Acceptance is the act of putting down your weapons and walking away from the fight. You are not resigning yourself to be beat up by your emotions; you are simply letting go of the struggle.

In some ways, accepting emotions means also accepting that emotions will change. When we are happy, we have to accept that it is a short-term condition: we will not always be happy. Also, when we are sad, this is a short-term condition too.

Why Accepting Emotions Is Helpful

Why is accepting emotions helpful? What is the point of trying to accept your emotions, and wouldn't it be easier to just get rid of them? Well, no, it isn't easy to get rid of emotions. In fact, most people with BPD have tried to get rid of their emotions with little success. What they have learned (and what research supports) is that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for us to just get rid of an emotion.

We have emotions for a reason, so you shouldn't want to get rid of them completely. Emotions are part of a complex system that helps us decide what we should stay away from and what we should approach. Emotions also help us keep lasting relationships with other people. Without emotions, we would make terrible decisions all the time! Therefore, accepting emotions is helpful, because when we listen to our emotions, we can actually learn important information.

How to Practice Accepting Emotions

It is not easy to learn how to accept emotions, because they often do not feel very good and we have instincts that may tell us to avoid them. With persistent practice, though, you can learn how to be more accepting of your emotions. Mindfulness meditation, or the practice of being aware of

both your internal and external experiences, can be tremendously useful as you are learning how to accept your emotions.

Recognition Of Feelings

Our repressed feelings have to fight for recognition from ourselves. The conscious inclination is to try to rationalise them when they are upsetting or bothersome and this however is not the necessity – we must recognise our own feelings and not dismiss them. Denying recognition and dismissing the way we feel represses our feelings.

When we allow our feelings to speak we find out that at the heart of today's feelings we want to die. We still struggle to repress our feelings under the assumption that we have no more bad feelings. Accepting our feelings means recognising our own feelings – accepting means releasing. Denying recognition continues the repression and continues the entrapment of our feelings. Recognising our own feelings means recognising them no matter how weird, terrible, awful or undesirable or unpalatable they may. There are no wrong feelings.

The fact is that every feeling we have belongs to us. It is our property and we possess it. It is a message from our emotional selves to ourselves. We should not ignore or dismiss any of these messages.

How to help

- *Acknowledge anniversaries, birthdays etc. and include the child in planning for these.*
- *If appropriate, allow the child to choose a personal keepsake.*
- *Encourage the child to talk to you about their sadness, fears and worries.*
- *Share memories of the deceased, both happy and sad.*
- *Reassure the child that it is common to experience a lot of strange and unfamiliar feelings after a death.*
- *Try to keep a predictable routine and encourage the child to keep up with their friends.*
- *Reassure them about your own health status but also talk to them about who would take care of them if you got very sick.*
- *Enlist the support of family and friends and particularly teachers.*
- *Talk to your G.P. if your child's behaviour is causing you concern.*

Giving good support

- *Encourage them to tell their own loved one's story*
- *Encourage them to tell their own story*
- *Listen without interrupting*
- *Acknowledge their feelings*
- *Accept their feelings without challenging them*
- *Sit with their pain*
- *Let them cry – tell them sad doesn't mean bad*
- *Invite them to do things they would normally enjoy*
- *If you say you will call make sure you do*
- *Avoid making promises you can't keep*
- *Remember significant dates, birthdays or they day they died*
- *Bring up the deceased person's name in conversation*

- *Reminisce with them*
- *Offer practical help – cooking meals, shopping, babysitting etc.*
- *Suggest they see a counsellor if they seem to have difficulties resuming their normal activities*
- *Offer to accompany them to first time appointments – bank etc.*
- *Encourage them to re-establish their routine*
- *Invite them for a walk or a drive.*

Be mindful that for the bereaved there are no time limits to their grief.

If death were discussed more openly in families and in schools – people would see it for what it is another part of life.

We are all amateurs at grief, it comes to us all, and we must all go through it. To treat grief as a problem to be fixed, or worse still to medicalize it, is to rob us of the extraordinary privilege of encountering the experience on our terms.” P1

Positives on Grief

- *The aim of overcoming your grief isn't to forget your loved one but to learn to live without them physically in your life. Eventually, most people who are grieving get to a point where they can invest emotionally in developing a new and different connection with their loved one.*
- *People often find it helpful to tell the story of the person who has died.*
- *Positive things to do*
 - *Donate or plant a tree*
 - *Celebrate their birthday*

As with most unpleasant events, often the anticipation is worse than the event itself. This is commonly referred to as “anticipatory” anxiety. People usually feel less anxious once the procedure is underway because they have a greater sense of control, especially as they know the end is in sight. Reminiscing allows you to access fond memories that help you maintain a connection with your loved one.

If you keep in the mind the continuous wave-like pattern of grief it will help you acknowledge that the holidays are likely to trigger waves of significant intensity.

One important component of making this decision is realizing that this doesn't mean forgetting your loved one or getting over their death but instead finding a way to incorporate your experiences and memories of them into your life, as it is now.

Grief is not an illness with a prescribed cure.. The experience of grief is not linear. It is wave-like.

Contrary to popular belief, empathy is not about imagining how you would behave or react in the same situation. It is about forgetting your own perspective, focusing on someone else's experience, and imagining what life is like for them at that point in time.

Mature Relatedness

Being Mature

The status of maturity is distinguished by the shift away from reliance on guardianship and the oversight of an adult in decision-making acts. Jerome Bruner proposed the purpose of the period of immaturity as being a time for experimental play without serious consequences, where a young animal can spend a great deal of time observing the actions of skilled others in coordination with oversight by and activity with its mother.

In psychology, maturity is the ability to respond to the environment in an appropriate manner. This response is generally learned rather than instinctive, and is not determined by one's age.

Maturity also encompasses being aware of the correct time and place to behave and knowing when to act appropriately, according to the circumstances and the culture of the society one lives in.

Adult development and maturity theories include the purpose in life concept, in which maturity emphasizes a clear comprehension of life's purpose, directedness, and intentionality which, contributes to the feeling that life is meaningful.

A depressed person in this context would be unable to mature. Time passes but they don't grow emotionally. I think that has to be pretty devastating and depressing to be caught in an immature cycle of living. For people who are healthy emotionally they go through a natural and undramatic maturation process. Someone who is 20 is clearly less mature than someone who is 45. The natural cycle of my development was highly interrupted.

I think maybe I suspect a lot of "sensible" people I have stay on the pathway of parental approval. But I found that when I came off that and throw off this idealisation relationship with my mother that was really a significant turning point for me. So I suppose as regard partial narcissists I guess they are conformists basically and that is who they are. In some ways there are advantages. I don't think any of them would be envious of me at the moment.

But as I have discovered it's not what other think about me that matters. What matters is how I think about myself. And I was wrong to think they would judge and reject me for being myself - in fact quite the opposite. I get on with all of them much better.

Not Characterising others in relation to me

I would tend to characterise people according to how they make me feel or how I feel in relation to them. That is not how they are or ever were. It's not allowing other people to be when I characterise them. Why characterise anybody? If I feel good about myself then that's all that matters. It's got nothing to do with other people how I feel. How I feel is my business.

That's not to say people don't characterise – I am sure they do. But it's only revealing of my own inner insecurities. I think people can know this and project a façade which means they need a safe place to de-stress in.

I am eternally benchmarking my feelings based on my interactions. There isn't really any connection. I used to think my feelings were driven by my associations. It was always truer to say I was driven by my feelings. I was passion led and so I could only really connect with people I felt comfortable with. And that became in an emotive way very limited. But actually was the evolution of my emotional journey to self that was driving these internal representations and that was the pathway I was on and I couldn't really stray off it – not comfortably.

What I saying in essence is - I was always feelings led. It's truer to say my feelings were guiding me on the pathway to myself. And so that is why it entailed some fancy footwork from time to time. Having reached my destination I find that there is nothing here in particular - which is fine I don't mind that.

I think I have been driven on groove and that driving force has evaporated. So what now? Well I don't have to do anything. It's done. The transition is complete. It's the same old stage but I like it a lot more than I did. I think the groove has been feelings driving me to self. That's the groove. I think it's a train that you can't get off until you reach the station. I think there is something pretty inevitable about it - because those who have not completed their journey are obvious to me now.

Ending My Narcissistic Relatedness

There is no need to control or dismiss anyone. Relatedness finds its own natural balance and childhood strategies to control and dismiss feelings are not necessary in maturity.

Correcting Deficit in Self-love and Self-esteem

Stop Buddying Up

Stop trying to buddy up with people and form folie – a deux all over the place. I am not a rebel. But I am not aligned. I was a dissident from my own culture. As it has turned out I know the people around me. They do not know me necessarily. But there are degrees to it. I actually think the understanding I have always sought I find in myself and not in the admiration of people I don't know or competing and beating the people I do know. I was a maverick – in and out of other groups and never staying to long nor be able to bear their expectations of me. But in maturity I am a rock not a rolling stone.

Don't Idealise/Don't Be Passion Led

A man who has not passed through the inferno of his passions has never overcome them.

It's clear to me now that my level of emotional repression was too high for me to function successfully or certainly in the way I wanted. As the repression reduced so the functionality improved. I was always passion led – this I did not appreciate in the controlled phase – but now I do and I am no longer.

I could give in to any feeling really if I allowed myself but I have the power to choose and I need just to exercise that power. The internalization gives rise to a feeling of emotional helplessness – I am the victim always of powerful conflicting emotions over which I have basically no control and no learning from. But that doesn't have to be the case. Yes I have strong feelings – which I do know. But I don't have to be led always by my passion. I can choose and decide. So if I feel a bit knackered go to bed. If I concerned about my lack of progress set some metrics for myself.

I do have the ability to choose and my emotions are directed within the framework of my objectivity and reason. So just as I wrote some time ago that creativity must always be within an objective framework so too must emotions. Emotions cannot supersede objectivity. That can never be a good thing. Because then I become passion led and neurotic.

There is no need to impose relatedness on people. It's a given. It's for granted. There is no need to struggle in relatedness. There never was.

1. *Focus on outcomes not on personalities.*
2. *Don't worry about how other people behave or how things are for them. That's their lives.*
3. *Don't be a perfectionist.*
4. *I do have the ability to choose and my emotions are directed within the framework of my objectivity and reason. So just as I wrote some time ago that creativity must always be within an objective framework so too must emotions. Emotions cannot supersede objectivity. That can never be a good thing. Because then I become passion led and neurotic.*
5. *The resolution of my relatedness problem is the resolution of this problem. Until it was resolved I was necessarily defensive, risk averse and fearful of entering problem situations. But there are no problem situations. There are just tasks and choices to be made along the way. Nothing complicated.*

Don't Control

1. *Control is against relatedness and creates problems. The control I was trying to subject other people too was an index of control I subjected my feelings too.*
2. *There is gratitude in relatedness and there is a regret and sadness in the failure of relatedness.*
3. *Control is an illusion. There is no control. Letting go is the realization and catharsis of this. Control creates sorrow and struggle. We do not control the reality around us. It unfolds independently of our feelings. I let go of control to be free. In so doing I surrender to reality as it unfolds.*
4. *The idealizing/dismissive relationship is dyadic. Accepting people as they are and not idealizing them is far better. And it's the truth.*

Don't Dismiss

1. *Dismissing is teenage, punitive and unnecessary. It was an attempt to control people. It creates instability and uncertainty. All is cast into doubt and then must be recovered leading of course to conditional relatedness.*
2. *I avoid the cycle of immature relatedness: Judgmental (self-righteous) leading to judged, dismissive and contemptuous leading to dismissed and contemptible, conditional acceptance leading to powerlessly striving, confused and needy.*
3. *Don't have an agenda for anyone. They don't work. I have no agenda in relatedness.*
4. *I was dismissive of my own feelings. My feelings didn't matter to me. Dismissing my own feelings is an offence against me. It's self-abusive. Dismissing does not allow for emotional growth.*
5. *Dismissing seems like a possible cause for the entrapment of my feelings. My feelings were dismissed - and I kept dismissing. And on I went. And I trapped more feelings.*

6. *I “agree to disagree” for me is far better than dismissing. But before that I accept how I feel. Not just the parts I like but all of it. And then I am not surprised by how I feel. Because I have already felt. I also have to listen to other people - even when they say things I don't like - and accept and process that. Then I think I will have much more balance.*
7. *Dismissiveness offends other adults. It's off putting. And they will do nothing for you if you dismiss them. And it doesn't matter if you come crawling back - conditional relatedness. There won't be any healing with dismissiveness.*
8. *I can trace my dismissive nature back to my relationship with my parents. And I began to dismiss my own feelings in order to relate to them and that's how it started.*

Dismissing seems like the most likely cause for the entrapment of my feelings. My feelings were dismissed - and I kept dismissing. And on I went. And I trapped more feelings.

I “agree to disagree” for me is far better than dismissing. But before that I accept how I feel. Not just the parts I like but all of it. And then I am not surprised by how I feel. Because I have already felt. I also have to listen to other people - even when they say things I don't like - and accept and process that. Then I think I will have much more balance.

Because of my dismissive nature I struggled in relatedness.

Dismissiveness offends other adults. It's off putting. And they will do nothing for you if you dismiss them. And it doesn't matter if you come crawling back - conditional relatedness. There won't be any healing with dismissiveness.

In this realization all dismissive cycles including the office job dismissive cycle collapse and liberated for me. I see and identify and I realize my pattern of idealizing and rejecting my own feelings and I realize of course that they are neither ideal nor contemptible.

Universality of Relatedness

Mature men have other healthy relationships. There's a saying that goes: **"How you handle anything is how you handle everything."** This saying applies a good deal into relationships. If a man seems to have a lot of problems with his friends, his peers, and his family - and never seems to do anything about it except complain - then it's a sign that he may not be as mature as he looks.

Remember that everyone has similar emotional needs (including you!) Because I didn't know what my emotional needs were I was inept in relatedness and unaware of other peoples emotional needs which is why as I learned better my emotional needs my relatedness to others automatically and gradually improved. To be fair to me I was just as dismissive of my own emotional needs as I was of others.

Knowing My Emotional Self

To know ourselves we must let go of our schema. We can live our lives through the lens of our schema but it is better to relinquish that schema and accept reality as it is not as we think it should be. How we might it to be is an index of unresolved feelings from our schemas. How have we been hurt and how are struggling to fix that hurt so that we might ever so vulnerable again, so that we might not endure such injustices and never have to feel that way again.

In this process our feelings become attenuated and truncated. The natural evolution of our pain is to find catharsis in ourselves not in other people or even in tasks. Such things will not bring resolution.

In this we must confront our worst fears. If we can conceive of them then we have accepted and forgiven them.

And what is the worst that can happen? That we let go of the illusion of control and thereby fear ourselves from our own past.

Parents – Completing Cycle of Self

Our parents complete the emotional schematic cycle. Our parents are the end of the emotional rainbow as much as they are the beginning. Finding peace on these relationships ends the necessity for the emotional schematic.

Emotionally accepting and forgiving both parents. We must to be ourselves emerge from our childhood schema and to do that we must forgive and accept both of our parents and reach a resting on point on both sides of our formative identity. When this is accomplished then the emotional connection that has existed from birth is accepted, released and resolved.

This is the signal turning point in emotional maturation. Life is no longer viewed through the lens of parental interactions and internalisations. We can really be ourselves and live life as we see it. No longer are we hamstrung to someone else.

End of Internalization

The internalisation process begins with parents and the schema ends with the ending of parental internalisation. In so doing we take full emotional responsibility for our own lives.

I think it is okay not to love or like my parents. What I am saying here is I no longer idealise my parents, nor do I reject them. There is no need to be dismissive of my parents or their memory. And that is where the dismissiveness started. Just like Clare said. What happens when I idealise someone is then I reject them when they depart the ideal as they invariably will and so a cycle develops of idealisation and rejection.

If I stop idealising my parental relations – then I no longer find I have any need to reject them either. I no longer feel disappointed because my expectations of my parent and my former parent are realistic and I know what they are and were like and I understand how that made me feel and I know who I am and how I differ from them.

Idealisation is the obvious choice when reality is very disappointing. I had a fictional understanding of my parents because real sense of them was that I strongly disapproved of them and their shenanigans.

At the heart of my dismissiveness was my relationship with my parents – it was my fundamental dismissive relationship. This was an on-going relationship for me because I was interacting and am interacting on an on-going basis with my parent and formerly parents.

Since that forms the basis of my idealisation of them then it is fine. Basically ending the cycle of idealisation and rejection in favour of the truth about who I am and being myself. I find that I neither love my parents in an unqualified, unconditional way, nor do I attempt to dismiss them or

their memory in some complete way. Neither is going to work for me. The fundamental dismissive relationship is no longer dismissive. There is no need.

I really do think that every child idealises their parents for at least period of time. And then in the more adult phase they tend to identify with one, or they may identify with neither which probably suggests a big struggle and internal conflict, but ultimately we must be ourselves. And in that realisation we, I, are not our parents.

Obviously when I was a child my parents whys and wherefores were very relevant to me – so I felt. I couldn't be successful in my own right, I couldn't even work, so I had to try to encourage my Dad to be successful.

I find in so many ways that I am not like my parents nor would I want to be. When the cycle ends I remain and so it is clearer that I am not dismissive like my mother, irresponsible like my father, neither a prima donna nor a narcissist. I am not afraid of the truth – and both my parents were. The truth is I am very different to my parents in a lot of ways but those differences are not an issue as an adult. They were much more of an issue as a child, teenager, and young adult as I struggled integrate the legacy of knowing them into my own life.

With the schema I tried to be like my parents – to present myself to them in a way they would find acceptable. But as a mature adult I realise I don't have to be like them at all and probably never did. It was my interpretation of what was required of me that led me to such huge internalisations. Also find that my surviving parent gets on much better with me in this way than in the schema style of relatedness.

I am maintaining therefore that people I know who identified positively with one parent and not the other – idealised that one parent first of all and left themselves with the task of integrating the experience of the other negatively identified parent as part of their emotional growth programme.

I think this ends the schema cycle for me because it ends the cycle of idealisation and rejection in favour of the truth and reality. My parents had good and bad points like anyone – they are just people. To me as a child they were more than just people. Not exactly sure what I thought they were but they were something special anyhow.

In saying all this I can confidently express and accept who I am and being myself. I find that I was and am radically different to my parents and as a child I struggled to hide that because I suppose I felt a lot of anger and incomprehension towards my parents. I think I came to believe there was something fundamentally wrong with being myself and of course there isn't but it was just that I was so different to my parents and my other siblings even were more like them.

So that's where I am coming from in my statement that negative identification with both parents leads to a high level of internalisation – that's exactly what happened to me. I thought my parents were for the birds.

Parenting cannot fail to offend. For me that kind of idealisation has to give way to rejection and dismissal and disillusionment at some point. I just cannot imagine that wouldn't happen.

Clearly I internalised my self-judgement. In condemning and critiquing my origins I satirised and critiqued myself. A deadly internalisation. I don't however judge myself and therefore I make no judgements of anyone else including my parents. How can I evaluate their contribution in my life - I have no ability - no compass or map to do that. How can I evaluate myself or that portion of myself I deem defective and unsavoury - I cannot nor could I - so all of me is fine and that's how it remains.

And in the same breadth I realise that I am neither qualified nor competent to evaluate anyone else and if I dig deep enough I can generally find some kind of reason for why everyone would do something. So I find that for this LBOH to work it is vital that it is non-judgemental.

Being Oneself

This must include a complete identification with all elements of self. In the developmental stage the developing adult is highly dismissive in himself of the secretly, covertly admired aspects of the parent he will not identify with openly.

Compare yourself to you

Instead of comparing yourself to other people create the habit of comparing yourself to you. 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.

Creativity

You may be a highly creative person. Many highly creative people remain unaware that they are, in fact, creative. The inability to identify highly creative individuals in and of itself may place them at risk for serious and longstanding difficulties in many areas of life. Without appropriate education and intervention strategies their problems often continue to escalate over the long term. Why do so many creatively gifted people remain unidentified and struggling in our society?

One reason this happens is because of a mistaken notion about what creativity is in the first place. Most often we link creativity to an exclusively artistic activity or occupation, like playing the piano or painting a picture. This stereotype misses the real root of creativity – Creativity stems from a way of absorbing and processing information and experience. Through this process, new ideas, inventions, products and works of art are born.

- **High ideaphoria - Having a naturally rapid flow of ideas;**
- **Divergent thinking – A natural inclination for simultaneous and multifaceted thinking (used in addition to linear thinking);**

- Acute sensory skills – In one or more of the five senses (often exhibited in terms of having strong sensitivities to light, sound or visual images);
- Strong intuitive capabilities – The experience of “knowing” something is true and being highly accurate without reliance on concrete information;
- High emotional intelligence – Having an acute awareness of one’s own feelings as they occur, and the ability to be highly attuned to the emotions of others.

Many highly creative people are at risk of receiving an incorrect mental health diagnosis when their doctor or therapist remains unaware of their special needs and abilities. Some of the most common misdiagnoses are: mood disorders (depression, bipolar disorder), anxiety disorders, obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD), attention deficit disorder (ADD), attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and social anxiety disorder.

If a diagnosis is incorrect, treatment will often be in error as well. For example, the failure to realize that highly creative individuals frequently become depressed when they do not have adequate outlet for their rapid flow of ideas may result in the recommendation for an antidepressant medication rather than a real solution to the original problem – adequate outlets (projects and people) for their highly productive thinking.

Knowing My Physical Self

Listen to Physical Messages

Just as we repress our feelings so also we repress and ignored physical health messages concerning over eating, over drinking and lack of exercise. We need to stay within the parameters of these messages for health and wellness. They are there to remind when we stray from the path of wellness, not as annoyances or inconveniences. They are actually part of our health warning system - messages about being full, not eating crap food, not eating food that increases the heart rate like butter and so on. When we very ignore these messages we often do we end up feeling like shit and it takes hours or a whole day of the system to recover.

A lifetime of ignoring these messages leads to serious health problems. There are no obese elderly people. The strain of being overweight and the effect on our internal organs significantly reduces our lifespan.

We continually ignore our stomach’s message that we are full also. All we need to do is stay within the boundaries of these messages and we should slim down to our natural weight gradually and exercise more. Quite simply really – just listen to ourselves as we often say to ourselves regarding our feelings.

Longevity

The majority of centenarians lived by modest means, *under eating was the norm among them*, and some, due to circumstances more often than intent, and practised fasting for periods of time. Heavy carnivores were the exception, most ate a semi-vegetarian diet. *They followed the ¾ rule. Stop eating when they are ¾ full.*

They ate smaller meals more frequently. Eat most at breakfast. Eat meat the weekends. Fresh fruit less salt drink tea, drink glass of wine per day, garlic, eat fish, apples, brown rice, berry, sea

weed, broccoli, oats, soup, chew 30 times, nuts and seeds, sesame oil, vinegar, honey, mushrooms, burdock root, tomato – lower risk of cancer, sea salt, water, cherries good for diabetes, olive oil good for blood pressure, carbonation – bad for bones, contains phosphoric acid, avoid caffeine, orange peel, **overeating very bad for heart**,

Commercial feed for animals is full of growth-stimulating hormones. The meat comes from diseased animals raised in stressful, inhumane conditions.

Orange juice is a substitute for milk and contains calcium. *Symptoms of poor digestion include bloating, gas, indigestion, constipation, diarrhoea and fatigue.* Use spinach for eyesight, sorghum grain, artichoke for liver, *high fat animal fat butter cheese correlate with cancer.* *Nucleic rich foods – sardines, mushrooms, asparagus, wheat germ, salmon, and spinach – slow down ageing process.* Ginseng general

When controlled by their desires humans quickly become broken in health.

Independence is a common quality amongst centenarians, many of whom see to their own daily affairs until the end. *If you depend on doctors to keep you well you will surely be disappointed.* *Learn about your own health and implement steps to improve and maintain it.* They led simple clean lives with little or no extravagance. They were *fiercely frugal* obtaining the most from the least amount of resources. *Strong spiritual faith a characteristic of all centenarians*

Joy is the emotion associated with the heart. Happy go lucky people are less likely to develop heart disease. *Those who experienced prolonged stress characterised by a strong tendency to deny and repress their feelings are much more prone to developing cancers.* *Acknowledging our feelings is one of the most powerful ways of neutralising negative emotions.*

Gaining Objectivity

Objectivity rules over subjectivity

In control emotionally

With good self-knowledge we can choose how we respond regardless of how we are feeling. Anger can be right – can be justified – can be motivating. It can also be wrong and I can be angry and not justified and that's one for me.

In maturity I can choose my reactions and choose my next steps. In immaturity I am led by my passions. That's the difference.

Highly dismissive people appear to be very shy, but only because their internal representations are inaccurate to such a degree. They are shy because they are struggling to hide their dismissiveness. They are under pressure to interact with people they would rather dismiss.

Don't take anything personally

There are no personal matters. But I care more about the people around me than I ever did. I just don't take anything personally anymore. I think that's the key – don't take anything personally –

then this whole analysis can stop and that's the end of it. Other people may take things personally or be offended or hurt – that is their business.

If some people don't like me that's okay - I can live with that. They would have to hide it anyhow. If my whole micro schema world doesn't like me that's okay - I can live with that. I won't take it personally.

What is true? How the people around me feel has nothing to do with me and I am in no way responsible for their moods or feelings? Or some of them – many of them don't like me and are dismissive of me – or they fluctuate between idealisation and dismissal in their feelings towards me because they are emotionally immature and don't have balance in their feelings to me – for which I may in part be responsible because I was highly dismissive also?

I see now that I do tick people off and most of the people around me are pretty touchy and sensitive. I get that. I would read that now that I exist in a highly sensitive plane. Outside of this space I would expect people to be less touchy. Drink obviously disinhibits me and then loosens my tongue as it does to anyone.

I think perhaps one's savouriness is confirmed by one's friends – not random – chance encounters with strangers – that can never be so rewarding. Since I don't really have any friends I am out there on a limb always - can't turn siblings or in-laws into friends. I am eternally needy therefore socially, right?

But I care more about the people around me than I ever did. I just don't take anything personally anymore. I think that's the key – don't take anything personally – then this whole analysis can stop and that's the end of it. Other people may take things personally or be offended or hurt – that is their business.

If some people don't like me that's okay - I can live with that. They would have to hide it anyhow. If my whole micro schema world doesn't like me that's okay - I can live with that. I won't take it personally.

What is true? How the people around me feel has nothing to do with me and I am in no way responsible for their moods or feelings? Or some of them – many of them don't like me and are dismissive of me – or they fluctuate between idealisation and dismissal in their feelings towards me because they are emotionally immature and don't have balance in their feelings to me – for which I may in part be responsible because I was highly dismissive also?

I guess if how other people feel towards me has nothing to do with me and I have no responsibility for it then I certainly didn't need to see a therapist – right? That can't be right.

I see now that I do tick people off and most of the people around me are pretty touchy and sensitive. I get that. I would read that now that I exist in a highly sensitive plane. Outside of this space I would expect people to be less touchy. Drink obviously disinhibits me and then loosens my tongue as it does to anyone.

I think perhaps one's savouriness is confirmed by one's friends – not random – chance encounters with strangers – that can never be so rewarding. Since I don't really have any friends I am out there on a limb always - can't turn siblings or in-laws into friends. I am eternally needy therefore socially, right?

Don't take anything personally because nothing is personal. Even if someone has a go at us for whatever reason they are probably unwell or neurotic and otherwise if they have some personal issue they will never say it anyhow so take nothing personally.

No longer passion led

I do have the ability to choose and my emotions are directed within the framework of my objectivity and reason. So just as I wrote some time ago that creativity must always be within an objective framework so too must emotions. Emotions cannot supersede objectivity. That can never be a good thing. Because then I become passion led and neurotic.

With the end of idealizing people and obviously dismissing them for being less than ideal comes the fact no relationships are ideal. And this is disappointing to someone like me who has always idealized other people. The idealizing convinced me that I had a type of relationship that I really didn't have – that was not possible –with a person might often have been very different to what I wanted them to be.

A man who has not passed through the inferno of his passions has never overcome them.
Carl Jung

When controlled by their desires humans quickly become broken in health.

One's Own Approval

A man cannot be comfortable without his own approval. Mark Twain
It strikes me that this quality of self-approval is rare and that most people maintain a narcissistic dyad with one parent for their whole lives. For those who prefer father or mother to me – they are not worthy of me.

Mature Outlook on World

Correcting Negative Outlook on World

Highly Idealised Re the World

I have always had a highly idealised view of the world and I was also highly dismissive of the world - hence my comments about RTE etc. The world is neither ideal nor terrible. This guys who run the world or parts of it are doing their best. They are thinking, feeling, emotive human beings. My place in this world is not ideal nor will it ever be, neither is it highly dismissive. I need to end this vicious cycle of idealisation and dismissing with the world just as I have ended it with relatedness.

Being realistic about the world is vital to successfully making my way in the world.

This has been the obstacle to participation because I have always been on a high horse and I was just too good and too clever for my options so I opted for long periods of unemployment and underutilisation which sustained the romantic view point.

realism

1. *An inclination toward literal truth and pragmatism.*
2. *The representation in art or literature of objects, actions, or social conditions as they actually are, without idealization or presentation in abstract form.*
3. *Philosophy*
 - a. *The scholastic doctrine, opposed to nominalism, that universals exist independently of their being thought.*
 - b. *The modern philosophical doctrine, opposed to idealism, that physical objects exist independently of their being perceived.*

The world is outside the realm of relatedness.

My representations to the world are a type of inverted narcissism. I have just been too narcissistic. When I replace my narcissism with realism I will find that I connect with the world just fine. I don't have to deny myself in order to relate to the world. I can do that and have done that all along. The office is not what I am looking for but I have to believe in myself in order to relate to the world in the way that I want and get what I want. In terms of my relatedness to the world I engaged in a type of self-denial.

The truth is I don't or didn't support my creative self an aspect of me that it very important to me. And the part time teaching is to structure my life around my creativity. So what is wrong with that? Nothing. Only I internalised the view that the world disapproved of that side of me and I agreed with that and I dismissed that side of me.

I have never accepted my creative self. And so I always struggled in my representations to the world. But as I know very well there are plenty of people in Ireland and everywhere who would choose this kind of lifestyle. So really I isolated myself. It's not about proving to myself that my creative side is worthwhile – it's about me accepting that it is worthwhile. The battle was always an internal one.

And I felt worthless because aspect of me I so prefer was never known or accepted by me. I was my own jailor in effect.

For complete objectivity I must completely accept myself in both senses – that being in relatedness and in relatedness to the world. I find the world is not ideal, neither am I. But that was always the case. So for effective writing I need to be completely objective, otherwise I am only writing about my own personal struggle when for other people I need to be writing about struggles they have.

Taking the personal out of the writing makes it objective, when the writing is highly personalised then it's highly subjective.

I was too repressed that's why I was emotionally unstable. And the more of myself I accepted and lived with in a conscious way the more the instability receded. Or put another the more I did things for me and things that I wanted to do the happier I became and those sinister feelings in AIB are my feelings just telling me this is not what I want and don't be here. I was at that point distant from those feelings of mine. So they seemed alien and hostile. But they were my feelings.

So in my representations to the world I feel exactly the same sinister isolated and completely alone sentiment. This is the path to nowhere. This will bring me no respect or acceptance from my peer group. Best to get back on the acceptable path and then I will be reapproved and re-welcomed back into the fold. The issue is internal conflict and not association because the world is not repressing me. I am repressing myself.

Internalised Fear - World is opposed to me

My father never made it as an artist or a writer. So for himself which I think he secretly always wanted he never got there. And neither have I. I think I internalised a belief that the world was more than indifferent actively opposed to me and me being myself. So therefore the book rejection in Chicago was the other devastating blow in that regard. Love and betterment both denied.

My grandfather was opposed to my father's artistry and my father idealised his father and could never resolve the conflict. My mother also strongly disapproved of my father's artistic leanings. She never supported them and was highly dismissive of them. Strong reasons for suppressing artistic and creative tendencies. There was no support in the formative environment for such things.

My whole life has epitomised this struggle also. I am up to my neck in the commercial world and hating it. Claire and Jane of all the McGovern children have made most headway in that area and are entirely comfortable with what they do. And entrepreneurship is a bid for freedom for sure from being commercially managed but it isn't artistry. It's not an intellectual pursuit.

With this internalisation I became depressed about my creative abilities and deeply repressed them. It's a complete internalisation. Not at all. The world isn't opposed to anyone. Parents can be opposed and internalisations can be formed.

For depression it really takes both things going wrong. It really takes a double whammy to really unseat someone and destabilise them. Pearl and Maura struggle in both aspects – Maura more than Pearl. They would be the two depression candidates apart from John of course.

The mantra of the unsuccessful is of course how unfair the world is.

There are only two aspects to being oneself – love and the world.

A double negative internalisation leads to emotional instability. A single negative internalisation leads to disillusionment, relatedness struggle or worldly struggle.

It's not possible to talk people out of their internalisations. That's why people say patients can't be talked out of their depressions. Psychology doesn't work.

I was completely and utterly wrong that the world was opposed to me. It was a fundamental, deeply held belief and so I blamed the world for my setbacks rather than learning from them. It's only today and yesterday that I actually finally and completely realised that I blamed the world for my setbacks. So it was never my fault which could hardly be the case and it was a loaded situation from the start which was never true. That is a sick philosophy on the world.

Internalisations make people highly subjective – even very intelligent people – it doesn't matter. These internalisations are nothing to do with associations – nothing to do with who you are with or where I work. It will never be right until the negative internalisations are discarded and then it's always right after that.

I was outwardly positive but I was always fundamentally negative and that was the deceptive aspect of me. To be successful one must have positive internalisations concerning the world and relatedness.

It seems to me that fundamental to the success of any venture in life is that it has to be driven by someone who is fundamentally positive. A negative person would never take on anything like that and would never be suitable. They wouldn't be able to stay the course with their negative internalisations.

So in my case I had to psych myself up to be positive – it was highly cyclical and ultimately and always the psyching up took so much out of me that I always opted for the safe, sure bet. I think I can do whatever I want – I can interact with whoever I want – and I have the positivity now to see things through and that's because root problem in my outlook on the world has been corrected.

Setbacks don't make people fail. It's the fact that they give up. That's when they fail.

In my case so much of my energy was devoted just to being, to being okay, to battling this internal negativity that really was in a type of emotional stasis. I think that I could see that quite powerfully in relatedness struggles for me lately – they took up a lot of time. My struggle with the world again would be very cyclical in nature. I would make abortive forays and withdraw and do something completely different and then come back to it again much later – years later maybe. Because of the highly cyclical aspect of my approach to these matters it was never going to work and it never will until the internal conflict is replaced by a positive outlook on the world.

In resolving my internal conflict with the world then my representations to the world become stable and consistent and that will a big change.

World

Relating to the world is a competency just like relating to other people is a competency also one I have improved and refined over recent times. I essentially had a negative outlook in relating to the world. I believed the world was opposed to me and I represented a part of myself I didn't like to the world continually got frustrated and withdrew. It was a vicious cycle really.

Now that I am competent in matters of relatedness I realise that I interact positively always. I get other people and I appreciate their sensitivities and their vulnerabilities now that I accept my own. I don't always click with people but I do interact positively and I know how to relate.

In the same way my representations to the world were negative and just led me to isolation and unemployment. I couldn't engage or connect and I interacted negatively. That said looking back I can see that in truth my interactions were in most cases positive. I did very well in interviews. I connected well with people initially and for the purposes of being hired but fundamentally the internalisation was there that the world was opposed and that my true self was hidden and had to remain hidden.

Now that I re-approach showing my true self – teacher, writer (finish the book), business owner I see how vital a positive outlook on the world is. Firstly my real self is totally acceptable to the world. In fact this is the only way the interaction will work. Second nothing is personal in matters of jobs and work and business. I was taking these things personally and so I got completely bogged down in Sureskills for 4 months. Thirdly I decide my level of involvement. Entirely up to me. But my interactions with the world will now be competent and positive.

I am not talking about a frenzy or flurry of activity but I am talking about overcoming my personal, subjective feelings concerning the world, not taking things personally and interacting positively in the areas I am interested in.

I know what a breeze relatedness is and I actually quite enjoy it – meeting Mark or the Dags whoever from previously it being very stressful for me. I know also that it's a competency. A skill once developed – never lost. I can interact positively with anyone. It would not be personal, bias, pejorative or come off badly. That's for life. Other people are responsible for themselves obviously.

In the same way relating to the world is a competency once acquired – is never lost. Worldly interactions therefore become positive and I learn from them rather than dismissing and not learning.

Changing My Life Philosophy

A strong philosophy based on what is true in life saves us from playing the victim – a person who has been ill-used, who has suffered bad luck, or whose life is one of despondency and unhappiness. A personal philosophy that is good frees us from the tyranny of events.

I must accept that reality unfolds beneficially. There is no cruel fate. Everything happens for a reason. God doesn't make mistakes. Everything that happens is for our benefit. Things that appear not to be beneficial are really beneficial. Life is a mystery to be accepted and lived and not a problem to be resolved. We accept ourselves and our imperfections and find balance in ourselves. There are no right or wrong feelings. I can't choose my feelings, accept the ones I like and discard the ones that trouble me. Right or wrong is in doing not feeling. I cannot be too euphoric about success or too dismayed by failure. It is a natural and healthy cycle. I live for neither and accept the natural rhythm.

For a clear conscience I must forgive myself. If I look into my own heart, and I find nothing wrong there, what is there to worry about? What is there to fear?

Without agenda for others that is possible. I just think that's maturity and I see now that I have often had an agenda for others. It's not indifference or uncaring it's just non-reactive.

So if I have good thoughts or bad thoughts either way the outcome is desired then that's okay. All thoughts are impressions. Thoughts are impressions of how I feel. Feelings therefore are also impressions of what I might do, then again I might not do it, I might not feel like, maybe I do.

So the thoughts and feelings are essentially the same, they are positive and negative but the philosophy has changed and therefore the conclusion and resultant action are changed and positive.

I confirm my new philosophy by an acceptance of the world and reality. I was wrong. I don't need to do anything to be myself. Neither do I need to achieve anything in particular or prove something about myself. In this sense therefore stable balance is achieved and I become myself, become balanced, all my relatedness and involvements now find balance also.

I come first and before everyone else. My needs come first and I take care of them and I do not put anyone else's needs before my own. This is not selfish – this is healthy and necessary. It was part of my inverted narcissism that I believed myself to be unconditional and therefore in theory putting everyone's needs before my own. This started with the internalization of my distress and becoming my parent's burden bearer.

Objectivity and objective reality always comes first – my creativity exists within the framework of objective reality.

All creative works are subordinated to objective structure and exist within that objective structure. That's the only way in which they can work and be rendered.

Objectivity comes first so fantasy plays no part in my mind either sexual, notions of grandiosity – undiscovered genius, special purposes or mission, center of global or personal focus. None of these false beliefs are true nor were they ever true.

Objectivity comes before feelings and emotions also. I want my feelings – I am happy to have them but I don't want to be ruled by them.

The point is that people are dismissive because they don't want to be hurt. And that's the reason for it much as I can see.

I don't owe my parents or my family or my siblings anything. I don't feel in anyway honour bound to them. My parents were quite happy to leave me with that feeling of obligation – it

suited them. I have honoured my parents as much as anyone – more in my own way – but no I don't owe them anything.

My Philosophy

Fundamentally my outlook on life and experience is positive. Because it was fundamentally negative I struggled with positivity. But now I don't.

A strong philosophy based on what is true in life and reality saves me from playing the victim – a person who has been ill-used, who has suffered bad luck, or whose life is one of despondency and unhappiness.

I have been fortunate in many ways.

A personal philosophy that is good (positive) frees me from the tyranny of events.

Reality unfolds beneficially. I accept reality is beneficial and in my interest.

There is no cruel fate. I do not live at the whim of happenstance struggling to stay alive. I embrace reality. Everything happens for a reason. God doesn't make mistakes.

Life is a mystery to be lived not a problem to be solved. I accept myself and my imperfections finding balance in me.

There is no right or wrong feelings. I don't choose my feelings. That's the battle in me. I am trying to choose how I feel. I don't have any choice. I surrender to my feelings.

Right or wrong is in doing not feeling.

This is unconscious competence. When I don't struggle to choose them then I get the benefit of having them and I don't have to analyze how I feel all the time.

God

My needs are of this world and in worldly way they must be addressed. But of them I must be able to let go for reason and objectivity and peace. Self is self-deceiving without correct orientation. Ad majoriam dei gloriam. If it is the greater glorification of self then it's just narcissistic. And yet the glory of God is a man fully alive. So I am correct to question my own motivation but not overly lest I be cast in self-doubt and I internalize what I believe. I was wrong about many things but I was foolish and idiotic. I paid for my vanity but I don't need to keep paying neither should I. As a catholic I suppose I felt I had to atone for the hurt I had caused. And yet I was in a lot of pain during all that time.

The truth is I think a cycle of engagement and letting go. I let go of self to be free and to reengage again. If I don't let go of self then I never implement and move on and move through.

Is there a God? Well there is now. Is there not also a God when God does not speak? Surely then more than ever. But to sustain my belief in God through all phases of my cycle leads to positive and healthy orientation and engagement. Otherwise there is only self and I collapse inwards on myself yet again and become consumed by my whys and wherefores. So with God I am correctly benchmarked. Believing in God allows me to grow and puts things in the right perspective for me.

I believe God exists and I did periodically until now. But my belief in God was inconsistent and changeable but then that was me. The human intellect is flawed and biased and as far I know always has been and always will be. It cannot be set up as a holy thing. That's a false God. So I have to say I didn't see God because I was blinded by myself.

I find God through my own experience through myself. That's the only way. Just as everyone else I know who is or was religious found God in that way also. So it's not my father's interpretation – it's my interpretation. I don't believe because I have been told or encouraged to believe or even because it may be in my interest to believe – I believe because I believe. My intellect is not the greatest thing to me. And I am no better than anyone else.

The vanity of me is that there is something special about me. But there isn't.

For me as a voice of in my time therefore the ultimate balancing of myself are positive beliefs that I can hold onto during all my phases. Believing in God stops me self-idealizing or self-recrimination because it gives me something to orient myself to beyond myself. And so it puts myself into perspective for me.

For me my childhood world went from being a right place to a wrong place and I intellectualized my grief and couldn't integrate what had happened.

Grief is emotive so there was always something wrong with the present. I never got over my grief. And because I was motivated to resolve my grief rather than accept it, it just distorted my creative efforts and made them highly emotively bias. The co-narcissism was motivated by my internalization of my parents' needs. I wanted to address those needs. If they were happy I could be happy.

Self-Responsibility

After 18 I ceased to be a child and assumed control of my own life whether I chose to exercise that control or not. So I don't treat myself as a victim or behave like a child. I don't accept victimhood in me.

Right and wrong

There is right and wrong, good and bad but I was confused about this. It is a sign of love to set people free and let them go. Needing someone I hang onto them even when they want to or have to go.

Being myself

I no longer feel connected emotionally with my parents. I do not blame them for how I am. I am responsible for me. I know that blaming them leads only to me be being a victim and internalizing rage that I should direct into change.

Being me is not an agenda. I am a free spirit. So being happy is not an agenda.

No matter how much iteration the I Ching is true. Get your relationship to self-right and all else will be right. I see nothing that changes that.

My feelings

My feelings cycle. Hurtful life events interrupted the cycle of my feelings and grief and trapped those feelings. Powerful trapped feelings can be integrated – if they are allowed to do so.

Without rationalization the cycle finds a natural rhythm. I am being myself. I was constantly checking because I was deviating from being myself and that caused imbalances.

In fighting my cycle I demanded closure and experienced despondency of myself when I don't get it.

Letting go is at the heart of acceptance and the antidote to trapped feelings of rage, anger and powerlessness.

Rage can be renewed purpose. What was internalized and imbalanced can be a driver and sense of purpose for me. Integrating these feelings makes me stronger. I can never be impatient for the now. So I concede and it runs more tranquilly.

Ending and closure are rationalizations. Feelings don't end and close. They don't takeover however. Objectivity always comes first.

I was trying to maintain objectivity so I battled with my own feelings and struggled with them and trying to control them and suppress them. That's where the energy was going and that's always been the problem. So I don't do it anymore. Whatever I feel is right for now.

I accept my feelings but I am objective first.

In the negative phase of the cycle energy and time is expended trying to recover back to the positive phase and so we develop strategies to feel good more often or as often as I could including associating with certain people or trying too, drinking, doing and eating to make myself feel good. It occurs to me that with mental control I was able to manage the cycles and so present a positive front to the world consistently in my 20s. However with such poor emotional intelligence it was not possible to have a sense of direction or any luck satisfying basic emotional needs so it didn't work and wasn't a long term prospect for me.

I have no idea why feelings cycle. It is one of those inevitable and unchangeable aspects of life which I accept just like everyone else does. Of course because I struggled against the inevitable of my own feelings I was engaged in a titanic internal battle.

I think I am confusing 2 different things - the cycle of my feelings which is natural, inescapable and healthy and good for me and control and dismissiveness which is my attempt to control my cycle and manipulate it for a variety of reasons.

Success

Successful people capitalize on their opportunities - miss no opportunities as they present themselves and are consistently positive in their approach and life philosophy.

The point is I can be successful doing anything I turn my hand too. So there is no need to be a fugitive from myself. I have control of myself and that's it really. I am not passion led. I don't expect to find myself in any situation where I would struggle inexplicably to myself. I get me and I love me.

Changing Life Philosophy 2

Self-Directedness

My emotive bias

Emotive bias is the essence of me. What else would define me? In the same way everyone else is grounded in their own emotive bias. In my experience of being co-narcissistic I denied my own emotive bias - but not for a world without emotive bias just to provide a forum to other people's emotive bias.

The essence of my emotive take therefore is that things can be better, should be better and people are remiss in not making them better. I have demonstrated that in my own life and now I bring

this to the world. I am emotively oriented to change and improve and I know that I can't do that if I am too highly subjective hence this process of gaining objectivity.

So I never eliminated my emotive bias – I just repressed it. So the point being I articulate how I feel in a meaningful way – meaningful for other people – that is the driver of my direction. I do feel quite strongly about things emotively but I bottle it and I hide it on the grounds that it is asocial and I will be rejected for being assertive?

The reality is that in putting aside my emotive convictions I have nothing. I have no agenda. And therefore I am lacking in self-direction and lacking in any intentionality. Without the emotive impetus I am hopeless, going nowhere. It's saying I will marry someone I don't have any feelings for. Well it's not going to be a great marriage. I am trying to marry with the world on some repressed, unemotive basis. There is no way to connect. The connection is emotive. Relatedness is emotive.

Co-narcissism is dead to the world. In seeing every else's point of view I have no opinion of my own. At least overt narcissists are self-directed and have goals and intentions. They are going somewhere. The co-narcissist is going nowhere unless into therapy to figure out why. It doesn't matter what other people think. It's my point of view that matters to me. This is not dismissive. This is assertive.

Co-narcissists are not attractive people. They are non-existent people. The co-narcissist of course believes that if they are assertive they will be rejected. The opposite is the case. They will be respected. So push on through. I know what I am talking about. But push on through for myself. Not for anyone else. I am for Hugh. I don't want to be everybody – remember the co-narcissists diatribe which used to be my ringtone. How appropriate is that?

Be assertive

I was often told I am sure that being focused on me was selfish. What about me my mother would always whinge? I am not talking about assisting other people as my primary function – I am talking about asserting myself. In that self-assertive I have more capacity to positively affect the lives of the people around me. For one they can learn from my example. My world is won for me by me being assertive – that is missing element. What's absent from my life is assertiveness not psychology – I have got psychology to burn.

*Is this the mirror of myself?
Am I somebody else?
I don't want to be
Everybody*

The critical aspect of me that is missing or underdeveloped or confused and struggling is being assertive. I really have a problem saying and knowing what I want and that absolutely has to change. I have to assert myself within myself – it is relation to me that I am not assertive. If I get this relationship to self right then my world is correctly balanced.

So in all this involvement and consideration of the people around me including Mary I am looking for myself. And yet as long as it was externalized it was never found.

I don't have to run off and do anything. I have to listen to myself and assert myself. The bridge between me and other people is me being assertive is being myself. That's the connection. My assertiveness is my uniqueness which I have always had but chose not to reveal. I need to assert myself above my fear of rejection otherwise I am not asserting myself. So Claire and Jane and Mum and Mark and John and Sully and anybody else who emotionally withdraws in the face of me being me – I let go. Let them go – chances are they will come back. And in so doing I overcome my childish fear of rejection and I become more fully me. I have no obligations to anyone else.

When people emotionally withdrew from me I found that devastating but it could be for any number of reasons the least of which could be to do with me. So I was inclined in my insecurity to overcome that withdrawal. But I never needed to. Let them go. Let them storm off and get over it. Overt narcissists are childish so are co-narcissist. It's all narcissism. But their emotional withdrawals are to be expected. I wouldn't regard that type of narcissism as anything worth focusing on or getting involved in or getting upset about.

In maturity I neither withdraw nor do I dismiss from my environment. I am assertive of myself which is fine for me. The dyad ends with maturity and that is my maturity. But maturity absolutely requires me to be assertive. Then I no longer feel annoyed or abused by other people.

Let people withdraw emotionally if they want to and don't re-double my efforts to relate. The McGovern's were always withdrawn from me – always. I have just have to accept that. That's how it is. I never wanted to accept that. But I do now. Let Sternal and Schertler and Fish go too. They are already gone a long time.

Me being me and being assertive and being myself is me relating. Anything other than that is not relating. I cannot give into to anyone else in relatedness – that is not relatedness. Relatedness is reflective of how I feel about it – if I don't feel right about it then it's not right.

Relatedness is not interaction. Relatedness is emotive and is emotionally based. In relatedness there is open disclosure between two people and problem solving and resolutions and an agreed partnership. Interaction is impersonal and doesn't require of involve any of that. To mix up the two is a terrible mistake.

I think in maturity I am not emotionally involved in my environment. A child is heavily involved emotionally. A young adult is perhaps rebellious and challenging of their environment. A mature adult accepts themselves and accepts the people around them the way they are.

But the other answer to this is in maturity all comes right. I am assertive for me. And I don't find my narcissistic relatives concerning because I am not emotionally involved with them.

Me first

I am concerned about myself first and foremost. And I keep my empathy, love and maturity for me. I come first and my needs come first. That's the way it is. I tend my own garden. My concerns for others come second and never take precedence over my own needs.

Me Writing

All I want to do write and I accept that. I am happy with that and that is primary concern. I appreciate now that really I have just always been fighting myself. And so accepting myself is the resolution. I don't need to debate what to do any longer. I know what I want and I know what to do. Before I struggled with myself about this but now there is no struggle. I am cool with it.

I think I should line up another contract because nothing else is going to happen. I know what I am doing already.

More Comments

I think I like to blame other people for my problems and I should always remember that my depression is my problem and no one else's. It was never any else's problem and how could it be.

It did occur to me walking back home tonight that someone like me with a creative intellect who does spend a lot of time alone and in his own head could be more vulnerable to depression or mania at any rate even still. I think however I would have been perfectly happy to scale back the medication if I had found support from one the doctors. For now it's parked. I still don't regard it as a burning issue. That vulnerability I felt and felt recently is more of the co-narcissistic disassociated needs variety. Now that my needs come first and I accept them I don't see how I could be re disassociated. Fact is I never put my needs first until recently so always felt the vulnerability. Don't see how it could happen.

It is interesting that I applied to all these teaching colleges 2 years ago in 2010 and thereafter I still ended up working on a contract. The vicious cycle presumable is that I didn't assert my intellectual needs first and foremost.

Looking back over old emails there definitely is a cycle wherein I try to break free of the contracts world and I send out emails for training/teaching but ultimately I always come back to the contracts. Then I am reminded that the contracts are really for very biddable docile people. The corporate world is completely hierarchical which is offensive to an intellectual like me. I don't think I would enjoy even six months in an office. I don't like being bossed. Simple really. Then again I might need to do it. I think I would be nervous.

I guess the question must be did the environment make me lose my cool or was it me? I think it was me. It was also me with the training, writing, part time teaching of economics and everything that I "tried" to do. If it didn't happen it was my fault. I had it all worked that it was not my fault. And that leads only ever to a dead end. I think with the training I should look elsewhere and keep on with the teaching. And contracts are also a possibility.

I think being depressed I fundamentally did not want to take responsibility for my own feelings. But who else is likely to take responsibility for them? Who would even know what my feelings are?

It's all my fault really – the whole thing. I made it all up. It's entirely my fault because it's entirely my problem. It doesn't matter to anyone else if I never get what I want but it matters to me.

I am not saying my parents were innocent of creating problems for me or other people but once internalized it's my problem from then on in. Not anyone else's. I was a gullible child – I put my hand up to that charge – but I don't need to be a gullible adult. So resolving my depression really benefits me and is entirely my concern and always has been.

I think the co-narcissism did make me feel very vulnerable to exploitation in offices and other places. People could very easily take advantage of me. Wendy Hederman noticed this when I worked for her. She even commented on it. However I don't see that vulnerability as long as my needs are met and realized which they will be now they come first. Back then anyone could take me for a ride and I would let them. The only way I could assert myself was by dismissing the situation – the job. That was the vicious cycle.

I think now I have an explanation for that period in 1994 from October to December. I thought my needs were going to be met because I was going to meet LDH. This led to a definite surge in my mood. And the superego phase when I knew Liane first which ran from October 1992 until March 1993. During which time we met three times. Also the LA summer of love and meeting Karen and being loved by her made me feel I could meet my needs and that kept me going long after the relationship ended. In fact it ran from summer of 1991 until 1996. So the only reason I felt any better during this period than I did before was I believed my needs were going to be met.

With Karen she came all the way over from LA and I cheated on her with other girls. And then I told her and she went home totally crushed and disillusioned with the whole thing. And I had the idea that the failure of that relationship was not my fault. It was 100% my fault.

With Liane was different. In her case she was playing games. No doubt of that. And she didn't stay in touch. So that was really her fault. Jennifer nearly lost herself in relationship to me. What didn't she do to keep it going? That was totally my fault. Apart from Sinead Dillon the rest were all my fault.

Why was I meeting with people and breaking up with them? Well I was just ridiculously dismissive. More importantly from my point of view I could not meet my own needs. I set up regular stream of short relationships in my naivety but really my need was for one good relationship with a woman. It comes back to the fact that I had chronic low self-esteem and did not love myself so I needed constant reassurance and proof that I was lovable.

The only way to get that was to have a regular supply of females. I think I preferred short term relationships because they were exciting, everything was new, more importantly I felt much more strongly vindicated at the start I had reassured myself I was lovable then later on I realized I don't even like this girl and we have nothing in common and I am not really attracted to her. I just needed the reassurance. From any normal perspective such activity was futile and self-defeating but because I was narcissistic I was unaware of myself to the extent that I would get into those situations.

Because I had low esteem I needed to be reassured that I was loved and liked and so I just engaged in strategies to reassure myself. They basically like at this time are deficit in self-esteem.

The reason it was a problem was I externalized my need to love myself and sought constant reassurance and approval that I was loved. This was reflection of my low esteem. I needed to love myself and then all the people around me would fall into place. But I didn't love myself and I externalized my need to be loved which made me very shaky and very dependent on the approval of others far beyond what was appropriate for someone of my age. I was looking for approval and reassurance way beyond the norm and when I didn't get it I was highly dismissive.

I see this applies to the girls too. I would dump them as soon as they stopped idealizing me which didn't very long after they started to get to know me - as long as they were idealizing that worked for me.

Then in terms of my professional cycle I would go into an office – I would be completely overcome by trying to relating and failing to the people around me. Ultimately I would dismiss them. Then I would be out on my own being creative, writing and so on, try teaching and training and back into the next office position. I think in the office I could be popular like Matt was popular but it was completely co-narcissistic. I would buddy up with everyone – kind word

Contracts were a problem for me because I had very low-esteem and co-narcissistically tried to relate to the people around me, which in practice meant they could easily take advantage of me.

I didn't know what a good relationship was like. I only felt I had to perform and be charming and win them over and that was the game.

I get it now my needs were completely externalized so there was no chance they would be met. I wasn't able for a serious relationship. I lived with my parents until I was 23. It all happened off premises. I wasn't allowed to do anything. I used to go swimming with my Dad when I was 23. My needs were always externalized – I didn't own them.

Or in a truer sense that I was going to acknowledge and accept my own needs for to be loved on a stable, permanent basis and also to connect intellectually with myself in a stable permanent basis. If I had accepted and acknowledged that in my 20s then I would have embraced my opportunities – instead I didn't accept that and so I made love and intellectualism a struggle and a pursuit – at time in other words I was still in pursuit of myself insufficiently to know myself well enough to what I needed.

However as a narcissist my needs were externalized from me and I had to internalized and accept those needs. My father was a bit like this too. As the paternal co-narcissist he put his needs aside in order to relate. She had him working out of Jane's bedroom in the house he owned!

I think I get it now regarding food, drink etc. I feel like it but I know it wouldn't make me feel good so I decide not to do it. I weigh it up and decide better off without. It's a level of control I have not had. It's not so much that I don't feel the impulse – I still do – I just think better of it.

Rule on Fantasy

I can rule on the all my different types of fantasy including sexual ones that they are entirely and 100% subjective and completely emotive. There is no objective truth in any of them – never was and never will be. They are unique, entirely personal, emotively biased and completely subjective.

Further the world of women is entirely comfortable to me. I feel sure I will always have fantasies. I could not even predict who they would involve or the nature of them but I do fully appreciate that they are entirely subjective now. I found that in repressing fantasies – particularly of a sexual nature as I was conditioned to do that I actually that was psychologically really unhealthy.

For me self was mired. My needs were dissociated and not met or not properly addressed. Because of my disassociation it was natural for me to blame my environment for how I felt. After all my stress resulted from being in unsafe, unpredictable and uncertain environments. However for me my stress was very profound simply because I believed or strive to control my environment by my behavior. I feared ambiguity because it meant my construct of myself needed to re-evaluated and my self-concept was very rigid. I always opted for the predictable and thereby ensured my emotional development was in stasis.

And minimal contact with people for me the extreme co-narcissist was the norm. It's not because I didn't want to or didn't yearn for the society of others it just made me feel so terribly inadequate. I approached relatedness from the prerequisite of very low self-esteem – so I was extremely vulnerable to begin with and without constant reassurance and hand-holding which I was not going to get in adult society I dismissed or withdraw.

Knowing me entailed knowing what my needs are. Not knowing me well led to a poor and dissociated sense of my own needs. In my narcissism I was not clearly aware of my needs. I related in a narcissistic but unemotive way which gave rise to sudden and unexpected disappointments and reversals. I was deficit in empathy and emotional intelligence and so I experienced unpredictability and setbacks often in trying to relate. My behavior was unattractive to adults and was asocial - so struggled to relate in adult society.

My narcissistic persona was robust and self-righteous so I did not learn from my mistakes in relatedness.

I thought I was very rational when really I was very repressed – big difference. Any girl of average intelligence was more rational than me. It seems to me my addiction was emotively bias.

My disillusionment

I was highly idealistic about relatedness and other people and I had childhood internalizations that I was not loved enough and yearned to be close to other people. However the closeness I desired does not exist in the adult world. Adults are not emotionally closely relating to each other in that way. So I was always disillusioned in relatedness. It is never as good as it should be.

I think I felt in my efforts that it would be closer to other people and I have found that really it brought me closer to myself but not any closer to the people around me than I already was. I think I am disappointed in that. I had an expectation that something big would happen.

I can see the little girl in Mary now when I interact with her and before I didn't see that. For my part I accept I was an adult child with a utopian vision which was entirely personal and subjective. Really what I wanted from the vision was that people should be close to each other and help each other and love each other. The truth is the reality I always disliked and ignored. Adults are not emotionally close to each other. In maturity one does not seek that kind of closeness.

That's the disillusionment for me. In letting go of the vision I let go of the necessity to fight reality. The only way forward is to cease to be a narcissist and then I and anyone else like me must accept the mature adult life is not allowing one to be close to others. It hurts me to write this and accept this but it is true. The narcissist can only go in one direction – to a better understanding of self.

Part of the emotive bias is that I would reach a place of complete belonging, security and togetherness. But the truth is I was pulled out of a place like that I dropped into the adult world prematurely so I clung to my childish beliefs. I defended my fantasy narcissistically and so there is emptiness in self-awareness. It really doesn't have anything to do with other people.

I wanted to be closer to people so that was part of the motivation. As it turned out I only got closer to myself. I also see that all the narcissistic people I know are struggling to get closer to themselves - NOT TO ME. They don't want to know me any better.

However it is possible to interact with people in a non-emotive way and this is the essence of adult interaction. It is non-emotive. It is for specific reasons not emotive reasons – for work, for common purpose, for common worship, for shared tasks.

Until now it would not be safe for me to enter into an impersonal arrangement with other people. I was too fearful that I would be taken advantage of and that it wouldn't work.

Multiple Needs None Are Met

The fact is I have multiple needs and none of them are met. I don't want to be an eccentric. A half cracked individual. Sure I want to write but what is stopping me doing that. My life feels empty because it is empty. There is nothing going on for me. Maslow says there is a pyramid of needs. But the pyramid has levels. My lifestyle is not the way of fulfillment. Now I feel how it is to live like this. It doesn't feel good.

There are needs other than writing, socializing with family, extended family and friends. These other needs need to be permanently addressed also. There is an unmet need or needs for me because the needs I have identified are all personal to me. What about the worldly dimension? My place in the world, being known to the world, on a stable mature basis? When is that going to be addressed? Because it surely isn't at the moment.

There is a need for impersonal esteem and approval from people unknown to me and not related to me. Obviously I will never be known for my subjectivity only the objective presentation of me to people who don't know. I guess I have no profession. That's really it isn't it.

I have to develop a professional interest – what about analyst? I have background. I am very analytical. This gets me out of the contracts trap where I take unrelated, generic contracts but which don't really advanced a professional career. What I am writing about is analytical psychology. I need to chart an analyst's pathway. And take only relevant work not veering into finance or accountancy. That advances the teaching and the consultancy which made not be immediately available to be but with some time and relevancy would open up.

So in this sense then I work in an analytical way – which I do. I am writing in analytical fashion which I am. And I would like to teach and consultant in an analytical way.

Looking back over my history I see that I did well as an analyst. I got good jobs. I was well-regarded in those jobs. But more recently I strayed into other areas that were not rewarding like generic contracts. I see that I am not a fiction writer – I am an analytical writer.

I think I should stay with the career I have and develop that. That's what I am good at and so on. Finish what I am writing and maybe after that attempt some creative writing. For success I think a congruent effort moving forward stably is going to work and I should remained focused in the analyst/consultant/academic space indefinitely. There is no need to strive for another career. I just needed to stabilise myself and now it's obvious to me what I have and it's perfectly viable.

I was caught up in a subjective fantasy about myself and I couldn't make stable connections in any way.

Career Discussion

I have a lifelong history of feeling dangerously inadequate and vulnerable to rejection and blame. This obviously and invariably will arise and does arise in professional interactions. I would naturally interpret my interaction with Sureskills that I was inadequate and that is the reason why it didn't progress. Whereas the likely reason is just the work isn't there.

My needs are foremost for me and come before anything else. So I need to write and I need to develop my profession. This comes before any consideration of anyone else. And that is healthy. My professional need has always been dissociated from me.

A corporate support employee is not a profession. The middle class professions are doctor, dentist, and barrister and so on. And there is a long apprenticeship with those professions. I have worked long and hard to develop myself. I don't think a support role is going to work for me. I had a basic level of self-esteem that allowed me to interview and enter into the places I worked in but I never wanted to stay. I was ashamed of that type of role. In maturity I can play a stable support role but I don't want too.

The question is how do I or by doing what do I permanently represent myself to the world and become known for. I don't want a support role. I want to connect with the world – the impersonal world in a way that I feel good about.

If I can't answer it right now then just carry on with the part-time teaching & training.

Take responsibility for my problems

I am looking for an impersonal interaction that works for me. The problems I have are my problems because they affect me and they affect the quality of my life. And they remain my problems until I resolve them. I am not interested in being a support to someone else. That does not meet my needs.

I am emotively connected with my needs – finally and this is very good. I am not going to try to blame anyone else for my needs not being met. That is 100% my responsibility. I realize now other people's problems have nothing to do with me and never did. I don't solve my problems by solving their problems. I just ignore my own problems. I do not feel my needs are met at all by me. And that is now going to be 100% and is my preoccupation.

I really don't believe anymore that co-narcissistic relatedness can be improved, not by me anyway. I am invisible psychologically to my narcissistic relatives. I think its fine the way it is. It's always been like this. I don't mind. It's nothing to do with me.

Positive Confirmations from the World

I need positive confirmations from the world. That tells me on I am on track, relevant and focused. I don't have any and therefore I am not connecting with the world. There is always a boost from establishing a connection with impersonal world. I had a spring in my step in October after meeting with Sureskills. It evaporated but I coasted on that for months.

I don't care about other people's problems. I care about my own problems. Why would I get involved in Aware again? I don't care about other people's depression. The reason people get involved in Aware I think is to try to give the support they never got as children.

I don't need to look at the people around me pejoratively. The deficit in my life is the absence of any connection to the world. For an adult that is not a healthy situation long term. And to have the belief as I did that I was incapable of connecting is a despondent and depressing feeling. The world needs to make sense to me and I to it. And that need will always exist. Because it always has.

Obviously I have defocused from the people around me and onto myself. That's perfect.

I think it's important to be content and satisfied in myself first of all. But I need to stay focused and I will on connecting the world. That will bring me real satisfaction because that's what's lacking.

Feelings

Let the hidden remain hidden

Things need to be hidden for a reason. It's destabilizing to put core motivations on the table all the time. Getting into other's people's problems is a Pandora's box. People don't admit to their feelings for very good reasons. Interaction with other people occurs on the surface. Getting down and dirty all the time is a crazy place to be. It's bad for me. It's bad for Mary. It's undermining. Let that which is hidden remain hidden. Let all these terrible feelings sink now deep into the heart of me where they belong. Opening a vein to the world and all who care to listen is bonkers. I am temporizing with the core of my identity. Perhaps it was necessary but it was very painful. Move on and forget about it.

All that my siblings require of me is a brother and my mother a son - nothing more and nothing else. I don't think I should seek deep disclosure from other people. Or even encourage them to give it. Interaction is light and breezy. How's it going? Fine. I should not expect people to say anything they don't feel comfortable saying. That's not being fair or really being open to relatedness.

It's time to be cool and not a head-wrecker. Leave resentments and bias in the past where they belong. Live don't make a theory out of it. Life isn't theoretical.

Connections with the world happen on the surface. Being consumed by my own psychology meant I was in no way going to be connecting. Yes I was in a transitional phase – have been god knows how long. But it all happens on the surface. And that's the tip of the iceberg. Of course there is the great mass of ice below sea level. But that is never seen.

In life I can only deal with situations as are they are presented. I can't present or develop a model which will resolve all eventualities. Life cannot be modeled. Life is not abstract or conceptual. People may be like that but life isn't. Intellectualizing life is only a divorce between one's needs and feelings and to them I must return. Those who know most say least.

Modeling development may not be a flop because that has a start and an end point. But modeling life is for sure impossible.

Don't have to admit to feelings

I think I am going to be like an iceberg – deep man – sees a lot- says a little - Gandalf style. Then I can interact comfortably in the world on all levels. That's the best way for me. I seem to think I am always under an obligation to confess how I feel or think. I am not. I can say how I feel when I feel like it and say nothing anytime I want. I don't have to find a safe place. I have a safe place in me. I am private like everyone else. I am answerable to no one. I don't need to confess to the world.

It's weird keeping everything inside. Somehow I always believed I was externally represented. Completely false of course but that is what I thought. No wonder I felt so hunted and unsafe. There was nowhere I could hide from myself. It's good though - unprecedented for me. I was such a blabber mouth always talking up and down about my feelings endlessly - allegorically. In coded ways – ways so coded even I didn't understand them. Not aiming to be James Bond. But I

think it is very clear to me now that I have to handle my own feelings always. And keep handling them.

The tribunal was self always. And there was no escape from my own judgement of me.

I am not a therapist or counsellor and I have had enough of playing that pretend role. I am not interested in other people's problems.

I drank to repress and forget for a little while my feelings. Smoking is a type of repression also. It's a type of forgetfulness. I see that my feelings are very close to the surface of me I want them at the core of me and all else above that. I no longer want to debate and discuss my feelings with myself. This is me for life now. I put my feelings at the heart of my life now – not at the surface.

Motivation for the Theorising

Theories about Myself

I was always a theorist about myself. I think that is an indication of deep repression. In situations where my I felt vulnerable I theorised as to what might be the cause of that feeling of vulnerability. I had many theories about LDH and my parents. But it didn't stop there. In my struggles in the world again I theorised. So I had a theory about who I was. Unfortunately that was a very bad place to be and indicative of very poor self-knowledge.

Further comments

I can see now that I have always had narcissistic concerns in relatedness and that has influenced my behavior and approach to other people. The main and only reason that I felt situations or involvements I was in is that they ceased or no longer met my needs. That was the case and still is the case. The only other point then is that I had a mental condition which was prone to flaring up from time to time.

To know my needs I had and have to know myself and I think my problems with depression were as a result of not knowing myself well enough. It was certainly the problem in every other aspect of my life. Why would depression be any different? Or was not depression just the manifestation of that lack of self-knowledge? Depressed people are just not nice to themselves and who else is going to be. I think I was caught in a narcissist trap or a vicious cycle with myself wherein I could not address my needs. This of course was very depressing. I think therapy helped me to start to grow out of that cycle and as I did I found my ability to address my needs started to improve. It has to be true that depressed people can't meet their own needs. My depressed period began with that conviction and ended with the realization that I could.

I was having problems with this as recently as March of last year because I was still unable to meet my needs in terms of work. I found a stable work situation eluded me. So it was concerning and the introspection continues until the vicious cycle is ended. So the self-questioning and doubt is very much driven by my need to satisfy my own needs.

I don't find my observations about myself or other people very interesting anymore and when I stop myself from talking about that I find that I really don't have very much to say which could be good because I find I have a lot more to do.

I have always been inclined and still am to blame my developmental problems on other people and invariably therefore on myself. I have tried to help my younger siblings because I wish someone had in my environment been able to help me. However on an emotional basis they were not able and they were consumed with their own problems. I don't think I am anything special in any particular way I just have gained a level of emotional intelligence now that is not evident in my formative environment - having said that I now realize of course that other people of my age have had that for very much longer than me and were growing emotionally as teenagers.

The Universe strikes at our weakest point per Chris and Pax. Well mine was a chronic lack of emotional intelligence.

As for my older siblings I can see that they need to play a guiding more senior role to me and I should accept that age comes before beauty to some extent. I think that will always be the subtext or my interactions with them because they are older. Also with my mother who is of course senior by many years.

Family is personal and is part of my identity so I need to integrate it and I think I have. I did this by making a lot of comparisons and observations – too many I am sure. I am content with my family however and leave it at that.

My Manic Depression

My manic depression was therefore a vicious cycle of alternating between states of believing needs satisfaction is imminent and an overwhelming depression that needs satisfaction was beyond reach. Mine was a pathological cycle and did not result in needs fulfillment.

I was fearful that a similar experience could happen to Claire or Jane but really I had no evidence or justification for that assumption. My experience is and was unique. It can't be applied to other people. I wanted to be accepted as an authority in their lives but they are adults and not affected personally themselves by the kinds of problems I had.

There is of course some overlap by virtue of having the same parents etc. But nothing can be assumed. I really don't want to be that kind of older sibling but I suppose I was hopeful of relating to them.

Mary's Comments

I have to remember Mary is intruding on a private McGovern family discussion. Her family is not without its quirks. I think the situation was pretty fragile and I was concerned for Jane and more recently Claire. So I don't think there is anything unhealthy about that. I would much prefer they led self-determined healthy lives than that they had so close relationship with me.

I think it's a couple of things. I was growing emotionally and constantly reevaluating my relationship with my origins which she has heard a lot about and in that growth the risks became more evident.

I do value her opinion as an unbiased outsider. There is a difference between mature concern, empathy and so on and co-narcissism which is literally just trying to get on with people no matter what. I would rather say what I think and piss people off then not say it.

This argy-bargy psychology is not appreciated because I am dealing with people who don't want to accept it or change. So I think I would get on better in the short-term with family members if I said nothing. But it needs to be said. It has never been said by me. And so they can come back to me as they please but for me I being true to what I think and believe. More situations like this may arise but I don't think they are any different. I am sure I would have respected my parent's authority if I could have believed in it. I was in rebellion against my parents for sure and ultimately I think I just matured beyond a point that they did. I accept them but they are not authority figures to me and I don't have that kind of relationship with my mother.

I think all the McGovern adult children have that self-determined gene. It is probably a result of not connecting emotionally with narcissistic parents.

I find that I am assertive of what I think and feel and I am content with that. I don't take the blame or responsibility for other people's feelings. Anyone who knows knows what I think. What else is there to be said?

My Self-Esteem

Self-esteem Definition

It is a sense of personal worth and ability that is fundamental to an individual's identity. Family relationships during childhood are believed to play a crucial role in its development. Parents may foster self-esteem by expressing affection and support for the child as well as by helping the child set realistic goals for achievement instead of imposing unreachably high standards. Karen Horney asserted that low self-esteem leads to the development of a personality that excessively craves approval and affection and exhibits an extreme desire for personal achievement. According to Alfred Adler's theory of personality, low self-esteem leads people to strive to overcome their perceived inferiorities and to develop strengths or talents in compensation.

It seems obvious to me that the more self-idealised I was the lower my self-esteem was.

My Self-Esteem Not Linked to others

I was trying always to find a link between the way I felt and everyone else. Not ever realising of course that there is no connection. All my insane rationalisations were with this agenda in mind. Most recently this focused on the McGovern's. This was at the heart of my complete alienation (aliens) - complete emotional isolation.

This is why I found interaction and relatedness so damaging to me. I formed mental representations concerning interactions.

There is no link between how I feel and my environment. I certainly believed there was but I can appreciate now that there isn't. My self-esteem is in no way affected by my environment or the people I interact with. Is this not a complete liberation?

When our self-esteem varies in relation to how others think and feel about us, we are experiencing a narcissistic vulnerability. When we feel guilty or anxious because we fear that we are not meeting someone else's needs or expectations, we are being co-narcissistic.

These ordinary experiences are problematic the more they interfere with our ability to be successful and enjoy our lives. It is often helpful in overcoming narcissistic anxieties to realize that the other person's behavior is a result of their own views and experience, is not a reflection on oneself, and one's self-esteem does not have to be affected by their behavior.

For co-narcissistic people, who experience strong feelings of guilt and blame, recognizing that they are not responsible for another's experience is a great relief.

It is important for people with either narcissistic or co-narcissistic problems to come to believe that they have intrinsic value, independent of their accomplishments or what others may think of them.

My Self-Esteem is Based on Me

*I think the difference between before and now is that my self-esteem is primarily an aspect of me. I don't regard it as contingent on other people or **results**. That is a far better place than I was in. And the variations I think were based on my on-going perceptions of feedback and what I thought the environment was saying back to me. That is improved self-esteem. Because then I take full responsibility for how I feel. And before I was taking partial or a growing responsibility. And in this sense I become self-determined and self-directed to a much higher degree.*

I really believed things would get better with results. So I was incredibly results focused as a result. And it wasn't true.

I think for me one of the most healing aspects of my mental state is that I now finally own it and I am not trying to pin it on anyone else or anything else. It was always my problem and I didn't want it. So to that extent I agree with the medical view that patients always try to dissociate from their own conditions. It's very human, very natural perhaps but very unhelpful.

Generalizing everything is not owning my own experience. I was too subjective to be a good writer. I was too generalized to be effective. I wouldn't take responsibility for myself.

Implicitly I have always assumed that my experience is the same as everyone else's. There is no connection. My experience is completely and utterly unique and personal to me. There is no connection between what I do and what other people do. That it all.

My Self-Esteem Cycles Like All my emotions

The co-narcissist caretaker in me appears to me mentally almost like a puppet master who must pull strings all the time to control threats to my self-esteem. These strings are my representations concerning what I feel others may want from me.

This appears to me particularly in the case of my family. I also struggle in relationship to new situations or around people I don't know. I suppose for me realistically the struggle is not over particularly if I go back to work which I will have to sooner or later.

I should certainly not dodge interaction because though I may be a novice to good self-esteem I think in time it will come though I suspect there will be ups and downs. I have it fairly easy at the moment because I don't work but work will put me into contact with people who will cause me difficulties no doubt.

My impressions in this regard are of course cyclical and not fixed or static. My self-esteem cycles like all my other emotions. This is why it rises and falls. To the extent that my style was co-narcissistic this has also cycled always but of course I only now become aware of the cycle of my self-esteem.

This is a subjective experience not an objective one. Asserting me breaks my vicious cycle but does not lead to an objective difference. I think the people I interact with will not change very much I certainly make connections between my feelings and other people like I used to.

Stark characterisations of me are inaccurate and emotional growth is a gradual and non-threatening experience as I now know. I was neither too terrible in the past nor I am so brilliant right now in the present.

I suppose I resolved lately to keep it in and not vocalise it all the time to Mary or others and to disengage in any caretaking activities with my family. I don't talk about her family. She doesn't talk about mine. I think it's better that way.

New Rules for McGovern Interaction

I think I should adopt a rule with Mum not to discuss other family members - better for both of us. Same if I talk to Claire and Jane – just talk directly to them not about others. If they bring up Gaddis or Daniel or whatever I will not encourage it. I am no longer in the business of interpreting feelings. Mine presumably were under interpretation by me until now. I was in a painful place for me emotionally and my heart was certainly on my sleeve.

Lots of adults of course do not contain or handle their own emotional problems and I was certainly one of them but I think now this is the best for me. Of course the problem was that my female family couldn't manage their own and that is where I came in as far as they were concerned but if they start up and will just tell them to read the Co-Narcissist article and talk to therapists. They know everything I know now as I have said before.

I can't close off the McGovern's but I can grow out of this and detach.

I think also that approval from the McGovern females is really in return for some kind of co-narcissist support. So it's really not possible to be approved by them unless you provide the kind of audience support they want. So trying to make a relationship out of it is not realistic. Really I can just stop providing the audience. When I do that they withdraw emotionally. So that's the scenario.

I think Rapport is right. It's just not a relationship and that probably is the deep frustration I have had always with this. I have always struggled to make it something that worked for me but I have never been able to. I don't think when someone has dangerously low self-esteem that it is possible to know how they feel. They are not really articulate in that way. The way they talk about themselves and feelings it seems to me that they don't have a clue.

Guiding these people to a better self-awareness seems like a denial of how it feels. Not very good is how it feels. So I do need to be more detached around them but I see why I had such an appetite for these conversations. I wanted to be connected only now I know I can't, I never did and I never will. But I never was I only thought I was or could be. So it's the same. But I acknowledge the feelings. That was the denial. It's about liking or disliking. That's not it. It's about me wanting to be close and trying to be close. But I don't need to try to be close to people. It's a natural thing.

So no need to be quiet - me I should be celebrating. So the only thing that has changed for me is I accept my feelings on this. That's it. And what was motivating my behaviour in this oddly was a denial of how it felt.

I am not into this before and after characterisation. I don't believe it anymore. The more of my feelings I own the better for me. My life is neither so terrible before nor so enlightened after each growth experience. There seems to be this conviction always that I am losing something when I am really gaining more of myself. I guess that's the fear associated with growth.

The truth is that I am not in a relationship with John. Mum is not me. She lives with John. Claire is in some kind of relationship with Daniel not me. She only talks to me about him and when things are good with him I never hear from her during those times. Again Jane is in a relationship with her mother and Geddis not me. So none of these scenarios are relationships. It never felt like they were relationships and they never were. Sully and I actually are friends so it is a relationship.

For a relationship there has to be regular contact. Mary and Margaret have never been out of contact their whole lives. Greg is not a relationship. He already broke off before Xmas for six

weeks. Chris I never hear from. He doesn't live in Ireland. The relationship has to be established in order for an expectation to exist. A relationship is a two way street where there is regular contact.

Claire Jane and Mum pop up out of the blue. I never know with them when they might appear or not. Mark never contacts me. And John never contacts me.

Assertiveness

All the analysis makes sense to me now. It's inconceivable to me that I could have a relationship with someone where I am not present or cannot be present. My presence I assert. I don't consider my older siblings, Greg, Chris, Ray, Martin, Gonzaga boys and so on – they are not relationships. They are much more casual intermittent interaction. I think for an interaction to be a real relationship I have to assert myself in the relationship. That is what this is all about from my perspective. Then it becomes real.

A relationship has to be someone I am in regular contact with. And then a better relationship with that person is of course where I am fully present and known. Working with people or infrequent interaction is not a relationship.

Also I improve my ability to relate by asserting myself for me as and when required. And that is something I can do right now and have done and continue to do. Dismissiveness is not assertiveness. I only return then on the same terms on which I left. I think there are all levels of this going on at the same time for me. It's a dynamic situation.

In your relationships with others you have always had difficulty asserting yourself – mixing it up with aggression, and have therefore avoiding doing so in most relationships. However this has meant that you carry the burden with you and end up allowing others to take advantage of you and feeling extremely angry. This is the “fear of hurting others” trap. You have also indicated in the Psychotherapy file that you fall into the “trying to please” trap whereby you try to please others by doing what they seem to want. However you either end up being taken advantage of, or you end up hiding away because you feel out of control with the need to please. Either way your sense of uncertainty about yourself is increased.

I do think there is triad of Mum and Claire and Jane and I have been involved trying to pick up slack. I shouldn't have to be doing this. I know it is entirely correct to assert what I think in those situations.

I think my natural inclination always has been that being assertive is very stressful – I won't be liked. So don't do it. My learned inclination is to be assertive. And I am sure I will need to be mindful of my tendency not to be.

There were two parts to my changing style of relatedness – I stopped being dismissive and also I needed to be assertive of me.

My assertiveness is being expressive of how I think and feel. That's all. Not rocket science. It's the fullness of my relationship with self – where I openly and freely voice my views. It doesn't change anyone else or anything else. There is no connection.

I am not actually challenging another person. I am challenging myself by being more assertive and so I grow as a result. I find that I assert myself and I approve of myself in so doing. So this for sure has resulted in a better sense of me for me.

It's not about being wrong or right in the opinion of others of being agreed with or disagreed with – it's about me expressing myself and my views. I denied myself self-expression. I put this aside in order to relate.

This is my emotive cycle and in being dismissive of others I was self-dismissive and in being assertive of myself I recognize that I no longer dismissive others so I permit them to be assertive too. The cycle is complete and healthy.

Assertiveness associated with rejection and mental instability

I have to assert myself in myself and be good with myself in that way. It's not going to be obviously reflected in my environment any more than my lack of assertiveness was obvious to me or the people around me. So I don't expect anything to significantly different. It was a personal milestone for me. I see now how my conditioned fears of rejection, coupled then due to bipolar with an intensified fear of emotional instability, breakdown etc. tied me up in a mental straitjacket where very little could be risked or adventured. I was always verbalizing my thoughts and impressions and looking implicitly for support for me to a level was not healthy for me or Mary or what I needed to do.

I associated being assertive with mental instability and they are not associated. So it was hard for me to be assertive and yet that is exactly what I have always lacked, I don't hold my own corner. So I end up with nothing.

So really my fear of being assertive has nothing to do with my relatives or sending a few psych documents around the place. It is this conditioned fear that when I stand up for myself I have a breakdown. Again the opposite is the truth. By never standing up for myself I am trapped in a really pathetic emotional, narcissistic trap.

My Fragility

I am the one with the history of emotional instability. So I am fearful of destabilising myself emotionally. I would fear that would result from me being assertive. There has to be some quite powerful fear preventing me from saying what I think and doing what I feel is right for me and there was. I projected my instability onto the people around me – even assuming they are emotionally fragile or unstable when they have no history of such issues.

However I am big enough and bold enough and mature enough to be assertive despite my conditioned fear that it is unacceptable to others. So they stuff it in short. I am going to continue asserting myself just as I need to.

The truth as I now know so well is always the opposite of my conditioned fears. That is I am more stable as a result of confidently asserting myself then covertly thinking and writing things and being too afraid to express them is a more unstable place to be.

I am with it and I am up to date with myself. I am good with myself and that's what matters. I am not going to comment or review yesterday's actions or thoughts. That was yesterday.

I fundamentally have to agree with myself. And that really is about being right with me. I am not lonely. I was self-alienated - but never really alone. I never seem to get this but this is 100% an internal process. This is only to do with how I feel. I don't care who agrees with me about psychology or family matters or anything.

Growing Pains - Assertiveness

I am inclined to feel this is momentous but it really isn't. It's just a cycle of feelings. Assertiveness was and is an aspect of me that was hugely underdeveloped. I can't say how that will be or where that will go. There are times when I am sure I will want to let go as well.

It one of these growth steps entails a certain amount of emotional pain. It's not pleasant to re-evaluate myself. If it were easy I would have done it a long time ago. So there is a growing pain. But assertiveness was a lacking element for me but in many other respects I am fortunately in having balance, reason, calm, diplomacy, intelligence. So it was a deficiency and that's all. So this is an improvement.

I am changed too in this. I was too involved in family problems and I was too open to emotional distress in other people. And I did want to separate from that – but not necessarily from the connections. I do have a sense of service to other people which I like about myself. And I find rewarding. So it's greater balance. I am happy to not be a dominant presence around others. But I don't want to be invisible or an adjunct to other people's needs. And I don't want other people's lives to preoccupy mine to an unhealthy level.

I believe in Rapaport's definition of a relationship. I define a relationship as an interpersonal interaction in which each person is able to consider and act on his or her own needs, experience, and point of view, as well as being able to consider and respond to the experience of the other person. Both people are important to each person.

My relationship is summarised very easily as Mary.

I have been conditionally related to Claire, Jane and Mum which I don't like but I have always related to them in this way. I am happy for this to find its natural balance. In fact that's what I hope is happening. All else is much more detached and distant. So I am assertive in these connections and that is the change.

The problem with my pseudo connections is they were never relationships nor could they be. So taking them seriously made no sense. Outside of the core then – no emotional response is appropriate.

The Dilemma of Depression

However I think I understand the dilemma of depression as I find truth only in me and withdraw representation from everyone – this I have done many times before. However finding better truth for myself is not pejorative of anyone else or even critical of them. Also I should never have been so represented mentally in the first place. It was not a good place to be. Neither contrary to what I believed are other's opposed to my journey – I am opposed in the form of my representations. Objectively I have no knowledge of other's opposition to me. I am experiencing a narcissistic vulnerability.

This is a completely subjective experience not an objective one. I suppose a depressive dismisses everyone around them, isolates themselves and then when they feel better tries to re-engage. Reality does not change. I concluded a long time ago I am completely alone and I still am and always was. I haven't lost anything I have just gained more of myself.

Mother Approval

I think I have always been in an unhealthy relationship with my mother and I always had to have her approval or certainly this is the way things developed between me and her. Because I found her disapproval so devastating I worked very hard to keep her on side with me - too hard. It is also possible that this formed my style of relatedness with other people. I had to have their approval and so I was always invisible in relationships for that reason. Obviously during the repressed phase I was dismissive so I would end relationships for some of the reasons Clare outlined but that was fundamentally my style of relatedness whilst in a relationship.

Having to have other people's approval has meant that relating to people I don't know makes me feel extremely vulnerable. As I said before they could easily take advantage of me if they wanted to. Again although I think this started with the mum is not personal. It is an aspect of how I relate to other people that I want to change and I don't need to engage in transference or generalisation.

If I can be present in relationships I have no difficulty with those relationships so I need to assert myself and my visibility. That is going to be the case with anyone.

In the past I wouldn't be assertive I would be critical. Claire, Mum do that as well. They launch into major criticisms of people. It's a lack of assertiveness thing. By asserting it it gets it out. And then it's gone. If I was doing more of what I wanted there would be no need to criticise.

Yes I need to consider how other people make me feel but the major implication is for me and how I relate. And does how I relate need to change? If not – fine. No change required.

I can't now retrospectively assert myself for all the times that I didn't or I now feel I didn't but I can stop being co-narcissistic. In other words I feel inclined to be dismissive. Really I am angry at myself. And that is certainly the character of the last few days.

There is no escaping my own disapproval. I should know this stuff. I won't always feel this way. And I expect to be more positive in myself.

Recent Events

Emotional withdrawal as practised by Greg, Claire, Mum & Jane? Is a lack of assertiveness? Any narcissist person can play both sides of the narcissist game. It's just low self-esteem. Not sure what to say or not say. But I am not going to pay any attention to it really. It's passive-aggressive stuff. I think I can begin to see the narcissistic relatedness styles are not actually devastating – they are very predictable.

I am not a therapist. They are all adults. I don't think I am going to do anything. Does it matter?

Guard Against Transference & Globalisation

I am very inclined to transfer how on feel onto someone else or something else. And I should guard against it. Transference is my strategy to disassociate from my feelings. Globalisation or generalisation is another. Everyone feels the same way I reason. They don't. These are my feelings. I think everyone is an adult whether they act like that or not is their problem. I don't take responsibility for other adults so I don't feel embarrassed if they behave or live badly or immaturity. That's their choice.

In terms of being close to people that is solely contingent on being good with self. When I am good with myself I am relaxed, comfortable and easy to be around.

Confident in My Maturity

I think I can be confident in my maturity. It's not going to change. It is a stable state. Mature adults can interact with teenagers - happens all the time. In fact they might have a few of their own. As a parent I am sure it often arises that a child or an adult child is disappointing, demanding, whatever – not suggesting I want to parent teenage adults but I think I can interact with them without issue for me.

I think my growth is on-going and I measure myself against me. I no longer make comparisons. I am pretty happy with things as they go. I make improvements not character assassinations of myself. I can't expect anyone else to change for me. I think I have had a pretty eclectic life thus far. I don't blame anyone else for how I think or feel. I take full responsibility for my own feelings. I don't have to distance myself from my past but certainly not live in it. I am not the only person I am sure who has been disappointed in the people around them.

There is no end when it comes to feelings but I am of the view that success like everything comes right in me. So the journey goes on.

Success

I consider myself a failure and that can hardly be a successful outlook. I have divorced myself from my sense of success and placed it out of reach – something to be aspired too and strived for. That can hardly be right either. I keep looking for success outside me. It is in me. So I am haunted by too much failure. I wouldn't labour it. It is a growing thing for sure. Its an attribute – just keep doing what I do.

Work

Successful Contracts and Work situations

I can look back now and realise that my mental health issues really didn't have a lot to do with my problems in the office. Any contract where I had specific duties assigned to my role and the capacity to make them my own I did very well.

Custodial Jobs

Montgomery, Hammacher, Eircell, Irish Rail, Citibank. All these jobs finished in an orderly fashion and I left on good terms. I think in these roles it was obvious to me what was expected of me and I could deliver on that. And I got to grips with the role usually quite quickly. They were all custodial roles and that worked just fine for me. In a custodial job I am known for the job and for what I do and when I come in the morning I just do my job. And then at the end of the day I go home. Custodial is predictable and stable. I might easily spend years in a custodial job. Why not? This is what I would want.

A custodial job has clearly defined duties and expectations. A work relationship requires there to be work. If there isn't then it's not healthy and it doesn't fulfil my needs.

The reason anyone succeeds in a role is that they are presented with work to be done and they do it. If they are presented with nothing then the relationship doesn't work. The office was not a relatedness problem I think now it was that there was no relationship. There needs to be work to be done that is necessary and someone who needs the work done.

Work is relationship between me the person who does the work and the recipient of the work who needs and appreciates having the work done. That's the relationship. How I got on in the office was not the issue and it was never the issue. I wasn't there to get on with everyone.

It's so obvious – all the good jobs I have references for. Chris Burke would have given me a reference. I never asked him. Cornerstone was not custodial. There was a pool of analysts and they were assigned as appropriate.

I think has to be a core custodial element with a relationship with a manager. There can be projects. I think I would expect to have the same job indefinitely now.

Shit Roles

All the bad jobs – Cornerstone, Dell, Elavon,

The shit contracts MS contracts, AIB, Ulster Bank, Kelly Financial CIT, ITC, NT – they were all roles where there was no personal ownership. I never felt on top of it ever. There was nothing to take ownership of. There was basically no interview and I just showed up one day and sat at a desk. I certainly think if I end up in one those contracts again I will be walking out the door. I think in AIB and other places they attitude to the contractors was they had a pool of labour and they would assign transient tasks to people in the pool. For me that meant no idea when I was going to be given something, what it would be, and no personal ownership. In the shit job I am not known for anything. They might want to keep me around but it's a shit work relationship.

I have to consider the quality of the role because that really determines everything. Shit jobs which are not really jobs I don't want. So it is nothing to do with my mental health.

Mental Health & Writing

I really don't think that my mental health was the reason for my not being published. I didn't present anything worth publishing. That's the reason - theories about me or maybe a poorly constructed high-tech thriller. I don't think it's as esoteric as I think it is. I just don't think I was good enough. That presumably is the avoided truth in all this grandiosity.

I think I used mental issues as an excuse. Liane just wasn't interested in me. And I couldn't accept that. My writing was not going to lead to a career as a successful published writer. It wasn't good enough simply. The office did work out in the better roles. I just never really had many of them and I just assumed that I had no future in the office.

I need a steady job. I think that's obvious. I should continue with the writing now being objective. So up until now is my watershed for that kind of work. And beyond that I don't know. In terms of self-development I want to develop myself as a writer so that's going to be my long-term goal. Has been for a long time and still is.

Possibilities

To be honest I would be open to something new and rewarding. I think I have found that in my new awareness. So I would expect things will progress just fine now. I was stuck basically. And I was in a rut.

Self-Direction

I think my lack of self-direction and my uncertainty about what to do comes down to my relationship with Dad. He was an incompetent father and a terrible role model. He was engaged primarily I think in a battle to prove his own significance. He also lacked self-directedness. Didn't know where he was going or what he was trying to do.

I don't think I like writing or office work at all or ever did really. I was copying the paternal obsession for personal significance which I have now resolved for myself in favour of my realisation that I am significant.

Again I am the master of transference and avoidance on this topic always looking to and comparing myself to other people or believing that by withdrawing from other people this will somehow come right for me. I won't really. My father's unmet needs I have resolved for myself. SO I don't need to prove something about me to me. I know I matter. So now I can do what I want. Before I could only do what he tried and didn't succeed in doing.

Because my father was incompetent I very much wanted to prove how competent I was. That explains the highly urgent and stressful need to succeed and be someone. It was unproven and so it was very pressured. .

I think a lot of what “was wrong” in my previous roles was that I sought to fulfil something in myself that couldn’t be fulfilled in job or a role or even a novel. Those feelings of significance and self-worth and self-esteem and so on they are independent of adult involvements. And can’t be resolved by association. That was the problem for me. Otherwise I would have stayed put in my involvements once I was comfortable. But I never got comfortable.

There may be 2 aspects to this. Firstly the job or the novel was never good enough and was never going to fix my low self-esteem problem. *In saying that I don’t like jobs or novels what I am really saying is they don’t make me personally significant – only I can find that in myself.* This being the case I am content with those kinds of work then, I find peace in that work and ironically for the first time I give myself a change to do that kind of work.

I suffered from a serious deficit of self-esteem. I was trying to resolve it by association. Putting myself with the right people, in the right places, in the right kinds of work. Following that to its logical conclusion no-one and no involvement is good enough meaning no one or no involvement will correct this dangerous deficit of self-esteem. It doesn’t matter who I hang around with or what I do in terms of my self-esteem. It’s personal. I think the content and quality of what I say and do around others changes as my self-esteem improves. I don’t want to be dumped on and so on.

I really think now that I am going around and around this association issue. It’s not resolving it for me. I say I don’t want to walk with Sully. Then I change my mind and go. Now I don’t know. I say the end of the McGovern’s. See how you are in a week or two. The Dags were the exactly the same. Can’t tolerate them and then a huge effort to make it okay again? Why? Because it was never the issue. I think is true – I think I am feeling frustrated and highly dismissive but I have been here before many times and it didn’t make it better.

I had a deficit of self-esteem that needed to be resolved. It just means a more purposeful life for me. Because the issue was not can I write or work in an office. I can of course. The question was will that make me feel better about myself and the answer of course is no – it doesn’t?

I think my self-esteem was just too low to engage properly or function. Everything I took personally, misinterpreted everything, most of time I spent defending imagined threats to my self-esteem. That’s what happened to me because I always had low-esteem and so was always deficit in that area.

All I am saying is I am disappointed in myself and I know it has nothing to do with the people around me. *But I also know that it is just not true that I never want to see my mother again or Claire or Jane or Sully - that’s not true – or even anyone. I have often thought it’s a shame I am not friendly with Sherrard on some level.* So these feelings I know don’t stay fixed. And I happen to think now the feelings are really centred on me not people around me and I am disappointed in myself and I realise that low self-esteem has been a big problem for me and it was for Dad and Mum too. They just felt so inadequate and that’s why they leaned on their kids so much.

I think it is quite confusing because I think my natural inclination is to disassociate from people who don’t grow with me but I think family is a fixed commodity in my life. The Dags is a classic

example. I can't get rid of them and it is preferable to be on reasonable terms if possible. However I was not asserting myself in relation to them and so it wasn't correctly balanced from my perspective. Again I felt with the McGovern ladies that I don't assert myself for me and it's all about them. Again that's not good for me. Sully I don't want to spend two hours listening to him talk about himself. So I have not asserted myself around him.

I wasn't sure how I felt about the McGovern's or even Sully and so I was back and forth on it a lot. I think Sully is okay. He's annoying but he knows he's annoying or is starting too anyway. Again with the McGovern women I would be much more direct now. I was starting to be with Claire and Mum. But I know I know what I am talking about so that's the end of the debate for me.

Purpose of Narcissist Trap

The purpose of this document and the journaling about feelings was to overcome powerful and debilitating feelings of inadequacy and low self-esteem and to resolve this burning issue I always had about my own personal significance. Do I matter? Does life have meaning? What am I doing? - and all that. So it has delivered on those things and really that has always been the problem.

I was disassociating and associating continually from scenarios where my low self-esteem and my personal significance were not answered for me never realising of course that I had to answer it for myself. Other people or jobs or places cannot convince me that I am significant or bolster chronically low self-esteem. That is something I always had to do by myself. For Dad I think the two were mixed up and he could never quite disentangle from that.

Narcissistically he felt I think as I have felt that through my accomplishments and results I would achieve that personal significance, better self-esteem and so on but that was never true. The deficit was in me.

People are Unique

People are unique and everyone has their own unique experience, internalisations and beliefs and that is the main point to remember always. People cannot be categorised or put in boxes. Whereas some people display narcissistic characteristics they are unique and should be treated that way always and regarded in that way. People who display narcissistic tendencies are easy to spot – they either practise emotional withdrawal or are dismissive. I can summarise my problems by the fact that I cared about and devoted my energies to people who didn't care about me.

Every interaction is unique and should be regarded that way. In that way interactions can be evaluated on their own merits. Assuming people are well intentioned can be a mistake. People should be judged on the quality of how they interact. That is the telling point. If the interaction is good that's fine. The other point is that if it is narcissistic it probably has always been quite cyclical. That would be the case with Claire. It was always hot and cold depending on how she was. Greg must have dropped this email chain a few times since it started.

I think the Claire thing was never a good thing for me and whereas it might have seemed a bit exciting and glamorous to be skyped from NY regularly. At this end of the call is post middle-aged obese over drinking unemployed guy who is really doing nothing with his life – and is supporting his narcissistic sister. And when he protests she savages him and withdraws contemptuously. So looking at it from my point of view it's horrendous but the funny thing is I only every looked at it from her point of view.

Again Greg is dismissive – it's not very nice to be dropped without any explanation. That is how that feels. I guess I feel this things clearly now. I couldn't continue being Claire's agony aunt. And I feel a bit hurt that Greg just drops the whole thing. So I feel it. It's not very nice. I wouldn't like to put myself in another situation like that. Or to remain in a situation like that.

I have to look at my interactions on a case specific basis. Is this any good? Do I want this? Is this helping me in any way?

Conclusion

I think it's quite obvious what's going on here. I never have to tell other people how I feel unless there is a problem. They sense how I feel and they respond to that. That's called knowing someone. Being as it is that no one in my family has any idea how I feel about anything it is safe for me to conclude that they don't know me. That also applies to Greg and Sully. Not gifted in emotional intelligence. So I can end this incessant frustration with explaining myself and I never had to and it doesn't work. In all my adult interactions I was never told how I make other people feel barring when I was extremely out of line. But I do know that people avoided me like the plague and I don't blame them. I know now how the McGovern's make me feel and how they must also make other people feel. Not good. Not good at all. So leave it up to other people to get me or not. That's the way it works. Don't worry about connecting or relating. It happens naturally or not at all. So this is the pathological aspect of me the relentless self-therapist driving me to drink and endless smoking. How could it be otherwise with such endless and incessant self-flagellation? So if they need to be told they don't get it and aren't going to get it. Greg and Sully can't see that they are using me so there is no point telling them. Just politely evade. Anyone who is highly verbally expressive of their feelings on an on-going basis doesn't have a clue how they feel about anything. That's why this is so stressful. It's digging and digging all the time into the heart of things. And it is to no good purpose.

Those who know how they feel are grounded in good relationships. That's the way of the world. It's a bit sad really because there is no hope for the emotionally isolated. Only they can end their agony and leave the prison they reside in. But then again they choose to live like that. So it is fair. And why would it be any otherwise.

The other way to look at it is if they didn't need to be told they wouldn't be asking. So Claire is only interested in talking about herself. Mum is the same. And Jane has lost interest which is something of a credit to her I think. Mum wouldn't be interested in the connection if she can't vent. So it is all rather sad at the same time.

So I would now downplay in all directions because that will take the stress out of it. Rather than bringing up stressful topics with narcissistic people I would do the opposite and accept and realize that these conversations serve no useful purpose. We cannot really articulate feelings only listen to them in ourselves. And see where the dust settles. I should be able to disengage seamlessly from these engagements because the only thing holding them together is my desire to be understood. Now that this desire has left me I have no further interest. I cannot be understood or felt emotionally by the emotionally isolated. They would have to feel themselves first and that is not on the cards.

So this is no doubt disappointing for me since I expected or hoped for more but it is at least a conclusion and I accept it. To be an expert in my feelings I have to learn to keep them to myself and listen to my own feelings. Otherwise I am a crazy man isolated in an emotionally isolated world demanding intimacy and closeness and never finding it. Such as the McGovern's are in my view.

I can observe that Mary and Margaret keep their feelings to themselves and don't articulate them particularly not to untrustworthy people - I can and have learned a lot from them.

This is not poker this is reality my feelings were on my sleeve because I wanted so desperately to be understood. I get it coming from my family environment but it is not the world's problem to understand me. That's my problem.

Now that I understand myself I would rarely want to express how I feel verbally but I would express how I feel in my actions and avoidances. Feelings are the foundation of my life not the surface. That they were on the surface was a very bad sign of where I was at - and also very stressful. Having narcissistic engagements is also a bad sign since they are not relationships - they are no good.

Perhaps I am going too far in my anger. But if Mary can say that Marc is an idiot then that is how he makes her feel. And I have to agree he is an idiot. So do I regularly interact with an idiot? Would I not have to be an idiot to do that? The other telling sign is that my own life is still on hold. And what exactly is holding it back? Is it not all this stuff? At the very least it should be obvious to me that narcissistic engagements are not relationships. And they are not. They certainly don't feel like relationships.

I should only share my feelings with a trusted person.

And at the moment that would be Mary. Sully will go slobbering all around town. Mark at least has learned to keep them hidden but sometimes very hard to contain. Greg is another village idiot. And a weak link in Niall's view. Is he not right? Macker didn't want to tell me anything and why because he knows I am porous and he doesn't trust me. He was the one that told me not to give Murray a hard time and why because Murray told him what a gobshite I was. And how much I upset Murray. I then verbally abused his wife for good measure. If I want to know what the general mass of people think of me it is that I have leprosy of an emotional nature. But I go too far perhaps. In the narcissistic world all are offended.

Don't reveal anything of my feelings to people I don't know - ever -ever - unless there is some necessity.

My feelings are a joke to people I don't know and of course the emotionally isolated that I know only too well. So this is the Sully syndrome - he cluelessly goes around thinking he is connected with everyone. They don't trust him and don't tell him anything. And why would they?

I can learn from Hughie's style around people he doesn't trust. He isn't critical or condemnatory he just smiles and listens and nods and then goes off and does exactly what he wants anyway. Hughie gives no offense he is not brusque or dismissive and he interacts successfully with a lot of people and they don't feel insulted or demeaned by him but neither do they divert him from his purpose which he keeps to himself. That is a highly successful relatedness style in my view. The reason he has a lot of people at his wedding is they all wanted to be there

My feelings are very private and I only share them with someone I trust.

Sully's style is almost the complete opposite. He is very insistent. He is emotionally demanding he demands to be listened too excessively. He is very off putting. Dofter like Hughie has a very good relatedness style. People feel safe with Dofter and don't feel judged by him because he is not judgemental.

I was very emotionally demanding in that I demanded to be understood. I demanded understanding for the people around me. When I felt I did not get that I became dismissive and rude and combative.

With the McGovern's no explanation is required or sought. There is nothing to say about the emotionally isolated. Murray I think I owe an apology and I will at the opportune time. Sully evade and avoid. Greg the same. Claire I really don't know about Claire. All my "friends" were tragedies. No surprise there though. That's me summed up. That's the life that I had. No wonder I was miserable.

I am too closely involved with too many troubled people. And it is not good for me. Obviously I would get involved if I thought someone was in serious trouble. But I don't want to be troubled and I don't want to be routinely and regularly and closely involved with troubled people. I intend and am kind to troubled people and not mean to them but I don't want to be one of them. I think issuing apologies for drunken talk in pubs is probably not really worth the trouble. I am not trying to find a permanent place in the boozier.

Being more detached is not being offensive or dismissive in fact it may well be a relief to my narcissistic relatives. I am too involved up close with too many troubled people. It's taking up all my time and I am tired of it - time to detach.

Dictionary

Term	Definition
Breakdown	
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.
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.
Dissociation	The disconnection or separation of something from something else or the state of being disconnected.
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".

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.
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.
Externalization	Finding manifestations of one's own feelings in the external environment in the hope of resolve them.
Fantasy	The faculty or activity of imagining things that is impossible or improbable. Imagine the occurrence of; fantasize about.
Feeling	An emotional state or reaction
Inner conflict	The conflict between one's true and views, opinions, beliefs and so on that one has internalized.
Internalisation	= Trapped Feelings = Sub conscious
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
Isolation	the act of isolating, the quality or condition of being isolated.
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.
Neurosis	<p>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.</p> <p>Neurosis is a class of functional mental disorders involving distress but neither delusions nor hallucinations, whereby behaviour is not outside socially acceptable norms. 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</p>

	the resulting condition.
Personification of trapped feelings	giving names or personality to trapped feelings
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.
Projection	An estimate or forecast of a future situation or trend based on a study of present ones.
Psychosis	A severe mental disorder in which thought and emotions are so impaired that contact is lost with external reality.
Regression	The individual reverts to an earlier level of behaviour 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 defence mechanisms enable the individual on occasions to overlook or forget threatening or uncomfortable situations, to see him or others in a more satisfying way or to attack with enthusiasm obstacles that would otherwise be overpowering. However, the relief provided by defensive behaviour is usually only temporary unless the underlying or precipitating causes are modified.
Repression	<p>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.</p> <p>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 unfavourable or tragic events may be repressed and the accompanying unpleasant feelings thus avoided.</p> <p>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</p>

	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.
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.
Solitude	the state or quality of being alone or remote from others, a lonely or secluded place.
Suppression	an act or instance of suppressing, the state of being suppressed, the conscious intentional exclusion from consciousness of a thought or feeling
Thought	An idea or opinion produced by thinking or occurring suddenly in the mind, an idea or mental picture, imagined and contemplated.

THE END