

NOTE: The first part of this document is a cassette tape transcript of a two-cassette tape series entitled *Your Power To Create Love*, written and published in 1989. The next part is a transcript of a single cassette tape entitled *Decrease Your Conflict – Increase Your Standard of Living* on Side One, and *Responsible Speaking and Effective Listening Techniques* on Side Two, written and published in 1988. While marketing this material was not a success as a commercial venture, these ideas have given me, the author, much peace, and it is my hope that they can be shared more widely when distributed on a freeware basis.

Sincerely,

Larry Barnhart, llbarnhart@aol.com

YOUR POWER TO CREATE LOVE

SIDE ONE

“Love Defined: What It Is, and What It Is Not.”

Hello. I’m Larry Barnhart and I want to welcome you to a new world where you can discover your power to create love. This tape challenges many ideas we take for granted in this modern age. To make this challenge effective, I’ll ask you to consider the idea that reason and logic may be useful tools for understanding reality. On this first side of this two tapes series, we’ll explore different approaches to understanding love. Hence, the title: *“Love Defined: What It Is, and What It Is Not”*.

As we travel through life there are many difficulties we must overcome in order to live happy and productive lives. In the process of learning, we often experience much doubt and confusion. Nevertheless, unless we’ve totally given up, we plod on and gain understanding little by little as the years go by. There’s a common phrase that describes what we accomplish when we learn to look at an experience without feeling the former pain. That phrase is: “To come to terms with it.” It’s easy to take this common phrase for granted, but let’s talk for a moment and consider, what does this phrase really mean? There’s a wealth of knowledge hidden within this humble phrase. The phrase “to come to term with it” means just that. To find terms, or words that explain how an experience relates to the rest of our lives in general. It’s a process of taking many seemingly unrelated perceptions and with the aid of words, forming a conception of life that makes sense. Our ability to conceptualize is what sets us apart from all other species on this planet. Some people declare that humans are tool-making animals. But before we can make a tool, we must first develop a concept that explains why and how we’ll make that tool. As Napoleon Hill once said, “Anything man can conceive and believe, man can achieve.” How often have we heard people declare that love means different things to different people, and that

no two people experience love in the same way. This whole bromide has been repeated frequently for as long as I can remember. I've noticed that some people actually do find happiness when they find their definition of love. However, so many other people find only sadness and disappointment either because the picture in their mind never manifests in the material world, or because they find it, only to learn it wasn't all it was made out to be. This brings us to question, Why does the same thing, Love, bring happiness to some, and misery to others? One way to look at the different definitions of love is to see them as being philosophical road maps. When we choose a philosophy about love, we're choosing a map to a specific destination. Some maps to love do lead to peace with our selves and the rest of the world. While other maps promises only misery. Therefore, we're wise when we choose our map to love very carefully. When we choose a map to love, we need to be clear about what we mean by the word love. The popular notion that love is different for every person makes the word *love* as valuable as the map of Colorado, where every city is called Denver. With a map like this, when you ask for directions to Denver, they just point at the map and say: take your pick. When we say we want love, are we saying we want happiness, in the conviction that life is a gift to be enjoyed? Or do we want misery, and the belief that life is a sentence to be served? Once we know what we want we can look for the respective map, much the same as we would choose different maps for going to Alaska or Hawaii. When we choose a philosophy, is important to choose it as consciously as possible. Our philosophies determine our choices and actions. And our actions determine the consequences we experience. Sow a thought, you reap an action; sow an action, you reap a habit; sow a habit, you reap a character; sow a character, you reap a destiny. We choose our destiny with the thoughts we entertain most consistently. Sometimes it's virtually impossible to define what we believe about love because many of us have only learned one way to understand love, and then we assume that's the only way possible. Most people are content to describe love as "that unexplainable feeling you feel when you meet the right person. I can't tell you what it is, but you'll know it when you feel it." That leaves us free to make love into whatever we want it to be. Of course, our culture is more than happy to unravel the mystery of love through love songs, of which, I might add, make up about 99% of all songs. Thirty years ago the popular songs crumbled: "you're nobody 'til somebody loves you." Fifteen years ago many songs declared: "I love you, I need you," implying that love and need are synonymous. Now we hear our popular singers shout: "I hate myself for loving you." The words in the music may have changed, but central themes have not. They all proclaim we're despicable, meaningless, little creatures, until another despicable, meaningless, little creature gives us their stamp of approval. How two pitiful creatures are supposed to transform each other into heroic beings is beyond me, for it stands to reason that if happiness is multiplied by dividing it, so is emptiness and misery.

In this tape I want to offer a new definition of love that puts each one of us in the driver seat. Most definitions of love focus on controlling our outer world, in other words, other people. The definition of love that I'm going to offer asks that we control our inner world. If love is to be the most profound experience we're ever

have, and life isn't worth living without it, we shouldn't leave love to chance. Therefore I want to suggest a definition that depends only on you. **My definition of love is: "The will to appreciate all that is."** As this definition implies, love is a skill to be learned, not a gift to be received from someone else. The requirements for actualizing this definition of love is strength of character and understanding of ourselves and the world around us, and an ability to interpret our experience in impersonal as well as personal terms.

Let's explore this definition further. The first part of this definition refers to the will. Most of the time we think of someone with a strong desire as having a strong will, or a strong won't, as the case may be. The strong desire is a necessary starting point, but true will refers to our ability to maintain a steady stream of consciousness through a varied sequence of events. This concept will be explored in greater depth on side two of this tape, in the section on "*Socially- Acceptable-Schizophrenia.*" The second part of this definition suggests we learn to appreciate all that is. Here we must be very careful. There are some schools of thought that suggest we should learn to *accept* all that is. I take exception to this, because that definition suggests that the perfect lover is the perfect doormat. To appreciate does not necessarily mean we agree with or accept what's happening. It means we understand that everyone always does the best they can, based on their prevailing awareness. Also, we understand that while we are working to change things, we don't have to make ourselves unhappy in the meantime. Summed up, this definition asks that we stabilize our psyche and strengthen our character, so we can deal with the events in our lives without making ourselves miserable in the process.

This approach to love may seem contrary to everything in our experience, but it really isn't. Most of us experience a strong sense of appreciation when we're admired by a desirable member of the complimentary sex. In general, it's easy to appreciate life when things go our way. What's tough is to consider that a hidden justice may be at work when things don't go our way. Just the same as it does when they do. Nevertheless, this is what we need to do if we aspire to experience love more frequently and consistently.

Now that I've elaborated upon my basic definition of love, let's take a closer look at five things that are commonly called "love." Each of these feelings or sentiments leaves us at the mercy of other people. Thereby making our chances for happiness tentative at best and impossible at worst. The five feelings or sentiments we're going to explore are *desire, pity, guilt, possessiveness, and projection.*

Of these five things commonly called "love," *desire* is the one we're most often aware of. Furthermore, desire is probably the one that's least harmful. Desire, like pain, is a natural part of life. Where as pain tells us something's wrong, desire tells us what will help us live a more pleasant life. Of course, that's assuming our minds are programmed to believe that life is worth living in the first place. In order to live a satisfying life we must respect our desires. To deny them only puts us at odds with ourselves. That's not to say we should act on every whim. There's a middle ground where we can experience our desires without necessarily having to act on them. Many of our smaller desires are distraction from the larger, more central desires in our lives. Therefore, a total respect for our desires means being able to acknowledge all of our desires, and then choosing to act only

on those that will create the life we want to live in the long run. When we approach our desires in this way, we'll improve both our inner and outer lives. It's much better to be the master of our desires than to be a slave to them. As a master of our desires we can expect to enjoy three benefits. First, we cut down on inner conflict because we know we can survive frustrated desires. Next, we reduce our conflict with others because we have the presence of mind to let them make their own choices based on their desires, instead of imposing our desires on them. Finally, we become more attractive to others because we'll not present ourselves as being needy, and grasping. It's been observed that we tend to lose our magnetism when we desire something too strongly. As an author named Florence Scoville Schinn once said: "Don't let your heart's desire become your heart's disease." When we mistake desire for love, we upgrade a preference to a need and then end up feeling desperation and fear.

Life cannot or will not always cater to our every whim. Therefore, if we believe that the world should be totally committed to making us happy, we're in trouble. Love cannot be given to us by another person. The only time we ever experience love is when our feeling of appreciation passes through us as we project it outward. We've all heard stories about people who were showered with love and praises, but because they couldn't feel it themselves they chose to end their lives. For them personally, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary, the world was barren of love. Unless we have the love we seek within ourselves, we have no means for connecting with the love of others. This being the case, why can't we take this one step further and choose to experience love even when we're not showered with the approval and adoration of others. The number one thing we desire from others is their approval. It's very easy to get caught in the trap of working so hard to win the approval of others that we forget about winning our own approval. Dr. Wayne Dyer, the author of Pulling Your Own Strings, calls this disease approval-itis. When we suffer from approval-itis we find ourselves doing things we'd never do if we had a healthy self-respect. Without a healthy self-respect, the biggest threat to us is the statement "I won't love you if you do this," or "don't do that," and so on. On the other hand, people who use this threat need to understand that love cannot be tested. All we can test is our ability to play on other people's fears. This approach to defining love makes love a very scarce commodity indeed. When the withdrawal of approval is interpreted as a loss of love, finding and maintaining an experience of love can be just as painful as its loss.

The second feeling often mistaken for love, is *pity*. It's been said there are three things that attract people to each other, sex, mystery and sentiment. Very often the one called sentiment can also be called pity. It's gratifying to think that we're so competent in life that we can take care of others as well as ourselves. Unfortunately, the person being pitied has to swallow their pride in order to participate in a relationship where pity is the prime motivator. Of course, many people are willing to play the role because it offers them an easy way out. Nevertheless, it's not a satisfying role because the taker will usually act ungrateful by showing resentment for having lost their sense of pride and self-sufficiency.

My experience plus my observations of others have led me to suspect the vast majority of relationships have a dominant member and a passive member. In my earlier years my attempt to attract nice girls who were crying about the mean man they dated proved futile. I would try to be a nice guy and listen to all of their sad stories, all the while hoping they would notice that I could offer them something better, and then they'd turn around and hook up with up another man just like the one they were crying about. On the other hand, all I could attract were women who wanted to dominate me. After trying a number of relationships with these women, I decided that was not the way I wanted to live. So I once again started pursuing nice women in their mid-30s only to discover that nothing had changed since their late teens and early 20s. One woman I befriended, and openly admitted my romantic inclinations to, replied that she actually recoiled from my advances. Her reasoning was that I seemed to be too together and that in her eyes I was a living put-down to her. On the other hand, the men she responded to did little else but insult and degrade her, but at least she had the consolation of knowing that they were even more out of control than she was. Apparently her own judgement based on comparing my best with her worst, was more painful to her than the judgements and insults throw at her by the men she didn't recoil from. On side three we will explore this dilemma further as I introduce you to the 5,000 year-old con game.

A friend of mine once said: "what right have we to pity anyone." In reality my friend came closer to the truth than either of us realized at the time. James Allen in his book, As a Man Thinketh, states that: "Man is always a master, even in his weakest and most abandoned state. But in his weakness and degradation he is the foolish master who is mis-governing his household." Whether we be foolish or wise, we're all masters. James Allen continues further by stating: "A strong man cannot help a weaker unless that weaker is willing to be helped, and even then the weak man must become strong of himself. He must by his own efforts develop the strength he admires in another. None but himself can alter his condition." This doesn't mean we should never help anyone. What it means is we need to give in a positive manner instead of a negative manner. When we give in a positive manner we give to support and encourage someone in their pursuit of an ideal we believe in. This type of giving assists others in a more rapid development toward their potential. On the other hand, negative giving is when we respond to someone's need regardless of whether or not they're doing the best they can with what they already have. Instead of assisting them toward development we may be supporting them in weakness and worsening their condition. Summed up, it's safe to say that whatever we give to, we'll receive more of. If we give to ability we'll receive more ability as our reward, and if we give to need, we'll be rewarded with more need.

This leads us to the third feeling mistaken for love, *guilt*. When we promise ourselves that we're going to make the difference for someone else, we set ourselves up for failure, especially if they've caught on to our game. The game I'm referring to is the one where, if we can make them understand our perspective, we've won. Unfortunately, all they have to do to win is simply to not understand. With the dice loaded like that, our chance

of winning is virtually non-existent. Here's where the guilt starts: anytime we fail to accomplish an objective we've given ourselves, the resulting feeling of guilt.

At this point we stop saying, "I feel sorry for you, and I want to help you. Therefore, I must love you." In its place we say: "I failed to help you, and I feel miserable and obliged to keep on trying. Therefore, I must love you." It's here that arrogance gives way to misery. All in the name of love. That was another issue I had to work on to understand. If I found it so difficult to change myself when I sincerely wanted to change, why should I expect myself to change someone else who does *not* want to change? In fact, it was ludicrous to think they should change when it was that very behavior which gave them their power in the first place. Why would they want to give it up?

There are many people in this planet who know only one way of keeping control over others. The way they do this is by never being satisfied with anything. Robert Ringer in his book, Looking out for Number One, introduces the concept of the happiness plug. A friend of his once suggested that everyone has a plug in the back of their head called the "happiness plug." Some people's plugs have been pulled and all their happiness fluid has drain out. One can't just look at a person to tell if his or her happiness plug has been pulled, but by observing their behavior for a short while it can become very obvious if one knows what to look for. Basically, you know someone's happiness plug's been pulled if you find yourself in 'dammed if you do,' and 'dammed if you don't' situations every time you turn around. His friend's advice for dealing with this type of person is to simply stay away. With such a person, our mere presence is enough to reinforce their game.

Guilt is obviously not love. When we feel guilty we're expecting ourselves to do things that we're either unable or unwilling to do. Part of the all that is we need to appreciate is our choice of how we want to live our lives. It's been said that whoever can live up to their ideal is life's master, and whoever cannot it's life's slave. So if we're feeling miserable doing what we're doing, we either need to change our behavior or we need to reevaluate our ideals. It's not fun to live in a state of mind that whimpers, "here I am alone and afraid in a world I never made." That state of mind is definitely not the kind we need in order to create the experience of appreciation.

Possessiveness is the next thing often mistaken for love. Much tragedy and misery has been caused by this approach to defining love. In its extreme form, possessiveness is expressed by the words, "If I can't have you, no one else will have you either." Or try to imagine a romantic moment like this, "Oh Darling! I love you so much I could kill you!" In its not so extreme form, possessiveness reveals itself through suspiciousness and a demand for constant attention and reassurance. Although it may be obvious that the passive party in the relationship, better known as the victim, may be degraded by being told how to do every little thing, what's not so obvious is that the aggressor is being degraded also. In order for an aggressor to be motivated to use force, fraud, or guilt to control the passive member, they must first surrender their own psychological power. At some point, the aggressor must've decided that the approval and cooperation of the passive member is essential to

their survival. Once they've relinquished their psychological power they must then compensate through the use of force, fraud, or guilt. In other words, if they're not powerful enough to sanction themselves, they are then obliged to seek the sanction of the victim. Those who have control over themselves, mainly those who have the power to choose the experience of appreciation, are the ones who can give others the space to be themselves. Stated on a personal level, 'If I know I can survive without you, then I have no reason to control you.'

Mistaking possessiveness for love is most tragic for both parties. The aggressor needs the sanction of the victim in order to compensate for his lack of self-esteem, and the victim needs the arrogant reassurance of being needed by the aggressor. Should the aggressor become strong enough not to need outside validation, the relationship would end, and should the victim stop needing to be needed, the relationship would end. In fact, this is a common pattern of alcoholic relationships in particular, and addiction based relationships in general. It's very hard to appreciate the world we live in, when we believe we can't live without the approval of a particular person. Furthermore, if we believe we can experience love only when that person approves of us, our experience of love would be tentative at best. For love to be a consistent experience, it can only come from within and then be reflected out into the world.

The last thing mistaken for love is what psychologists refer to as *projection*. Of the five, this one is probably the least recognized and understood, even though it affects every area of our lives. Furthermore, this problem has been studied for centuries. Actually our colloquial language indicates that we have some awareness of the problem. Oft repeated statements like, "he sees only what he wants to see," and "love is blind," indicate that many have observed the selective way in which we see the world. One rascal philosopher even went further by offering this quote: "even a plain thought gets tangled when told to a person with a knot on his head." In short, it's within the power of the wishful mind to ignore much of reality. In Greek mythology there is a story about a time when humans had four legs and were very complete, self-contained, and powerful. In fact their power became so great that the gods started to feel threatened. So after much thought about the problem, the gods came up with a plan. They cut humans in half, making each half have two legs. One half being female and the other half being male. This was probably the supreme example of the divide and conquer tactic. The gods no longer have anything to fear from humans since then because we've been so busy trying to find our other half that we're barely able to take care of ourselves, let alone pose a threat to the gods.

This leads us to the theory of *animus anima projection*, which was introduced by Carl Jung. The term *animus* refers to the typically male energies and capabilities within each one of us. While the term *anima* symbolizes the female energies and capabilities within each of us. In our culture, especially in recent generations, women and men have been trying to express themselves as half people. Men have been trying to, or at least are expected to be strong and competent in dealing with the world outside the home. Furthermore, men have been discouraged from expressing their emotions or nurturing capabilities. Women, on the other hand, have been given a license to express their emotion to the point of indulgence. At the same time women

have been discouraged from demonstrating competence in dealing with the work a day world. In reality, women and men possess varying degrees of both.

How does this effect our every day lives? Well, the scenario goes something like this: throughout our maturing years we tend to develop a picture in our mind about what our perfect mate should be like. In reality, a large part of this ideal mate we're seeking is our disowned half self. Just for the sake of example, let's say we develop a list of twenty characteristics our ideal mate should have. However, as time passes, loneliness, sexual desire, and social pressure all take their toll. So, we meet someone with only five of those characteristics and from that decide to be attracted to them. That decision is usually unconscious of course. Where the decision conscious, we'd look at the fifteen characteristics that are missing and then decide to be happy with the five that are there. Unfortunately, that isn't what we do. Instead we make ourselves believe that all twenty are there, and then declare to ourselves and the world that we've found a perfect mate. Of course, there is also the aspect of new lovers being on their good behavior, but even then a lot is overlooked.

Usually the way we overlook the evidence that doesn't support our theory is to make alibis for them. An uncle of mine dated a woman who threw impressive temper tantrums. He rationalized that she was just nervous about being single and that getting married would solve her problem. After he married her he was surprised to learn that nothing had changed.

The other way projection manifests is through denial. In this case, the person who's madly in love is unable to see anything but what they want to see. Contrary to what the person doing the projecting believes, the beloved is in reality little more than a screen on which to reflect an image. Usually the result is that the energy behind the projection gradually weakens, allowing the other person to poke holes in the screen. One way to understand this is to consider a movie projector and screen. Should the projector's plug be pulled, what happens to the projection on the screen? It immediately goes off. It's much the same way for us, except that we wear down more like a storage battery. However, there is one critical difference between us and the movie projector. With us, we insist that the screen changed. In other words, we're convinced that the other person has betrayed us. From here, is logical to conclude that the act of projecting is definitely not an expression of appreciation, if we have to cover over another person with our fantasy image, we're not appreciating them for who they are. Also, we're not appreciating ourselves and our ability to live life quite admirably without a special person. When we don't feel a sense of urgency, we can afford to wait until we meet someone we don't have to project on in order for them to fit into our lives.

In review, love is personal, powerful, and creative. One way to look at it is like an engine that provides power for movement. Like any engine, the more weight it has to carry, the more sluggish any movement will be. When we take off the weight of desire, pity, guilt, possessiveness, and projection, we lighten up the load for our journey to our creating love. These burdens are unnecessary and only serve to limit our ability to create love, as long as these weights are attached to our concept of love, we'll be waiting for special events to happen

and fail to see the special nature of the ordinary. A man named George Ivanovich Gurdjieff once observed that “above all, people need to learn how to accept and enjoy non-fantastic representations of reality.” An example is when we’re driving down the road in our generic automobile and notice a nice Cadillac gliding by. It’s equipped with power antennas, tinted windows, the works. In fact it does everything except have dinner awaiting when you come home. The first thing we think of is how exiting and special it must be to have so much money and, supposedly, freedom and security. Furthermore, that person can be making decisions that shape the lives of millions at that very moment. Surely that must be more exciting than driving to another day at the factory, warehouse, or office.

From our viewpoint, the life of the person in the limousine must be anything but ordinary. However, for that person a Cadillac may represent a demotion compared to the fleet of Rolls-Royces her family owned during her childhood, a time when a million dollars was still worth a million dollars. Therefore, while we’re seeing her life as being very special she might be seeing it as even less than ordinary, and may even be contemplating suicide at that very moment. As an aside, let me interject here that this example is not intended to suggest that all wealthy people are unhappy. I’m simply trying to point out that when we rely on comparison in order to determine how well-off we are, we’ll always find someone doing better, and in turn we’ll diminish our chances of enjoying what we already have.

Appreciating all it is doesn’t necessarily mean we’re deliriously happy twenty-four hours a day. Our emotions are valuable indicators of whether reality is in alignment with what we want, and it would be dangerous to totally disconnect them. However, when we develop a basic attitude of appreciation toward life, the experience of pain can only go so deep. It ceases to be an all-encompassing focus of our lives and becomes simply guidance. Another way to look at appreciation is to think of it as an emotional undercurrent that modifies the impact our experiences have on us. Instead of taking 10 years to learn that a big disappointment was in fact valuable guidance toward a better life, we only take a month, a week, a day, or maybe only an instant.

A willfully chosen attitude of appreciation can make it possible for us to enjoy situations that once caused us pain. For instance, there once was a time when the sight of happy lovers walking around hand in hand was painful to me because they made me think of what I was missing. Now I enjoy the sight of young lovers and I’m not concerned about whether or not I have a relationship. It feels good to enjoy the flowers without having to pick them. Ultimately, the challenge of love is the challenge of mastering our perceptions, not of mastering other people. Having a satisfying relationship and all the other niceties does make life easier to appreciate, but they cannot substitute for a personal decision that says we’ll appreciate our lives regardless.

The pursuit of love is the pursuit of self-mastery. It’s an ability to be developed within ourselves, not a commodity to be acquired from others. Therefore, the next question is how do we make it happen? I’m glad you asked. That just so happens to be the topic that’ll be explored on side two of this tape series. Side two is titled

Creating Love is an Inside Job and I'll present specific concepts and techniques that'll help make this ideal a reality.

YOUR POWER TO CREATE LOVE

SIDE TWO

“Creating Love Is An Inside Job.”

Welcome to Side Two of *Your Power to Create Love*. On the first side of the tape we explored five sentiments or psychological defense mechanism that are often mistaken for love. Also, we considered a new definition, *Love: The will to appreciate all that is*, and how it will give us a greater sense of mastery over our inner and outer lives. Naturally, whenever we aspire to gain more control over our lives, we must be prepared to accept greater responsibility. That’s what this side is all about.

Creating love is an inside job. In order to have the will to create love, we must first figure out how to develop a sufficiently strong and stable will that won’t fail us at the first sight of adversity. At first glance this can seem like a simple task, but don’t let it fool you. Have you ever tried to maintain a positive attitude when things weren’t going your way? It’s not easy, is it? Sometimes it’s virtually impossible. Self-control is probably the toughest form of control we’ll ever have to learn. For a student of this approach to love, learning self-control is the first step. Unless we have self-control we don’t have the power necessary to be able to interpret our experiences positively. It helps to keep in mind what one author observed, “Within every adversity lies the seed of an equivalent or greater benefit.” I for one have discovered that my greatest blessings have come from what I once thought to be my greatest liabilities.

Before we go any further I want to give you my definition of self-control. Very often people mistake self-denial for self-control. Self-denial has its useful function because it’s just as important to say no to what we don’t want as it is to say yes to what we do want. However, if the decision to say no is based on fear, we’re lacking in the power of choice, and in turn we’re lacking in self-control. True self-control means being able to make our own choices based on how a decision affects our ability to live the life we want to live. When we can avoid the extremes of either desire or fear we can then *act*, instead of merely reacting.

This brings us to the issue of forgiveness. Many authoritative people have declared that in order to forgive you must forget. In reality this doesn’t work. For if we have to forget in order to forgive, we haven’t really forgiven. The best definition of forgiveness I found so far is, “forgiveness is being able to remember the event vividly without experiencing the form of pain.” When we consider that everyone is doing the best they can based on their prevailing awareness, we’ll start to understand that forgiving people for what they do is like forgiving cats for eating mice, or forgiving mules for being stubborn. Letting others off the hook for the things in life that don’t go our way is the first step. The next step is letting our selves off the hook instead of beating ourselves up because we supposedly should’ve known better. If you are like me, you probably find the second step more difficult than the first.

Before we leave the subject of forgiveness I want to share with you the wisdom of the philosopher Epictitus. He lived around 100 a.d. Epictitus observed: “The uninstructed, blame mothers for their misfortunes, those beginning instruction blame themselves, and those who are perfectly instructed blame neither.” When we resort to using blame throwers we kill our happiness and the happiness of anyone who is unlucky enough to be around us. We need to fix the problem not the blame.

When we set about to create love an important question we need to ask ourselves is, who is it within us that is going to do this? In other words, as long as circumstances around us can cause significant mood changes and as long as our different moods have totally different opinions about the importance or desirability of creating love, we can expect our success to be moderate at best. In our culture, and in most other cultures as well, we offer ourselves many alibis to explain away the confusion in both our inner and outer lives. We minimize the effect of broken promises and unrealized dreams by muttering something like: “I had a change a mood,” or “I just didn’t feel like it.” Considering that the results couldn’t have been any worse if a totally different person had stepped into our bodies and taken control, we need to find another term or definition that’s not so flattering.

The term I’ve developed to describe these strong mood changes is: “*socially acceptable schizophrenia.*” As long as our mood/personalities only cause chaos in our personal lives and in the lives of our near and dear ones, society allows us to remain on the lease. However, if our schizophrenia advances to the degree that total strangers are affected by our behavior we’ll very likely find our selves locked up in some institution somewhere.

Eric Burn in his book, *What Do You Say After You Say Hello?* offers an excellent explanation of this phenomenon using transactional analysis terms. Transactional analysis focuses on three main ego states and labels them: parent, child, and adult. I personally like to take this one step further and point out that there are two different parent ego states, two different child ego states, and one adult ego state, making the total five. First, there’s the critical parent who’s always finding fault in trying to present an appearance of superiority. We also have a nurturing parent who’s caring and supportive. The first child ego state is the adaptive child who reacts defensively to the critical parent. The other child ego state is called the “natural child,” who is creative and fun loving. Finally, there’s the adult ego state who tends to act and communicate in a rational and well-thought-out manner. On page 249, of *What Do You Say After You Say Hello?* Mr. Burn offers this example to illustrate what he calls the “mobile self:”

“Ordinarily Zoë is good natured, sociable, and adaptable, but at certain times she becomes very critical of her husband. This is her nagging parent. Later she brings out her fun-loving, sociable, adaptive child and forgets what she said to him in her parent ego state. But he doesn’t forget and remains weary and detached. If this sequence is repeated again and again, his weariness and detachment become permanent, which she fails to understand. ‘We have so much fun together’ says her charming child, ‘why is it that you withdraw from me?’

When her child is her real self, she forgets or overlooks what she has said while her parent was her real self. Thus, one ego state doesn't keep a very good record of what the other ego states have done. Her parent overlooks all the fun they've had, and her child forgets all the criticism she had offered. But his child and adult as well, remember what her parent had said."

Of course, intimate relationships aren't the only parts of our lives that suffer because of socially-acceptable-schizophrenia. Our careers and friendships suffer too. When we have a battle of wills raging within ourselves much time and energy is lost, leaving us with less time and energy for relating well to other people and for achieving goals that are important to us. Overcoming this disease isn't easy, but it can be controlled to a greater or lesser degree depending on how sincere we are in working on integrating our psyche. This doesn't necessarily mean eliminating all personalities or ego states except one, but it does mean developing a central self that is capable of observing what all the different personalities do.

The process of observation is tricky because it's like studying a rare, shy animal. This is further complicated by the fact that we're both the observer and the shy animal. Initially, our task is simply to gather information about the different personalities. As the observer self gains more information, it'll naturally become stronger and eventually develop the power necessary to subordinate the other personalities to its will. An important indication of progress is when we start to experience a greater continuity of consciousness. For example, we find we can access sad memories while in a happy mood, and vice versa. The process of integrating our psyche is a fascinating subject and deserves further exploration. Unfortunately this tape doesn't afford me the time that would take.

The next obstacle that stands in our way to creating love is what I call, *center-of-the-univers- disease*. Like conceit, it's a very funny disease because it makes everyone sick except the one who has it. Center-of-the-universe-disease starts when we are babies. As a baby we learn that all we have to do is scream, and instantly we're surrounded by concerned and anxious faces eager to do our bidden. From this experience it's easy to conclude that we are the center of the universe and that everything and everyone else should order themselves according to our convenience. And of course, should something or someone fail to recognize our special place we're then justified in acting out our favorite negative emotion.

Based on a young child's experience, this is a logical conclusion. Adults on the other hand have to ignore much evidence to the contrary, in order to maintain this picture of the universe. How does center-of-the-universe-disease reveal itself? Let's consider a common example. We're driving down the road in rush hour traffic. After a while we become impatient, then we start to become angry, and depending on our habitual way of expressing our disappointment we either yell and scream or we feel sorry for ourselves or something in between. *In reality there's only one cause of emotional pain. Frustrated expectations.* Therefore, in order to understand our angry behavior in traffic, all we have to do is ask ourselves what were we expecting. In this case we were not expecting much, just that all of traffic pull over to the side of the road and let us by and that police

officers should manipulate the signals in our favor so we can pass through unimpeded. As a final measure, it only makes sense that those same police officers should be waiving at us with undying admiration, because they recognize just how special we are.

As long as we insist on seeing our selves as being the center of the universe, we're going to spend a lot of time feeling ripped off. There's much competition for that coveted place and we can be sure that our competitors aren't going to take time out to tell us how great we are. Rumor has it that even cockroaches suffer from center-of-the-universe-disease because they think kitchens were invented so cockroaches could have a convenient place to live.

The desire to be special in a better-than-others sense is a real trap. The desire to be special can enslave us as we try to be especially good, or having failed at that, when we try to be especially bad. In reality superiority complexes and inferiority complexes are just two sides of the same coin. Having to be perfect just to break even is just as frustrating as believing we don't deserve to play in the game in the first place.

How do you conquer center-of-the-universe-disease? First you need to recognize that everyone else is just as preoccupied with himself or herself as we are with our selves. I remember the day this point was brought home to me. I just to spend a lot of time worrying about how other might see me, not just friends but even strangers on the street. In the middle of one my worrying sessions it dawned on me that everyone else was probably busy worrying about what I thought of them and most likely they scarcely even noticed my presence. This realization left me with mixed feelings. On one hand I felt a sense of relief to know that no one was really watching me. On the other hand I felt disappointed because I wasn't the focal point of everyone else's attention.

A hidden vanity is revealed when you worry too much about what other people think of us. Like any map that may used to help us navigate through life, our success in reaching a destination will be no better than the accuracy of our map. A philosophical map that suggests we're the center of universe is about as helpful to us as a road map of South Dakota would be for crossing California. The best we can hope for from either map is to end up in a rut.

Using the *slide-rule-of-sanity* to our advantage is a powerful approach to conquering center of the universe disease. The term slide rule of sanity is probably new to you because I coined that term myself. In a nutshell, this concept refers to our ability to acknowledge our interconnectedness with everything else.

One important characteristic of insanity is that the person suffering from it believes they're alienated and separate from everyone and everything else. It's really scary to believe that everyone is out to harm us and if we make the slightest misstep we're done. Of course, this fear isn't totally unfounded. There's a popular saying that suggests we do unto others, before they do unto us. But we need to ask ourselves: which came first, distrusting attitudes, or, hostile and exploitative situations? This question can't be answered within the context of our generation for we've been born into a world of fear and conflict, but at some point in our ancestral past a decision was made to start believing in a hostile universe, where one's survival could be had only at the expense

of others. In reality, we live in a sympathetic and nurturing universe on a planet that could support 50 billion people easily if we could only stop fighting and then use that time and energy for producing life supporting goods and experiences. It's as simple as acknowledging that our lives are improved by building houses not by bonding them.

As may seem surprising, I receive many blank stares when I suggest to people that war is not good for the economy. I once saw a movie about Japanese warlords from an earlier century. The main character of the movie was an old warlord who had reeked havoc all of his life and was now witnessing the destruction of his own empire. In the end he and his most loyal son died together. At that point, the family nurse maid started lamenting "God, is this your idea of a joke? Does it make you laugh to see us poor humans suffer and die the way we do?" To this, one of the warriors replied: "Don't blame the gods! They're not the cause of all this. If any thing, they're weeping for us, for it is *we* who choose suffering instead of joy. It is we who choose war instead of peace."

As we become more sane we focus on creating value instead of confiscating values created by others. As we become more sane we encourage people instead of putting them down. As we become more sane we recognize that we're part of something larger in which we participate. Sanity means recognizing that we're not alone and that life is a gift to be enjoyed, not a sentence to be served. For those who want to learn more about what this concept means in relation to our everyday lives, my tape "*Decrease Your Conflict, Increase Your Standard of Living,*" may be of interest.

The next issue we need to confront in order to develop a will powerful enough to create love is that of our relationship with death. It's been observed that as people learn to live more fully they become less fearful of death. Although death is usually regarded as an enemy to most people, death can also be looked upon as an advisor and friend. This doesn't mean we should rush into death's arms. What this means is that by remembering that life on this planet isn't forever, we can better be motivated to do the things we want to do and live the lives we want to live. Being aware of the inevitability of our death and the death of everyone around us can help us keep our daily challenges in perspective. Most problems become meaningless when compared to our death. Like someone once said: "Life is wonderful. Without it we'd be dead."

And as for the problems that do not pale in comparison with death, death incomes is a welcome relief. When we deal with the issue of death we need to seek a balance. While being paralyzed by a fear of death isn't a satisfying way to live, being numb to the reality of death is often disastrous, too. Eric Hoffer in his book *The True Believer* talks about how people are hypnotized into seeing their lives as being the stage play instead of the real thing. Military terminology reflects this attitude best with references to theatres of wars and so on. A good general is a master of the art of making the troops feel like the battlefield is a stage where ancestors, from both past and future, rise up out of the desert sands to witness that historical event. When people are in this state of mind they're often wrong but never in doubt.

Maybe we need to do what was suggested by a little known Russian philosopher. He suggested that a new organ be implanted in our bodies; this organ would keep us continually aware of the inevitability of our death and the death of everyone we see on a daily basis. This would serve to shock us out of our hypnotic trance, force us to acknowledge that life is temporary and that the gains we hope to enjoy at the expense of others would be lost in time anyway. If we can't remember that we come from a common source, maybe we can remember that we'll share a common grave.

Throughout history wise people have observed that the conditions of individuals and cultures are generally a reflection of prevailing thoughts, attitudes and philosophies. As I mentioned earlier, sometime back in antiquity our ancestors decided that this is a hostile universe where survival could only be had at the expense of others. True to form, we've been acting on this premise ever since. Massive amounts of wealth and happiness are being lost to conflict itself or on security measures design to protect us from conflict. Our thoughts, whether original or borrowed from the cultural environment, do create our reality. While there are certain rules in the universe that exist independently of our opinions about them, there aren't as many as we've been led to believe. Albert Howard once observed that people often confuse bad management with destiny. While even congress can't repeal the law of gravity, or economics for that manner, we can avoid stepping off cliffs. James Allen in his book, *As a Man Thinketh*, explained our situation like this: "Mind is the master power that molds and makes, and man is mind and ever more he takes. The tool of thought and shaping what he wills brings forth a thousand joys, a thousand ills. He thinks in secret and it comes to pass. Environment is but his looking glass."

As individuals, we generally have a wider array of choices within our culture than we take advantage of. Similarly, as more individuals expand their horizons, the culture as a whole will expand too. Unlike many promoters of positive thinking, I'm not going to suggest that there are no limits, or that positive thinking people never have challenges. Being truly positive means being able to face challenges without wilting in the face of adversity. Opportunities are often difficult to recognize because they're usually dressed in more clothes. Furthermore, it often happens that our biggest problem in life becomes our greatest opportunity. There's a lot to be said for having to learn consciously what others assume they already know.

For a better understanding of how our thoughts create our reality, let's consider the part of our brain called the *reticular activator*. The reticular activator helps us notice some things in our environment while allowing us to ignore other aspects of our environment. For example, think about the car you now own or if you don't have a car think about something else that's important to you. Cars are a great example because many people have observed that once they buy a different car, they all of a sudden notice many cars on the street much like the one they just bought. Prior to buying that car they never even noticed other similar cars on the street.

Our minds are quick to notice whatever it's been sensitized to. Like PT Barnum, who once noted that "every crowd has its silver lining," we need to sensitize ourselves to the beauty of life and to reinforce the belief

that life is a gift to be enjoyed, not a sentence to be served. This doesn't mean we should ignore or underplay the tragedies people create. That means we should understand that it's within our power and the power of others to choose a satisfying life instead of a tragic one.

While it's true that our thoughts create our reality, we didn't create ourselves. There are some things in life that naturally attract us, and others that naturally repel us. Some people prefer to do physical tasks, while others prefer intellectual pursuits. Albert Einstein once said: "We can do anything we want except choose what it is we want to do." Recent research in genetics has suggested that many of our tastes and preferences are coded into our genetic structures.

Some philosophers from the East saw humans as being composed of two basic parts: the essence and the personality. The essence is the part we're born with, while personality is that which we acquire in response to the outer world of our experience. According to them, one of the biggest challenges we face as humans is learning to tell the difference between doing what we genuinely enjoy and that which we do to win the approval of others. Some South American Indian tribes suggest that we're born with a purpose. If we live our lives in alignment with that purpose we have good luck, and if we stray from it we have bad luck. Considering that sickness and accidents are often result of our staying in situations that are stressful for us, they may well be right. Many people are living unhappy lives simply because they've chosen their career and mates based on the opinion of others, instead of what they themselves enjoy.

The tendency of many cultures to esteem some professions while looking down on others not only causes individual problems, but also causes problems for the culture as a whole. For example, "a society that esteems philosophy, no matter how poorly constructed, and looks down on plumbing, no matter how well done, will soon discover that neither their theories nor their pipes will hold water." Ideally, we should accord dignity to anyone who is doing the work that makes life on this planet possible, but in order for this to happen we need to see through the fog of cultural judgement that worships riches without regard for the process of acquiring them. Were the riches gained through creativity and service? Or were they the result of confiscation and trickery? The former has become rich by making life on this planet better for all who deal with them, while the latter become rich at the expense of others. There's a big difference. To mistake one for the other can be as deadly as mistaking poison for food.

By looking at what wealth does and not just at what it is, we can then redefine dignity. By redefining dignity we can discover what it is we truly enjoy doing. Once we become strong enough to make our choices based on our genuine personal preferences, instead of the opinions of others, we'll solve our problem on two levels. First, we'll be happier individually and very likely better off materially. Even if we make less money we may enjoy a greater profit margin because lower stress will result in our hiring fewer doctors and lawyers to help us cope with health and human relations problems. In a small way, we'll be confronting the cultural level

of the problem too. Once we've given ourselves permission to live our own lives in our own way, we'll be willing to let others do the same.

The last barrier between us and love is what I call, *increasing accountability while decreasing judgement*. Many human growth groups have become very sensitive to the damage that's done when we place heavy judgements on ourselves and those around us. In fact, much of what's been passed off as psychology has been little more than alibis dressed in fancy verbiage. The discovery of the subconscious mind and the unconscious motivations that drive us can be viewed in two different ways. First, we can choose to give up any attempt to consciously direct our lives because we feel totally powerless next to the secular Satan of the psychological realm. Our other choice is to acknowledge that the challenge of mastering our lives may be bigger than the argument for, but we still believe we have the resources necessary to take a bigger bite than we can chew and enjoy. In ancient China there was a popular curse people would cast on others who displeased them. The curse declared: "May you live in interesting times."

Our present time in history may well prove to be one of those times. The specific item of interest I refer to you is the concept that people are innocent by reason of insanity. Earlier I talked about the slide rule of sanity. Sanity was defined as an intellectual and emotional awareness of our interconnectedness with everything else, and insanity was defined as the belief that we're separate and alienated from everything and everyone else. So, if we take the issue of murder for instance, it doesn't take much thinking to realize that we have to feel very separate and alienated from others before we can feel inspired to take someone else's life. By definition then there's no such thing as a killer who's not innocent by reason of insanity. In fact, any effort to confiscate the production of others without offering value in return comes from the belief in separateness and therefore insanity. And if insanity means innocence we live in a very innocent world. If it's true that insane people can't be held accountable for their actions then nobody should have to experience the consequences of their behavior. But is this really a sensible conclusion?

Let's take a look at what nature has to say about this subject. An excellent example of how nature runs her business is the law of gravity. She doesn't care whether we praise her for helping us keep our feet on the ground, nor does she care if we curse her by declaring that gravity doesn't exist because the world supposedly "sucks." Next, the law of gravity doesn't discriminate. When someone steps or falls off a cliff, it's non-stop to the rocks below. There's no hand of political justice that arbitrarily decides whether we should be exempt from the fall because of a bad childhood or a bad mood. It's simple cause and effect. Step off the cliff and down you go. The laws of nature demand total accountability.

While it's worth noting that the laws of nature do demand total accountability, it's also worth noting that the effects of our behavior are given to us without judgement. Therefore, after we step off the cliff and while we're taking a scenic ride down to the rocks below, we will notice that the mountains aren't screaming "Dammit! I told you so."

I've applied this concept very successfully with children. One rule of thumb I use is to celebrate the individuality of the child and to challenge the child's behavior. I make it a point to let them know that I know there's a difference. The first step I'd take was to draw the boundaries as large as my personal values would permit, then I'd find out what was most important to the child. Next I tied the two together and called the result the Rules of the House. Once the children understood the rules, I dropped out of the picture, figuratively speaking, then they went about choosing consequences and experiences to add to their body of knowledge. When they opposed my wishes, instead of telling them they were bad kids, I'd simply say: "Congratulations on the consequences you have chosen." Summed up, I concluded that it was unnecessary to make judgements about their worth as people when all I wanted was accountability for their action. Of course, this applies to children of all ages.

This side of this tape set has presented some ideas that'll facilitate development of the self-mastery necessary for creating love. Learning to love is an expression of strength and joy, instead of fear and need, can only be learned by study and practice. Creating love is an inside job and the wise choice of concepts or philosophical maps is the most powerful tool for making it happen. Like the sculptor, he chisels away anything that doesn't look like a statue. We need to carve away everything that doesn't look like love. In closing Side Two of this tape I want to leave you with one thought: *You don't have to go looking for love when that's where you're coming from.*

YOUR POWER TO CREATE LOVE

SIDE THREE

“Love is Sufficient Unto Itself. Relationships are Business.”

Welcome to Side Three of “Your Power to Create Love.” The first two sides have suggested that love is a self-created experience, and some ideas were offered about how we can develop the ability to love. One important point I hope you’ve understood is that love is available with or without a relationship. Although this might seem like a revolutionary idea, it really isn’t that extraordinary. People choose to have relationships everyday and never get around to creating love. So, if it’s possible to have a relationship without love, why can’t we have love even if we don’t have a relationship?

If love is our experience prior to finding a relationship then love’s not a good reason for being in a relationship. Why should we invest time and energy in order to obtain what we already have? That being true, there must be another reason. In fact, there is another reason for being in a relationship, a very good one I might add. That reason is: *Business*. Therefore, this side is titled: *“Love is Sufficient Unto Itself. Relationships are Business.”*

Kahlil Gibran in his popular book, *The Prophet*, counsels that “Love gives not but itself and takes not but from itself. Love possesses not, nor would it be possessed for love is sufficient unto love.” If that’s true, then love’s not a reason to be in a relationship. There are many who’ll feel uncomfortable with this idea, but that’s only because current day ideology has decided that business is evil. However, by the end of this tape you’ll learn that business is evil only if life itself is evil. By business, I mean business that’s not corrupted with political influences. First, we need to ask ourselves: why did people come together to form partnerships and corporations? If we ponder this question for a moment we’ll realize that as we specialize, we become more efficient. So when a group of people join forces they can be much more productive together than they could ever hope to be by themselves. In short, we combine our individual skills and resources in order to create greater satisfactions than we could ever create individually. This is the only sane reason for associating with others. Ideally, this principle should also apply to our intimate and family relationships too. We all have the capacity to create wealth and joy, so when we fail to use that potential, we have a problem.

Over the years I’ve come to understand that there are only two basic types of relationships: Practical and pathological. It’s very easy to tell the difference. In a practical relationship the quality of life for all parties improves by being in the relationship. On the other hand, a pathological relationship is one where people’s lives turn for the worse by being together than when operating as separate individuals. Of course, in order to accept this assertion we must first accept the idea that life is good and that we deserve to enjoy our lives. If we can’t

accept this idea, then any suggestion that relationships should be practical and profitable will be viewed with suspicion. Voltaire once said: “If you wish to converse with me, you prepare to define new terms.” Because we’re exploring a system of thought that’s not in line with popular philosophy, it’ll be necessary to define my terms. The first two sides of this tape series have been about defining love. As you’ve already discovered, this tape series has taken love out of the market place and has relocated love closer to our essential self. However, my taking love out of the market place wasn’t inspired by a belief that the market is a bad place. Far from it, the marketplace is in fact the most moral place on the planet as long as it’s left uncorrupted by politics.

Now it’s the time to present some definitions. First, let’s define the term *business*. One pundit summed it up nicely when he said: “Business is the art of taking money from people without resorting to force.” Though it may be tongue and cheek, to me that pithy little quip says it all. Business is the art of appealing to the self-interest of others in order to exchange goods and services. In pure business, there’s no room for force, fraud or guilt. When we resort to these tactics, we’re demanding that the other person accept a loss so we can enjoy an unearned gain. This is where business ends and politics begin. When we operate from a political mentality we make demands on others with little or no regard for their preference in the matter. Therefore, good relationships use pure business principles. Furthermore, as a relationship incorporates more political attitudes it becomes less enjoyable and less profitable.

Unfortunately, this concept won’t be easy to grasp because it totally challenges the major premises on which today’s society is based. An excellent way of gauging a society’s orientation is to look at the newspapers. If you’ll notice, the bulk of today’s reporting focuses on political and criminal behavior. Politics takes first place because many people still believe that human problems can only be solved politically. Common criminals take second place. They’re the ones who resort directly to force, instead of voting for laws that transfer wealth with the appearance of social respectability, and of concern for the common good. Finally, in back of the papers the small portion called “The Business Section.” This is what’s left of the great innovative nation that once believed that human problems could be solved by the best efforts of creative individuals. Even this section has been corrupted by reports of legal cannibalism ranging from the laws limiting competition to new taxes inhibiting capital formation, but this shouldn’t come as a surprise because people have been suggesting that government and business should be partners, not realizing the basic difference between them.

It’s here we need to define what I mean by *politics*. The founding fathers of our nation knew well what politics means. George Washington once said: “Government is force. It’s not reason, it’s not eloquence, and like fire is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.” Thomas Jefferson declared: “That government governs best that governs least.” What we’ve not pondered is the reason for these statements. If government is force, then politics is the study of the application of force in society. When we look at the situation from this perspective, it becomes apparent that government only has two legitimate functions. First, it must have a monopoly on the use of force for the sole purpose of protecting people from each other. Second, it should have a system of courts for

the enforcement of contracts. Actually, the second function could be handled just as well by private enterprise. With the present backlog of court cases, private binding arbitration companies are gaining favor. Summed up thus far, business is anything we do to create value that either sustains or enhances life. Politics is simply the use of force. Pure business appeals to our reason and rational self-interest, and pure politics demands our unquestioning submission with no regard for our personal preferences. Leon Trotsky, Stalin's arch rival for Soviet power, once noted that the theory 'he who does not work shall not eat' had in practice become 'he who does not obey shall not eat.' Finally, business appeals to our desire for a more comfortable and satisfying life, while politics tries to sell the idea that sacrifice is a supreme virtue. Where you are at between the two is the measure of the quality of life you can expect.

By now you may be wondering what this has to do with relationships. Actually this has everything to do with relationships. The ancients used to say: "As above so below." By exposing what I call the 5,000 year-old con game that's been run on humanity throughout history, we'll be able to understand how it works on the individual level too. When we trace human suffering to its root, we'll discover the belief that some people should be sacrificed for the benefit of others. For thousands of years political and religious leaders have been calling for endless sacrifices. The political leaders who've been referred to as the "mystics of muscle," claimed to be the true spokespersons for an amorphous creature called the State, or the will of the people. The religious leaders, or the "mystics of spirits," claimed the power of Divine Revelation. In both cases, they boldly claimed the authority to orchestrate much human suffering in the name of some so-called "higher cause." Ultimately, the only good they achieve is their own acquisition of power and wealth while almost everyone else suffers in body and spirit. Unfortunately, throughout history not enough honest people have had the time to ponder and develop philosophies which demonstrate the morality and dignity of people, who live by their own labor and who do not require sacrifices from others for their benefit. Consequently this con games been unabated for thousands of years with virtually no opposition. On a large scale this cult of sacrifice has caused millions of deaths, and on the individual scale it's caused millions more living deaths. In other words, if this morality of sacrifice doesn't cause a physical death, it'll most certainly cause the death of the spirit. As someone once said, 'too much compromise is soul killing!'

I mentioned earlier that there are three forms of violence people perpetrate against one another; Force, fraud and guilt. Force is self-explanatory, except that most of us usually have accepted some exceptions to the rule. Should people take drugs we don't like, we declare war on them. Should they exchange a sexual experience for money with no pretence of love, we lock them up and fine them. Finally, there are millions of laws that interfere with or forbid capitalistic acts between consent and adults. By now you may be wondering what these references to laws have to do with force. Laws represent implied force because under every stack of regulations lies a gun. As such, laws aren't meant to appeal to our reason. They are meant to make us follow a prescribed regimen without any regard for our personal preferences. Therefore, laws are primarily applications

of force, and when the number of laws exceed the bare minimum necessary to preserve individual rights, they themselves become violations of individual rights. Tacitus once observed: “The more corrupt the state, the more numerous the laws.”

Fraud is also self-explanatory. However, we frequently find ourselves offering alibis to excuse other people for disregarding our time and resources. Back in the days when I aspired to live the ideals that defined love as unconditional acceptance, I dated a woman who made use of my error in a subtle way. She had a habit of never being on time. Time after time I’d find myself waiting for her, and time after time I’d be fighting a swell of anger that grew within me. I fought those feelings because I had an ego investment in being an unconditionally accepting marvel of organic love. Finally the day came when my pretense crumbled. When she casually pointed out that I was feeling angry and that maybe we should just be friends, my response to her was: “You haven’t got what it takes to be a friend, let alone a lover!” And then I abruptly hung up the phone.

This experience shattered my self-image of being Mr. Love incarnate, and I had to do a lot of soul searching in order to reconcile this event with my values. At the time, I ascribed to the new age idea that declares ‘no one can hurt us.’ Therefore, no matter what someone else does they’re held to be innocent and any pain we feel is strictly of our own creation. It was then that I learned about what I call metaphysical manipulation techniques. Instead of saying, ‘I don’t care how you feel or how you will live,’ our friendly metaphysical manipulator would say, ‘Why did you create the experience of me taking advantage of you?’ After much thought on the matter I realized that by her not respecting my time, she wasn’t respecting my life. When it occurred to me that life’s made up of time, I realized that I was literally fighting for my life. However that didn’t answer the question of why I needed the anger in order to do what was necessary to defend my life. The answer that eventually came to me was that I didn’t really believe I deserved the respect I wanted. Consequently, I had to use anger as a bridge between what I wanted and my belief that I didn’t deserve it. Had I truly believed that my desire was justified I would’ve responded with a shrug and walked away. Ultimately, fraud is a form of force. When we’re told we can expect a certain result by behaving in a certain way, only to find out later we were led astray, we’ve been forced to act in a way we wouldn’t choose to act if we knew the true outcome in advance.

The last form of violence people do against one another is through the mechanism of guilt. For most people, guilt is the weapon of choice. In fact, without guilt the weapons of fraud and force would be useless. Unless people are morally disarmed, they won’t allow either force or fraud to be used on them for very long. Have you ever been with people who could never be pleased? If you watch them closely you’ll notice that they almost make a living out of being judgmental, and pretending to be the standard against which everything else should be measured. A friend of mine once dated a woman who was very intelligent but she used her intelligence to find fault with most everything she saw. Very early in the relationship his gut feelings told him to flee. However, she always had a good reason for her complaints so he felt obliged to stay and to try to

understand it. The message she gave him was that he was the most wonderful person she'd ever known, except that everything about him needed to be changed. His main weakness in this relationship was the power he gave her because she made almost three times as much money as he did. While he felt uncomfortable with her mode of operation, he silenced his internal alarm with the idea that it was just his poverty programming not wanting to change.

Because he didn't understand the difference between political power and economic power, he assumed that her values had to be correct even if he didn't understand them. She always had very high standards, the kind that no mortal human could live up to. On the other hand, he was a simple, laid-back type of person. Nevertheless, he tried to adopt her values and learned the meaning of the saying: "Too much compromise is so killing!" On occasion he did meet her demands, but was disappointed to have her respond with nothing but increased demands. While he was telling me his story, I thought about how his experience paralleled my own, and many other people I've talked with throughout my life. Also, I was reminded of other people who at some point decided that if the name of the game was to abuse or be abused, they were going to be the abuser. It seems that the world's been split in two, one side being the givers, and the other side being the takers. What's worst, they seem to gravitate toward each other. Between lovers, this may be what we call "chemistry."

These observations always mystified me until I learned about the 5,000 year-old con game. Underlying this con game is the age-old morality of sacrifice. Most religious and political philosophies promote sacrifice as being a supreme virtue, the greatest virtue being the supreme sacrifice. This notion permeates our cultural atmosphere so thoroughly that it's become unnoticeable, much like the air we breathe. Businesses aren't praised for the life sustaining work they do for those who can pay, they're complimented only for their charity and, furthermore, their charity work only partially compensates for the sin they've committed by creating goods and services that make life possible and enjoyable. We've been told thousands of times that we're born in sin, so working to maintain and enjoy a simple life must be a crime and worthy of the most sophisticated guilt trips. This issue of being evil merely by being alive plagued me for a long time.

I remember breaking away from the church when I was 16, not because I didn't believe the teaching but because I knew I couldn't live it. They told me I shouldn't think about lusting after young women, and truth be known, I couldn't think about anything else. In the end, I decided that it was better to risk a hot spot in hell than to violate my integrity by living a lie.

About 10 years later I was shocked by my first exposure to conscious hypocrisy. A catholic family I knew just laughed and said: "Oh, you don't really try to live that stuff, you just say you do." I felt repulsed by their statement. However, in retrospect, I realized they were probably more accepting of their desire to live than I was of mine. Now I only question why they'd want to carry the dead weight of a preacher of sacrifice. Of course, they were probably just playing it safe by buying fire insurance just in case the old priest was right. Lately, I've observed that in this supposedly enlightened age the battle still rages on.

Recently I had the opportunity to watch a group of teenage punk rockers act out in their all black uniforms. At one party I had a chance to talk with six different teenagers. It was exiting how in a span of 15 minutes several of them went from, 'life is meaningless,' to 'I can assign my own meaning to life and thereby make life worth living.' Of course, I probably accessed one of the more sincere personalities in their families. So I would only expect any change to be temporary at best.

About the same time I noticed the words of one of their popular songs: "I give in to sin because I want to make my life more livable." What a confusing world this must be when life enhancing actions are held to be sinful right along with life threatening actions.

Wherever there's a sacrifice there's a beneficiary waiting to benefit from that sacrifice. Those who advocate sacrifice the loudest are the prime beneficiaries of sacrifice. Because people will not willingly give when there's no personal advantage to be gained, they must be compelled to do so against their will. This is where guilt comes in handy. When people ascribe to this moral ideal, they have agreed that their desire to live is evil. Having accepted an impossible ideal, they pay endless tribute to the purveyors of that ideal as a penance for their desire to live. From of perspective of these so-called teachers of morality, the intention is not for us to succeed. It's for us to fail so they can collect their ransom on our guilt. This brings to mind an observation someone once made, "Men play at being God, but lacking God's experience they wind up as politicians."

Throughout history religious and political leaders have had a monopoly on free time. Those who've done the actual work of creating goods and services have been too busy working to have the time to develop pro-life philosophies which hold 'doing productive work,' and 'minding our own business' as the highest virtues. Consequently, religious and political leaders have been the one to promote the morality of sacrifice on a large-scale.

Most people aren't adept at becoming professional spokespersons for God, or the State, or the will of the people, or any other floating abstraction that is supposedly superior to the individual human being. So, they do the next best thing. They try to gain unearned advantages from their business associates and loved ones by making unrealistic demands. When my before-mentioned friend finally broke up with his girlfriend he didn't leave believing he was right. All he knew was that he'd rather be wrong his way than be right her way. In a way he felt sorry for her, because he knew she'd always suffer greatly when things didn't go her way. This theory brings to mind a highlighted quote in a magazine: "It was a classic situation. A guy set standards that others can't possible live up to and then feels betrayed when they give up trying."

The morality of sacrifice divides the world into two classes: givers and takers. The takers are the ones who were clever enough to harvest the easy pickings of unearned values that were left over after our religious and political leaders have taken their share. The givers are the ones who aspire to live the ideal as closely as possible short of death. Although they resent the sacrifices they make, they choose to continue sacrificing

because they believe there's only one other alternative; to be a taker. This is considered repulsive because to not create value is to default on an essential aspect of being human.

The third alternative, the market place, has been so thoroughly discredited by religious and political philosophers that it's hardly ever considered to be a possible guide for human relationships. The market place has been accused of being evil because in the market place people demand value for value. Of course, the detractors of the marketplace have good reason to be fearful. As long as they seek unearned values, people who believe in the morality of the market place, where exchanges are made without the use of force, fraud, or guilt, will leave them out in the cold.

These principles apply equally to both business and relationships. Whereas business has its primary focus on the exchange of material values, relationships have their primary focus on the exchange of non-material values: values such as affection, encouragement, intimacy, and so on. Many people who demand impeccability in their daily business transactions allow themselves to be shortchanged in their relationships. Of course, this would never happen if love were not defined in sacrificial terms.

Earlier I mentioned there are two basic types of relationships, practical and pathological. Now I'm going to introduce to you economic terms that will develop this idea further. Using these terms I'll redefine the two types of relationships as *capitalist* and *socialist*. The capitalist relationship honors the morality of the market place where the value is exchanged for value. In this type of relationship two creative, self-sufficient people join forces to exchange and share their creativity and abundance. Neither makes demands that put the other in the position of sacrificial animal. Should they find their goals and values are too far apart, they don't try to force it. They simply seek elsewhere for someone who's naturally more in alignment with what they want from life in general, and from an intimate relationship in particular.

Here I want to add that after years of hearing people talk about the importance of "working" on the relationship, I figured out what they really mean. "Working" on a relationship is nothing more or less than debating over who's going to make the compromises, so the other person can enjoy rewards out of proportion to their contribution. For this concept to work, one person has to be adept to the use of force, fraud, or guilt, and the other has to be philosophically disarmed so they'll tolerate such abuse.

This brings us to the socialist relationship. The socialist relationship differs from the capitalist relationship in that needs are offered instead of strengths. In fact, much of what passes for dating is nothing more than a comparison in needs, explored in a romantic setting often referred to as "pillow talk." Here all past disappointments are laid out and compared. Once it's established who has the greatest need, the honeymoon is over. For the relationship to continue the most needy one will be the master, and the strongest one will become the slave.

Karl Marx's prescription for the ideal society was summed up in the classic phrase: "From all according to their ability. To all according to their need." Surveys have shown that most high school graduates agree that

this is the moral way to run a society. This brings to mind a story about a high school teacher who had his students write a paper on socialism. One student worked very hard on her paper offering many logical arguments and even used footnotes. The reward for all her work was a “C.” No sooner did she see her grade than she marched over to the teacher’s desk and demanded an explanation. The teacher calmly responded: “You do agree with ‘From all according to their ability. To all according to their need,’ don’t you?” The student stuttered “Well, yes,” “Very well then. You see that guy in back of the room? I think he plays football. In any case, he received an “F” on his paper so I gave him part of your grade so you both could pass.” How long could the teacher punish ability and award need before draconian punishments would have to be used for motivation, and even then the class average would probably be well below failing.

While socialism as a national policy has been continuing in America for over 50 years, socialist principles have been ruling the family for much longer. Many atrocities, which wouldn’t be tolerated in relations between strangers, are accepted as normal when committed against members of the same family. This may explain why eighty percent of all murders are committed among family and close friends. A statistic like this suggests that unattached people are only twenty percent as likely to be murdered. So join or start a family at your own risk!

When need reigns supreme all becomes fair in love and war. No holds are bared. And force, fraud, and guilt become the tools of the trade. If we hope to live sane, happy, and productive lives, we must learn to embrace the third alternative, the free market. When we do this we’ll have cracked the 5,000 year-old con game. In Ayn Rand’s book, *The Fountainhead*, the main character, Howard Roark, said: “Man was forced to accept masochism as his ideal, under the threat that sadism was his only alternative. This was the greatest fraud ever perpetrated on mankind. This was the device by which the penance and suffering were perpetuated as fundamentals of life.” Later in a speech he continued: “In all proper relationships there is no sacrifice of anyone to anyone. Men exchange their work by free mutual consent to mutual advantage when their personal interest agree and they both desire the exchange. If they do not desire it they’re not forced to deal with each other, they seek further. This is the only possible relationship between equals, anything else is a relationship of slave to master or victim to executioner.”

One last point I want to make is that business relationships are important relationships, the same way family and intimate relationships are. However, I’ve noticed that people tend to take their business lives too seriously and then compensate by being frivolous with their personal lives. They squeeze the joy out of their working hours only to squander the rewards of their work by accumulating large debts, which bind them even tighter to a joyless workplace.

While it’s true that business is primarily about exchanging material values, many opportunities are there for the exchange of non-material values too. There’s no reason for us to starve ourselves emotionally at the workplace, when an honest compliment and a sincere listening ear can cost so little and accomplish so much.

On the other side of the coin, while it's true that family and intimate relationships are about exchanging non-material values, prudent management of the household can reduce our dependence on any particular place of employment, and thereby afford us a more peaceful and enjoyable life.

Hopefully, you're among the givers of the world who are ready to crack this 5,000 year-old con game, and are ready to consider a third alternative. If so, this means you're ready to declare that life is good and that happiness and productive achievement is the normal condition for humanity. However, I must warn you. Both professional and amateur parasites alike will probably demand cassette-tape-demagnetizing parties in an effort not to lose their slaves. Therefore, the only hope we have for changing this age-old scenario is to remove the sanction of the victim. When we stop giving to need and start encouraging ability, we'll soon see a reversal of the present trend.

Jerry Gillies in his book, *Money Love*, introduces the concept of positive giving as opposed to negative giving. Negative giving is the response to someone's need, which in the end impoverishes both parties. Actually, the one receiving this type of gift is hurt worst because they've been deprived of the opportunity for their condition to worsen enough to motivate them to do something about it. On the other hand, positive giving is beneficial. When we give positively, we give because we believe in what someone's doing, not because we feel sorry for them. Ultimately, whatever we give, we'll receive more of. If we give to need, we'll be rewarded with more need. If we give to ability, we'll be rewarded with more ability. It's been said that many people mistake bad management for destiny. Today's social and political climate has made it fashionable for the bad management of one person to become a mortgage on the future of another. We're seeing the results of this philosophy on both the family and the national level, as we manage our lives from one crisis to the next. The time has come to call an end to this comedy of errors.

In summary, love is not something we get from someone else. It's a gift we give ourselves by choosing to be glad we're alive and accepting the idea that we have a right to live happy, satisfying lives. Therefore, we no longer have to do all the degrading things we've been taught to do to win the approval of others. When we honor our desires as being legitimate, and at the same time honor the right of others to have their desires, we'll start managing our relationships for maximum satisfaction instead of competing to see who can be the best sacrificial animal. Remember, *Love is sufficient unto itself. Relationships are business.*

YOUR POWER TO CREATE LOVE

SIDE FOUR

“Success is Getting What You Want. Happiness is Wanting What You Get.”

Welcome to Side Four of “Your Power to Create Love.” The purpose of this side is to explore both success and happiness. The old prescription for happiness told us that if we became successful, happiness would automatically follow. In recent years that method’s been pretty well debunked. However, a new myth has sprung up in its place. The new myth, or should it be called the new age myth, says that if we become happy, success will automatically follow. I’ll challenge both myths because although both are attainable and both require the use of similar processes, the focus of attention is different. Success is the ability to manipulate our outer world effectively, while happiness is the ability to manipulate our inner world effectively. As we take this journey together you’ll understand why I titled this side: *“Success is Getting What You Want. Happiness is Wanting What You Get.”*

Life demands that we be successful in procuring food, building, shelter, plus anything else we can think of to improve our creature comforts. Ultimate failure means one thing: death. This probably explains why people are always seeking the secrets of success instead of the secrets of failure. It’s in our nature to seek life. No one but the most arrant fanatic is in a hurry to verify the claims of a wonderful afterlife.

This brings to mind a story about a church service where the preacher was moaning about the treachery of earth in contrast to the eternal bliss of heaven. Throughout his sermon the church members sounded their approval with frequent “Amen” ’s and “Praise the Lord” ’s. As soon as the sermon ended, a cowboy stood up, pulled out his six-shooter and addressed the faithful flock: “Anyone want to go to heaven? Stand up.” Rumor has it that no one stood up. This does seem contrary to logic; after all, we wouldn’t pay a dealer for a car and then refuse to take delivery at the first opportunity. Oh, well! Life’s full of its little mysteries.

Unless you’re in a hurry to check out the after life, you may want to join me in taking it one life at a time. That’s what this tape’s all about: the mechanics of success and the art of happiness in this life. The first part of this title states that ‘success is getting what you want.’ Everyone has a picture of what they would like their lives to be like. There are things we desire and experiences we want to experience. Our challenge then, is to do the things that can make our dreams come true. To do this, we must chart the cause and effect relationships that translate our actions into results.

Currently there are many theories going around suggesting that life can be the way we want it to be merely because that’s how we wish it to be. Philosophers tell us that all we must do is think right and riches will pour down on us without any significant effort on our part. Economists tell us we can spend ourselves rich. And now physicists are splitting chronons to tell us our senses are unreliable because the time it takes for light

to travel from the observed to the observer, insures we can't perceive an event at the instant it happens. Other physicists suggest that subatomic particles, called quarks, may be of the same consistency as mind energy and thereby infer the possibility that we think reality into existence. For the lay person this can easily be taken a myth, 'why work, when all we have to do is think what we want into existence?'

There are two problems with this. For every person who's reported to have thought things into existence, there are a billion who haven't. The other problem is, if it's tedious and time consuming to build a house board by board and nail by nail, how much more so it must be to build that same house quark by quark. There's always the seductive notion that we should be able to acquire knowledge and the products that sustain our lives by mystical means. There's not a part of this planet that's not infected with the notion that the work of maintaining our lives is a form of punishment. This unquestioned belief system makes theories that suggest we should be able to gain knowledge and the benefits of knowledge without effort, very attractive. Unfortunately, if we take this idea of mystical knowledge too seriously, when we fail to gain knowledge without effort, we'll most likely spurn ordinary means of gaining knowledge as well. Instead of seeing the work necessary for supporting life as being a burden, we could just as well decide that our work is an opportunity to express our strength, creativity, and competence in life.

When I was a teenager working in the hay fields, one of the farmers I worked for explained an important principle to me. He said: "Yank hard, and it will come easy. Pull easy, and it'll come hard." In order to master our lives, we must be ready to do massive amounts of work and study up front, often with little hope of a corresponding reward. Either we pay the price now with extra effort so we can enjoy a sense of mastery over our life, or we just drift along in the confusion with a vague sense of dread.

And then, of course, there are those who promote the concept of school without failure. The assumption being, if we fail at adventure, we're doomed to a life of low self-esteem and untold misery. After several generations of applying this theory, the big news of the day is that of the declining achievement levels of our children. Apparently, those who promote schools without failure must believe that failure is best experienced later in life. If anything, we need more exacting standards of excellence, tempered with the reminder that failure isn't a statement about who we are. Failure is simply feedback that suggests we should try something different. In Og Mandino's book, *The Greatest Miracle in the World*, this passage can be found: "Remember that the difficult tasks are consummated, not by a single burst of energy or effort, but by the consistent daily application of the best you have within you. A little bit of work each day when done consistently can add up to a life of surprising accomplishments."

A friend of mine, Dr. Matt Motchkavitz, does a seminar titled: "The Road to Wealth." In his seminar he covers five areas that are essential for achieving success in our lives. These areas are attitude, goal setting, time management, using resources effectively, and human relations' skills. These are the tools of thought and action that are the source of our experience.

This brings to mind a quote from *As a Man Thinketh* by James Allen, “A man only begins to be a man when he ceases to whining revile and commences to search for the hidden justice which regulates his life. As he adopts his mind to that regulating factor he ceases to accuse others as the cause of his condition.” Not long ago I was at a seminar where we were discussing where wealth comes from. Our conversation went round in circles until I had an inspiration. I took an empty chair and placed it in the middle of the circle, then I asked everyone: “Which came first, the chair or the idea of a chair?” At first they looked confused, then their eyes lit up as they recognized that we can only create after we’ve had an idea. In fact, here inlays the key to the secret Napoleon Hill talks about in his book, *Think and Grow Rich*. In his book, Mr. Hill states that there’s one point he’ll make over and over again. Although the secret is alluded to throughout his book, he doesn’t point it out because he wants the reader to find the key on his or her own. He said that depending on who we are and where we’re at in our development, you might discover the secret at the beginning of the book or we might not discover it until much later. At the risk of presenting myself in an unfavorable light I must confess that I had to read the book four times, back to back, before I discovered the key. *Ideas* are the key to wealth. You can have and be much more than you ever dreamed possible, no matter where you’re starting from. However, you’ll most likely have to work for it. Napoleon Hill suggests that we dedicate at least one hour everyday for the study of our chosen line of work. He further states that if we study consistently over the course of a lifetime, that one hour of study will pay us more than the previous eight hours of work.

Rollo May in his book, *The Courage to Create*, develops this idea further by pointing out that creative people, like Thomas Edison and Albert Einstein, usually labored long and studied hard on whatever their burning question of the day may have been. Then, after a great deal of hard work and sincere pondering, they allowed themselves a chance to relax. It was during that following period of relaxation when they received their inspirations and ideas. Come to think of it, maybe this is the re-creation that recreation is supposed to provide. Many people, not have been created in the first place, find themselves unable to re-create.

This takes us back to a comment I made earlier when I cautioned against spurning ordinary means of gaining knowledge. Thomas Edison is reported to have made over 14,000 experiments before developing a successful light bulb. This may be what he meant when he declared: “Genius is 1% percent inspiration and 99% perspiration.” Where it not for his perspiration we might now be watching television by candlelight. Unless we reverse our present trend of wanting to jump past the work and go straight to the inspiration, we may discover that not only can we not develop new ideas, we may fail to maintain and enjoy the old ideas too.

Success is the result of being competent and persistent in manipulating our outer environment. Thomas Edison tried over 14,000 experiments before he discovered that a vacuum makes it possible for a filament to glow without burning out. The average person might make the same discovery accidentally by screaming ‘This sucks!’ after only 10 or 20 attempts. While this reveals the principle of vacuum instrumental in making a light

bulb, it still doesn't get the job done. It takes a Thomas Edison to make the other 13,980 attempts necessary to figure out how to put that suction to good use.

In order to shape our lives according to our dreams we must first believe it's possible. Are we timid little creatures who declare: 'Here I am, alone and afraid in a world I never made.' Or are we creative beings who are capable of understanding the world in which we live. Our answer to this question will determine whether or not we even try. As you'll recall, thoughts lead to actions; actions lead to habits; habits lead to characters; and characters lead to destinies. Although we can't dictate every event that happens to us, we can choose our response. And from that response, we can set the tone for future events. The more consciously we can do this, the better. This pretty well sums up what Dr. Matt talks about in his section on attitude. In his seminars he often refers to a quote by Henry Ford, "If you believe you can, or if you believe you can't, you're actually correct."

The next area Dr. Matt explores is goal setting. Although he has a Ph.D. he's the first to admit that in all of his years of schooling he'd never once experienced or been offered a goal setting class. He notes further that this is still true today as he interviews professionals nationally. To an extent, this lack of training and goal setting is understandable. John Dewey, one of the founders of our present education system, in his book titled *My Pedagogical Creed*, stated as follows: "The school is primarily a social institution. Education being a social process, the school is simply that form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated that will be most effective in bringing the child to share in the inherited resources of the race, and to use his own powers for social ends." Education therefore, is a process of living and not a preparation for future living. If we're trying to be social animals with no goals of our own apart from what society dictates, and furthermore we'll simply share in the inherited resources of the race, then we don't need to trouble ourselves with such things as goal setting. However, if we want to be more than just sleep walking social atoms, and do more than just consume the inheritance built up by previous generations, we may want to start consciously planning our lives.

First, there are the mechanics of goal setting. As Dr. Matt often challenges us, how big would you dream if you knew you couldn't fail? It's important to have a goal big enough to excite us. Like a movie without a goal, a life without a goal can put us to sleep too. Next, without a goal it's hard to determine the best way to allocate our limited time in resources. Once we have a goal, we can trace backward and break the goal down into process components. It's much the same as when we plan a route on a map. We look at both the start and finish points, evaluate our choices and then choose the one that best meets our needs. Depending on our process goals as well as our destination goals, we can choose the direct route or the scenic route.

This brings us to the next phase of goal setting. It's very difficult to tell which goals are chosen based on social pressure, and which ones are in alignment with our personal inclinations. In our present culture, at this time in history, the status of our line of work is usually in proportion to our income first and our association with a professional monopoly second. Usually the more effective the professional monopoly, the higher the income. Then of course there's the pressure from our families and friends.

So now we have two questions to answer when we're goal setting: First, are we setting goals in order to gain the approval of others; Or are we setting them according to our own inclinations so we can have the experiences in life we desire? Herein lays the difference between real self-esteem and borrowed self-esteem. As someone once said: 'we can be blackmailed only if we believe someone else's opinion is more important than our own.'

A famous sculptor was once asked: 'How do you carve an elephant out of a piece of stone?' To that question she replied: 'I simply chip away everything that doesn't look like an elephant.' The success we can expect to enjoy depends just as much on what we say no to, as on what we say yes to. The more baggage we try to carry that doesn't relate to our goals, the harder it'll be to achieve those goals. Once we're in touch with what our genuine interests are, time and resource management will naturally fall into place.

Regarding time management, there are many excellent time management tools. Depending on whether we're taking the direct route or the scenic route, this will determine whether the calendar we use will be organized by hourly increments, or in weekly increments. As Allen Lakein, author of *How to Control Your Time in Your Life* says: "Even if you have all the money in the world, you still don't have time enough to do everything you want to do." As for resources, even if we had it all, we'd be able to maintain only so much. Therefore, we need to seek only those resources that help us create the life we genuinely want to live. To try to acquire more, just for the approval of others, is to acquire a junk yard. Either in our outer world because we don't have time to maintain our possessions properly, or in our inner world because there isn't enough time left for self-expression. This isn't meant to suggest that everyone should live in a drained pipe like Socrates. Each one of us has to decide what's best for ourselves.

The last area Dr. Matt explores is the area of human relations' skills. One point he emphasizes strongly is that success is non-competitive. This is true for two reasons. First, the average college graduate only reads an average of one educational book a year. In fact, if you read more than one educational book a year you're in the top one-percent of the population. Napoleon Hill once observed that, "less than one percent of the population does the work necessary to pass the torch light of civilization onto the next generation." Maybe this accounts for the saying that 'readers are leaders.' Second, the janitor who attends to every detail and works to the limits of his potential is more successful than a company president, who's playing it safe while hiding a genius that cries out to introduce a new idea or process. Once again we refer to James Allen who says: "Those who are not prepared for the apprehension of a great purpose should fix their thoughts on the faultless performance of their duty, no matter how insignificant their task may appear." Only in this way can the thoughts be gathered and focused and the resolution and energy be developed, which being done, there isn't anything which may not be accomplished.

As our quality of life depends on the greatness which resides in each one of us, we need to communicate with others as fellow sovereigns, whose desires are as legitimate as our own. This is the essence of human

relations'. It's the art of appealing to the rational self-interest of others, not the skill of imposing our wills on them. This is a subject in and of itself. Should you want to explore these ideas further, please refer to my tape entitled: *"Responsible and Effective Listening Techniques."*

Thus far I've focused on the art of manipulating our outer world in order to become successful. It would have been convenient if I could have done this in a form that totally separated outer success from inner success, but reality insists that everything be related to everything else. Therefore, I had to sneak in a preview of some information to be covered on the second part. Anyway, what good is success if we can't enjoy it?

Creating a desirable experience is only the first half of the journey to happiness. If we create a virtual paradise, yet lack the ability to perceive that paradise with a sense of appreciation, we've succeeded without being happy about it. This is why success doesn't guarantee happiness.

Philosophers throughout history have assumed that life is little more than suffering and tragedy. The eastern religions like Buddhism and Hinduism started from the assumption that man is powerless to live in this world non-tragically. Therefore, they promoted passiveness and detachment and were ultimately successful in showing the way to a happiness that didn't require a foundation of success. In fact, successful action on this planet could actually interfere because the ultimate goal offered is the obliteration, or melting, of our self-identity into a single undifferentiated form of consciousness called God. Religious philosophers of the West also agree that life offered nothing more than suffering and tragedy. However, in the West, God was portrayed as being an angry father figure, who had to be catered to with sacrifices and praise. The pursuit of happiness itself was never taken seriously. There was assumed to be a byproduct of perfect servitude to an all-powerful God. In fact, power seems to be the name of the game. God, or those who claim to represent God, rule over man; Man rules over a woman; Woman rules over the child, and if the child doesn't have a cat to kick, he or she may be excluded from the game entirely. Western religious history is noted for the tremendous amounts of suffering in death that results from when the hypocrisy of guilt and fraud breaks down, and the naked edge of force is revealed.

Although religious philosophers both East and West have constructed different cosmologies in an attempt to answer otherwise answerable questions, the basic assumptions have been the same. That assumption being the belief that life is suffering and tragedy with no escape except through the guidance and prescriptions offered by people who are experts about every reality except the one we share on this planet.

Our inherited belief that life is tragic continues to be supported by our experience because we've not shined the light of reason on it. James Allen responds to this by saying: "Not what he wishes and prays for does a man get, but what he justly earns. His wishes and prayers are only gratified and answered when they harmonize with his thoughts and actions." Some people talk of living in a world of peace and abundance which implies minding our own business and doing productive life-supporting work. How do our political and religious gurus propose we bring about peace and abundance? By forcing everyone to adhere to the same

political or religious ideology. In practice, it usually becomes the art of sacrificing the strong, for the benefit of the weak, at the discretion of the clever.

Our methods and actions speak of force and sacrifice while our words speak of peace and abundance. What do you think reality would respond to? Our words, or our actions. To this, Mr. Allen replies: “What then is the meaning of fighting against circumstances? That means that a man is continually revolting against and effect without, while all the time he’s nourishing and preserving its cause in his heart. Men are anxious to improve their circumstances but are unwilling to improve themselves. They therefore remain bound.”

To sum up thus far, both success and happiness are the birthright of humankind. However, if we do what we’ve always done, we’ll get what we’ve always gotten. So let’s try something different for a change. James Allen stresses above all the importance of right thought, and while the right use of thought can create material abundance, there’s one thing even more important. In his words: “Blessedness, not material possessions is the measure of right thought. Wretchedness is not a lack of material possessions, is a measure of wrong thought. Blessedness and riches are only joined together when the riches are rightly used, and the poor man descends into wretchedness only when he regards his lot as a burden unjustly imposed. A man only begins to be a man when he ceases to whining revile, and commences to search for the hidden justice which regulates his life. As he adopts his minds to that regulating factor, he ceases to accuse others as the cause of his condition and builds himself up in strong in noble thoughts. Ceases to kick against circumstances but begins to use in his faiths to his more rapid progress, and as a means of discovering the hidden powers and possibilities within himself.”

This brings to mind a little poem I originated some years ago:

The root of all emotional pain
is easily understood once we see.
It’s always found in the difference between that which is
and what we think should be.

In the late 70’s, I once studied under named Hugh Ripman. One evening did an excellent discourse on dealing with physical pain. He explained that a certain amount of pain is to be expected during one’s life. Therefore, although we need to do whatever we can to take care of any pain when they feel, we don’t need to add the additional burden of emotional judgement to the first pain. When we judge that we shouldn’t be feeling any pain, we stack emotional pain on top of the physical pain. In other words, we feel two pains when only one is necessary.

It’s been said that the prayer of the average person can be summed up as: ‘Oh Lord! Please make it so that two plus two be not four.’ It’s always tempting to demand that the laws of life make an exception for us. Unfortunately, when we make this demand we set ourselves up for disappointment. Of course, this doesn’t mean we should refrain from making any demands on life, is just that when we do we need to remember two

things: First, you can have anything in life you want. You might however, have to work for it. Second, you can do anything you want, all you have to do is pay the consequences.

Life offers both a range of freedom to act and boundaries which we cross at our own risk. In other words, life does have laws which continue to operate regardless of our opinion about them. So the question we must answer for ourselves is, are we going to fight our boundaries; or use them as guidance? “Nature to be commanded must be obeyed.”

Back in the days of Rome, an edict was decreed. If a roman soldier asked a citizen to carry his pack for a mile, the one asked had to do it. One small, but proud country was extremely outraged by this, so all the leaders of the community debated and pondered long and hard about what the proper response should be. After several days they were finally ready to issue guidance to their fellow citizens. Their council was: ‘When a soldier ask you to carry his pack one mile, carry it two. For the first mile you’re a slave, but for the second mile you’re free.’

Of course this theory could be understood to mean we should passively accept slavery. However, for me it reveals an important truth about life. If we tried to survive just by doing the minimum necessary, we’ll most likely be lacking in material well being and most definitely be lacking in self-esteem. Eric Hoffer, the author of *The True Believer*, summed it up very well with his observation that: “When people fail to strive for superficialities, they usually end up lacking in necessities as well.” Both our success and happiness require that we do more than just the minimum. In the bible Christ suggest that we “become a law unto our self.” To me, this means we need to align ourselves with basic physical and ethical laws with the knowledge that they’re designed for the support and enhancement of life. By claiming ownership of the laws of life we do become a law unto ourselves. The bad news for some is that even mastering the art of happiness requires work. Here our friend James Allen interrupts me once again to say: “Even the man who’s sole object is to acquire possessions must be prepared to make great personal sacrifices before he can accomplish his object, and how much more so he who would realize is strong and well poised life.”

The world is full of people who’ll achieve success in conventional terms but are left wondering why happiness didn’t automatically follow. Part of learning the art of happiness consists of unlearning many cultural assumptions we’ve been taught not to question. As I suggested earlier, happiness is primarily about choosing our perceptions consciously so we don’t burden ourselves with a second layer of discomfort.

A young women I once knew wanted very much to go to the military academy. However, instead of focusing on her desire to have the experience of the academy, she focused on her fear that she might not make it. As a result, she converted study time into worrying time, which in turn made her receive lower grades. Unfortunately one myth that’s common it’s the one that says ‘if we’re unhappy, we’ll work harder to achieve our dream.’

Another myth about unhappiness suggests that truly intelligent or sensitive people are unhappy because they're so painfully aware of how miserable this world is. The old testament, for example, offers us the choice of mourning with wise men or laughing with fools. Barry Neil Kaufman, the author of *To Love is To Be Happy With*, observed that the expression 'happy idiot' was not just a comment, but a suspicion that happiness and idiocy were synonymous. As an antidote to our cultural and personal glorification of unhappiness, Mr. Coffman offers 4 questions for identifying or clarifying unhappiness. These four questions are:

1. What are you unhappy about?
2. Why are you unhappy about that?
3. Why do you believe that?
4. What are you afraid would happen if you weren't unhappy about it?

Many people would sacrifice anything except their suffering. They'll sacrifice their wealth, their relationships, and even their lives instead of sacrificing their notion that the world is a terrible place to live because the universe will not dedicate itself to making them happy.

Although happiness and material success are indirectly related, it's possible to choose happiness even if we don't do what's necessary to bring about material abundance. Reality does pay more attention to what we do, than how we feel. Therefore, happiness does not automatically bring about success. Going back to my definition of love, the will to appreciate all that is, I once again refer to Mr. Kaufman where he declares: "People love in direct proportion to which they're happy." In fact, this is one of the turning point quotes in my study of relationships. Prior to this, and a few other sources, I, like most other people, assumed that the problems of love were unsolvable without first overcoming the problems of relationships. Hopefully, it is now self-evident that relationships can be created without love and love can be created without relationships. People love in direct proportion to which they're happy, and they're happy in direct proportion to their ability to appreciate all that is. Likewise, success can be created without happiness, and happiness can be created without success. It's within our power to have it all, but we can only start from where we're at. It does no good to pretend to be anywhere else but where we are. If our goal is to go to Denver while we're in San Francisco, but we believe we're in Washington D.C. our attempt at travel will leave us feeling all wet.

Life is about making choices, and the more choices we're aware of, the more power we'll have to shape our reality. This tape series has been about increasing your available choices and revealing *your power to create love*. May you claim that power that is rightfully yours. As this tape comes to a close I want to do two things. First, I want to thank you for having invested in yourself and in your personal growth. Second, I want to invite and encourage you to send me your comments and suggestions. These tapes do not represent the end of my study, they represent the beginning. Hopefully, these tapes will represent a new beginning for you too

DECREASE YOUR CONFLICT – INCREASE YOUR STANDARD OF LIVING

Hello. I'm Larry Barnhart and this tape is entitled "Decrease your conflict--Increase your standard of living." In this tape we are going to explore just how much we are paying for conflict. First we'll consider the concept of cultural maturity. Then, we'll look at four major occupations: mainly government, legal services, tax planners, and mental health services, all of which thrive on conflict. Looking closely at these occupations will help us understand the price we pay for conflict on the macro-economic level.

Once we've explored the macro-economic perspective, we'll be ready to look at the micro economic perspective. In other words, we'll consider how much wealth and happiness is lost as a result of unresolved conflicts with our friends, families, and business associates. These conflicts may never come to the attention of the before mentioned occupations, yet they exact a heavy toll in our financial and emotional well-being. Finally, we're going to look within ourselves in order to uncover some of our hidden belief systems that motivate our tendency toward conflict in the first place.

It's been said that conflict began when the first non-producer looked with envy on the fruits of the labors of the first producer. Conflict manifests itself in several different forms. First, there's outright violence or physical force. The second form of conflict is through fraud or deception. The third is force of law, which compels people to accept costs or give up benefits which they would not ordinarily consent to do. Finally, there's monetary manipulation, such as "increasing the money supply" which effectively confiscates wealth far more efficiently than a band of a thousand bank robbers. Everyone of these forms of conflict are deadly to a culture's long-term prosperity.

Although a mature person has many qualities, one very important quality is that of being trustworthy. The more people can trust one another other, the more time they can spend being productive, and the less time they have to spend devising ways to protect themselves from each other. As conflict escalates, people not only have to take time to protect themselves from each other, they have to start hiring third parties to act as intermediaries. Naturally, these third parties have to have to food to eat and a place to live. That means that those in conflict have to give up a portion of their production in order to pay for third party intervention. As more and more people are taken out of the productive sector of the economy, there will be fewer and fewer life-sustaining commodities available for the culture as a whole.

The first major occupation that arises to answer the need for conflict resolution services is government. The purpose of government is to protect the citizen from force or fraud perpetuated by others. If there were no force or fraud, there'd be no need for government. In this century government has become a booming business. In fact, many are noticing that it's becoming harder and harder to support the government in the style to which it's become accustomed. Between 1978 and 1982, government admitted to consuming thirty-two percent of our

nation's gross national product, more commonly known as GNP. However, this figure is misleading because when the government calculates GNP it includes its own spending. The government can spend only that which is first taken away or has borrowed against our future income. Therefore, real GNP is government published GNP minus government spending. For those who are mathematically inclined, let's consider what this means. If we take 32% from 100%, we're left with 68%. In other words, real GNP is only 68% of what government published GNP is. Then, if we divide government spending into real GNP by dividing 68 by 32, we'll discover that government is actually consuming 47% of real GNP. From 47% we don't have far to go 'til we reach 50%. Maybe this is why a fellow once quipped: "The poles are places where people go to stand in line for a chance to determine who's going to spend their money."

The next occupation that provides conflict resolution services is the legal profession. Although lawyers are generally not thought well of, our culture generates enough conflict to make the terms lawyer and wealthy synonymous. Of course, lawyers know that conflict is their bread and butter, so, they make the most of it. Through the ingenious development of a language called *legalese*, they routinely charge us \$150.00 or more for \$3.00 procedures. (This reminds me of the man who once declared "a lawyer is a fine gentleman who saves your state from probate and keeps it for himself.")

Many people have learned to be wary of the so-called professional advice because they've discovered that very often the advice they're given is more for the professional's benefit than for their own. A lawyer once moved into a small town, hung out a shingle and almost starved to death. However, before he missed too many meals he had an inspiration. He convinced a lawyer friend of his to move into the same town to start his practice. Together, they became millionaires in a very short time. The maxim, "it takes two to fight," is just as true on the social level as it is on the individual level. Nevertheless, before we start getting too upset with lawyers, we must remember that it's our tendency toward conflict that makes their jobs possible in the first place. I don't know about you, but I'd rather have a lawyer dig an imperfect ditch or plow a weeping furrow, than to have one send me a perfect invoice for a large legal fee.

The third occupation that's coming to being as a result of our conflicts, is that of tax preparer, tax planner, tax accountant, tax lawyer, and so on. This is the natural result of our government taking such a large portion of people's productive efforts. As people discover that they'll not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of their labor, they slow down their production and start spending more time protecting that which they already have. Most financial planners agree that you shouldn't even try to achieve financial independence unless you're prepared to do tax planning along with everything else you need to do to be successful. Of course, if you're a tax planner, this is good news. Regarding the new tax law, the Tax Complication Act of 1986, a cartoon I saw recently summed it up. Two men dressed in business suits were leaving the elevator looking at each other and smiling. The caption below said: "Ahh...At last! A tax law that everyone's tax accountant can understand."

Thanks to the government's 47% share of our wealth, and the legal profession's adroit use of legalese, the tax planning industry is booming while agriculture and mining are hitting rock bottom. Along the same lines, tax psychology is fascinating. Can you think of any other area of life where people spend a dollar to gain a 30-cent advantage? The same person who wouldn't go to the store and spend a dollar for 30-cents worth of candy, would gladly pay a dollar for needless consumer interest in order to save 30-cents in taxes. This speaks of a deep, unnamed resentment of the expropriation by force that taxation represents. If you don't believe force is involved, try not paying taxes for a while.

And now for the fourth occupation: mental health services. This is probably by far the smallest industry in the business of rendering conflict resolution services. The reason for this may be that it deals with conflict within an individual. Few people are willing to admit that the conflicts they're engaged in are at least partially created within themselves. Of the four, mental health professionals are the only ones who even attempt to teach conflict resolution skills. Nevertheless, mental health professionals are in the same dilemma as government, lawyers, and tax planners. If people were to learn how to resolve their own conflicts, those offering mental health services would have to learn how to do something else, in order to stay employed.

In summary, when we add together the resources used by government, lawyers, tax planners, and the mental health industry, we'll find that close to half of the real Gross National Product is being used to pay for conflict resolution services. What this means, is that we're now working half the day to take care of our selves and our families, and we're working the other half of the day to pay for conflict resolution services. Of course, not everybody is going to agree with this conclusion, especially economists of the Keynesian persuasion. After all, how often have we heard that war is good for the economy? The assumption behind this theory is that as long as long as we're busy everything's okay.

Unfortunately, we may be running the risk of imitating a particular type of worm. This worm has the tendency to grab the tail of a worm in front of it and start following blindly. Experiments have been made where a number of these worms were placed in a circle so they would all be following each other. Although food was put in close proximity of them, these poor worms went round and round until they died of exhaustion and starvation. Being busy isn't always the same as being productive.

One of the best rebuttals of "the war is good for the economy" theory comes from Henry Hazlitt in his book *Economics in One Lesson*. He called this "war is good for the economy" theory the "broken window" theory. Henry Hazlitt's explanation goes roughly as follows: One day a local hoodlum throws a rock through the baker's window. As no one was able to catch the hoodlum, the baker was stuck with a broken window. The window cost \$200 to fix. At this point all the Keynesians exclaimed that this was in reality good fortune. Now the glazier will have \$200 worth of business. As long as we look this far, and no further, this theory holds up. However, if we consider that the baker was planning to buy a \$200 suit from the tailor, we then understand that

the glazier's gain was the tailor's loss. The glazier's gain is also the baker's loss, because instead of having a window and a new suit, the baker only has a window.

Furthermore, if this theory worked well in reality, an auto body shop for instance, would never have to worry about slow times. If business got slow, all they'd have to do is take a sledgehammer and pulverize their own vehicles. Within minutes, their business problems would be solved because they'd be busy taking the dents out of their own cars. If they did a real good job of it, they wouldn't have time to work on anybody else's cars.

This is one of a number of examples of Keynesian theory that suggests that their basic maxim goes something like this: "that which is ridiculous when done by an individual is genius when done by a government." Adam Smith in his book *Wealth of Nations* had a different opinion. He said, "that which is considered 'prudence' in the management of a household, can hardly be called 'folly' when managing the affairs of a great nation."

Now we are ready to look at the cost of conflict on the microeconomic level. Or stated differently, we're going to look at what we do with the 50% of our production we're allowed to keep after the Big Four take their share. As Venita VanCaspel, the author of *Money Dynamics for the 80's* said: "the only money you'll ever have for spending or investing is that which the government lets you keep." How much wealth and happiness do we lose as a result of conflict within ourselves, among our families, in between ourselves and our co-workers? These costs can only be speculated on because these conflicts are the ones that don't generally come to the attention of the Big Four.

This world is in reality nothing more than a collection of separate individuals. Therefore, in order to understand conflict at any level, we must understand how conflict develops at the individual level. An individual must first be agitated within himself before he can be willing to fight with other individuals. When enough individuals become agitated, we then have a war. In between these two extremes we have family fights and divorces, neighbor quarrels, office politics, and so forth.

A major source of frustration for many of us is that we're on the wrong line of work. It's been said that the world is full of people who have to wait until five o'clock before they can do what they really want to do. However, it is a fact of life that in order to live we must produce at least the basic life sustaining commodities. Or if we don't produce, we must somehow confiscate the production of someone who does.

As our very survival depends on our production or work, it's safe to say that our work is very important. Of course, not only do we satisfy our basic physical needs through work we satisfy our self-esteem needs as well by gaining a sense of independence and control over our lives. Needless to say, if we find ourselves unable to make a living doing something we enjoy, it's hard to have a sense of independence and control over our destinies. This principle can be taken one step further in the case of those who are dependent on others who are productive for their sustenance. Ultimately, if we are not being productive in a way that's satisfying, we're going to experience a lot of conflict.

Along these same lines, many people who feel trapped in an unsuitable line of work further entrap themselves with debt. Having failed to meet their self-esteem needs through production they try to do it through consumption. In order to fill some vague, undefined sense of emptiness they purchase every available status symbol in order to reassure themselves. By spending every dime they can earn and borrow, they accumulate a lot of debt, which is, especially at present a major cause of stress.

It's been said that we're in slavery when 40% or more of our income is used for interest payments. The government is close to that point, and many individuals have passed that point long ago. More of us need to realize that when our outgo exceeds our income our upkeep becomes our downfall. A heavy load of debt means that a relatively minor problem can force people to make unwanted, major changes in their lives. The thought of this possibility is enough to inspire many people to become hostile toward their families and co-workers. This naturally translates the further losses in productivity and happiness.

Love relationships are another one of life's areas where many problems arise. It's been said that very few relationships are large enough to accommodate even one whole person, let alone two. Many people look to relationships to fill the void left by an unsatisfying work life that leaves them with a low self-esteem. As a result, they approach their relationships in much the same way as they do any other acquisition. As long as their acquisition does their bidding everything's fine, but the minute there's a difference of opinion, trouble begins. There's a great deal more to be said about this subject, but is not within the scope of this particular tape. For those who may want to explore this topic further, my tape: *Your Power to Create Love*, may be of interest.

A more evident result of internal conflict is the outright violence and fraud that people perpetrate on one another. Much of it never makes it to the Big Four, and that which does, cannot be undone. It can only be avenged. More often than not, when the Big Four come into the picture, insult is added to injury. The victim not only has to recoup his losses, he or she must pay for the administration of justice as well.

I'm not going to try to outline every possible way that our well-being suffers at the hands of conflict. No doubt, everyone listening to this tape can easily think of additional examples. The important thing is for us to realize how, and why the quality of our lives goes down, as our level of conflict goes up.

Thus far, we've looked at our nation's macro-economic picture and the micro-economic picture as it relates to individuals in small social units. Now we are ready to take this one step further and look at the world's economic picture. Using what we've learned so far, we'll be able to understand why there's so much poverty and starvation in the world. Today, there's a popular notion that America was just lucky to have its wealth. Therefore, we should feel guilty enough to ship a large part of our wealth overseas in order to make things more equal. The fact that we've already done that for over 40 years with no measurable change has done little to cause people to doubt this theory. What we need to realize is that there's so much conflict within the countries receiving our gifts that they cannot even make plans for the next crop, let alone develop an efficient industrial network that requires 20 to 50 years peace time conditions and the rights of the producers to enjoy the fruits of

their labor. In Russia where it is relatively peaceful, but under totalitarian rule, people sum up their situation by saying: "we pretend we're working, and they pretend they're paying us." Add to this demotivation continual wars and changes of government, and you'll have a situation where production is all but impossible.

Furthermore, all the gifts of food and supplies have done so far, is to prop up totalitarian governments so they can further control and demoralize otherwise productive and creative people. We do not help the world by plundering American producers and shipping that production overseas. If this trend is carried to its logical conclusion, all we'll accomplish is the demoralization of our own producers. Instead of lifting the rest of the world up we'll be lowering ourselves down to the same level of poverty and strife, as more people quit working and take to fighting.

A better way for us to help the world is to stop subsidizing dictators and start minding our own business. As a part of minding our own business, we need to learn how to produce in such a way as not to generate conflict. If we can set an example of prosperity without conflict, which poor nations can emulate, we'll be giving those nations far more wealth than we can possibly give them through our present method of plundering our own producers. Along the same lines, a better way to help the poor in our own country is to stop subsidizing professional altruists, either government or private. These people specialize in taking ten shirts off the backs of producers, keeping eight for themselves, and giving the remaining 2 to the poor. In 1983, if all the tax money taken from the American people, ostensibly on behalf of the poor actually made it to the poor, each person under the poverty level would've received \$8,000 tax-free. This system of white-collar welfare creates administrative career for bureaucrats, while breeding dependency and a loss of self-esteem among the supposed beneficiaries of the system. By putting both categories of welfare recipients back into the productive sector all producers would fare better, including these new producers.

Now we are ready to explore an unquestioned belief system that underlies and justifies our tendency toward conflict. One of the greatest contributions the discipline of psychology has given us is the concept of unquestioned belief systems. Throughout our lives we tend to develop a large number of beliefs about how reality is. These beliefs tend to coalesce together over time and from these beliefs some core assumptions about the nature of reality are formed, most usually on an unconscious level.

The way elephants are trained in the circus, will serve well to illustrate this point. When an elephant is very young, it's tied to a small pole with a heavy chain. There's no way it can escape so after a period of time it gives up trying. Once it's stopped trying it's then kept in place with a rope tied to a wooden stake stuck in the ground. This is very convenient for circus owners and trainers, but it's proven disastrous for some elephants. There have been cases where elephants have actually burned to death in circus tent fires because they believed they couldn't break free. They still saw themselves as helpless baby elephants, though they were in reality one of the strongest creatures on Earth. Unfortunately, humans aren't that much different.

There's more than enough brain power and creativity in this world to solve our problems ten times over, yet we're so willing to be overwhelmed by our problems. There are two ways to uncover hidden belief systems. First is to do a historical analysis in order to see what it has in common with present behavior. The other way is to look at present behavior and then trace backward in order to determine what the hidden belief system may be. In this case we'll do the latter. Whenever people resort to conflict, they're saying that they feel their survival is in danger. In order to understand this assertion more fully we must take a look at what is meant by survival.

The first aspect of survival is the preservation of our physical being, and for some the desire to attain a sense of immortality through lasting notoriety. The next aspect of survival is the preservation of people, things, and ideas that we've identified ourselves with. In some cases, we've invested our sense of self in things outside ourselves more than of what we have in our own bodies. These are the things we kill and die for. This reminds me of the guy who was approached by a couple of thugs who demanded: "your money, or your life," the man replied: "take my life. I'm saving my money for old age."

Now that we've considered that there's more to survival in many people's minds than merely keeping reasonably well fed and comfortable, our next step shouldn't seem too far fetched. Another aspect of feeling that our survival is threatened, comes from the belief that if we're going to survive, we have to live at the expense of others. People who have this belief in scarcity are concerned about trying to get a bigger piece of one pie because they don't believe that more pies can be created.

On the other hand, if we believe we can create more pies, we don't need to take someone else's. The *Denver Rocky Mountain News* had an article titled: "Lobbyists spend 61 million dollars to influence congress." This was the total for 1986, which was 25% higher than 1985, and 45% higher than 1984. Actually, this is pretty small when compared to a trillion dollar budget, but it does illustrate that a lot of attention has been taken from creating more pies, and shifted toward fighting over one pie.

Yet another unquestioned belief system that needs to be challenged is our use of comparison with others in order to determine how well we're doing. Along with believing that there's only one pie over which everyone must fight, we cause further problems when we interfere with the desire of others to create more pies. Whenever we decide that certain groups of people shouldn't be allowed any but the most menial or poorly paid forms of productivity, we are sabotaging the potential of many of those members who are able to make greater contributions.

To better understand where I'm going with this idea, let's consider the effects of slavery. As our history books have told us, our nation started with slavery being sanctioned in the Southeast, whereas the Northeast didn't think that was such a good idea. Although both started with basically the same economic potential, the Northeast ended up becoming considerably more wealthy than the Southeast. Why should this be? After all, the Southeast had the benefit of cheap labor. Actually, the problem was the cheap labor. The Southeastern states had no economic incentive to be innovative as the landed gentry enjoyed a lifestyle that was clearly better than

that of the slaves. As for the slaves, although they had every incentive to be innovative, they were prevented by law and custom. The law and the whip insured that creativity remained the exclusive property of those who needed it least.

On the other hand, the Northeast while not being totally free of exploitation, allowed more people to participate in the creative process. As a result, the Northeast spawned the Industrial Revolution. And even today the Northeastern enjoys a higher standard of living on the average than the Southeast. Ultimately, we have a choice. We can sabotage the productive efforts of others in order to enjoy a comparably higher standard of living, or we can encourage the productive efforts of others and thereby enjoy a truly higher standard of living.

When we inhibit the productive efforts of others, we simultaneously eliminate a market for our own productivity. So the wise thing to do is to encourage others to be productive, even if that means we'll lose the benefit of comparison. Our loss will be more than compensated for by a real increase in wealth, as we gain new markets for our own productivity.

Ultimately, our only hope for improving our long-term well-being is for each of us individually to start learning conflict resolution skills, and how to wean ourselves from employing conflict resolution services. The less we fight, the more time and energy we have for production. The less we destroy, the less we have to rebuild. If everyone believed in their own ability to create value, supported others in their creation of value, and then exchanged those values freely in the marketplace without compulsion by force or fraud, we could totally eliminate the expense of government, lawyers, tax planners, and mental health professionals. That would mean one of three things, more material values to enjoy, more time to enjoy non-material values, or both. Maybe the time has come for us to start honoring honest producers who benefit from solving problems, instead of honoring non-producers who benefit from creating or intensifying problems.

RESPONSIBLE SPEAKING AND EFFECTIVE LISTENING TECHNIQUES

On the first side of this tape, we took a look at how much conflict is costing us as individuals and as a society. By now the declaration that we need better communication has become a cliché, nevertheless, by learning how to communicate better we have the potential of improving our lives several times over, not only materially but mentally and emotionally as well. Hopefully, this tape on responsible speaking and effective listening skills will become more meaningful now that we know the stakes.

Recently I heard a story about a couple who were taking a drive in the mountains. The woman was enjoying the beautiful scenery, but the man was thinking about their home. As they were driving she commented, "we ought to get along more." He snapped, "a lawn mower? you idiot, you know we pay the condo association to take care of the lawn."

In this case everything was smoothed over once they understood that they were talking about different things, however, they could have avoided conflict and unnecessary pain had the man been more responsible in his communication. It never hurts to check out what someone is saying before we set about to alienate them. Better yet, it's wise not to alienate people even if we disagree with them. Wise people learn the art of disagreeing without being disagreeable, or as Abraham Lincoln once said: "The best way to eliminate an enemy is to turn him into a friend."

This side of this tape will cover communication principles as well as techniques for applying these principles to responsible speaking and effective listening.

The first basic principle of communication is that our words always reveal ourselves. Whenever we speak we may or may not be accurately assessing a situation, but we never fail to reveal ourselves. The situation is only part of our experience. The other part of our experience, the most important part, I might add, is our values, desires, and goals against which situations are measured. Epictetus, a philosopher who lived around 100 A.D. once declared, "Men are not disturbed by things but by the view they take of things." Two people can experience the same situation, one will rejoice and the other one will curse. Why? Because one sees it as a gain, and the other sees it as a loss.

For example, Joe and Augustine moved into identical town homes side by side, Joe is thrilled because he was moving out of his parents home to his own place for the first time, on the other hand, Augustine was less than thrilled because his perch home in the Cherry Hills Estates had been foreclosed on. We can be sure that what Joe says about his move to his friends will be completely different to what Augustine says to his friends, if he has any left. What they'll say will definitely reveal more about themselves than about their actual physical move.

Another rather different example of the subjectivity of our communication is portrayed in this short dialogue between a man and a woman. "I love you" declared the man." "Strange that I feel non the better for it" replied the woman." Could it be possible that she is not to be flattered or controlled by his declaration of need? Indeed she's revealed herself very clearly.

The next general principle of communication is to learn how to develop and maintain an attitude of mild curiosity. Once we realize that people, including ourselves, can only speak in terms of their own perspectives, we'll understand that nobody has a monopoly on objective truth. Then we'll no longer have to attack others when we speak nor will we have to defend ourselves when we listen. This means that we'll have more of our attention available for truly listening to others because we'll not be busy planing our next response.

Another term that applies to this subject of mild, albiet sincere, curiosity, is empathy. Empathy is somewhat like sympathy except that it lacks the sentimentality of empathy. It's been said that if you're sympathetic you understand someone else's problems and you agree. In other words, two people now have a problem where as only one person had a problem before. On the other hand, if you are empathetic you understand someone else's problem, but you don't necessarily agree. In this case you have the presence of mind to assist someone in exploring alternatives. Of course there are people who are not able to empathetic or sympathetic -- these people are just plain pathetic.

The third general principle of communication is: all conversation is therapy. All experiences whether they be negative or positive generate a certain amount of stress: even promotions, marriages and winning lottery tickets cause stress. As a result, we need to talk about the new developments in our lives. We need to talk about our negative experiences in order to better understand and put them behind us. We need to talk about our positive experiences so they will seem more real to us.

When an experience is no longer an issue we can they say we've processed that experience. One of the greatest challenges of life is learning how to process our experiences quickly, so our minds can be free to perceive the next experience more clearly.

There once was a young man with a wooden eye, obviously he wasn't born that way, so he must have had a traumatic accident that caused him to lose his eye. After the physical pain of his loss went away, the emotional pain of being like everyone else lingered on. As he was single this caused further problems because he felt too self-conscious to go out and meet people, especially women. However, as fate would have it a friend of his finally talked him into going to a singles club. When he walked into the club the first thing he noticed was a very beautiful woman who seemed perfect in every way, except that she had big ears. This seemed very promising because his wooden eye and her big ears would make them more equal. Nevertheless, asking her for a dance seemed very threatening. What if she said "NO!" An hour, and four rounds of liquid courage later, he got up, walked across the room, and as calmly as possible, asked: "Would you like to dance?" She, with great enthusiasm and excitement responded, "Wood eye, wood eye!" He immediately jumped back and yelled, "Big

ears, big ears!" Afterward he thought to himself, 'Of all the women I could have asked, why did I choose one that could see my wooden eye even in a dimly lit room?' Had he been successful in processing his experience earlier he would have realized that a new and possibly wonderful experience was awaiting him.

As all conversations can be used to help us process our experiences, none of it needs to be judged as totally useless. Small talk among strangers for instance, is a useful tool to dissipate tension that naturally arises when two people meet. Nevertheless, it stands to reason that if there are more effective ways to process our experiences we would be wise to learn them.

Building our lives with inefficient communication skills is like building our houses with hand tools. When we listen to conversations whether they be our own or someone else's, there is one key thing we want to listen for, is the speaker using "I" messages? The phrase *I message* refers to when we speak about our feelings and perceptions in the first person, instead of saying, 'You know how you feel when your lover tells you she's found someone new?' we say, "I feel helpless and angry when I think of how hard I tried to please her. Is not flattering to think that my best wasn't good enough." As long as we speak in second or third person our assumption is that our experience is universal; that we are right about our position and stuck in the belief that no other alternatives exist. Until we can get off our position we'll be stuck with an unprocessed experience that will interfere with our ability to perceive future experiences clearly.

Once we can speak in first person, thereby acknowledging that our feelings and perceptions are our own, regardless of how many other people may agree, we are then ready to consider alternative approaches to understanding our situation. Ultimately, we have a choice. We can either be right or we can be happy. Letting ourselves and others off the hook for the things in life that don't go our way is what processing our experience's all about. A master of life is one who can process his or her experience as it happens. It is not an easy ideal to attain, but it is certainly one worth striving toward.

The last general principle of communication is: all conversation is selling. No matter what we say or who we say it to, we are trying to influence someone in some way. Idle chatter about the weather, for instance, may be a way to trying to sell someone on the idea that they should get to know us better. Or we may try to sell the idea of closer intimacy, unless we are not attracted to the other person, and in that case we try to sell the idea of greater distance.

When we are in a job interview, we are trying to get an employer to buy our skills and services. We may not be accustomed to thinking of this as a selling situation, but even the most inarticulate person must either stutter and stammer "I I.I ca ca can do do do do thethe jo jo job," or sell someone else on being their spokesperson.

In an argument we try to make the toughest sell of all -- getting someone to admit they are wrong. And of course there is a kind of selling we can consciously recognize as selling, here we make a concerted effort to make people buy our goods and services.

The more we are consciously aware of the fact that we are selling, the better off we'll be. If we are to be effective at selling, we must think in terms of what the other person can hope to gain by giving us what we want. Instead of being like the little boy who tried to catch fish with twinkies because he liked twinkies, we need to be like the cat that ate the cheese and waited for the mouse with baited breath.

Now we are ready to look at responsible speaking. Remembering that our words reveal ourselves let's consider what it means to be responsible for our perceptions. No situation or person can bother us unless they at least appear to be in conflict with our values, desires and goals. Things that may aggravate us may not affect other people at all. As it's often said, "One's man's trash is another man's treasure."

There are two ways to stop the situation from being painful: one is to change the situation and the other is to change our values through which we perceive the situation. While it may be ideal to do either or both easily, most of us know that neither situations nor values are easy to change. On the one hand, other people have a vote on the nature of reality just like we do, and on the other hand, too much compromise can be soul killing. Therefore, we must try to find a middle ground.

Before we go any further let's take a look at the issue of who's right and who's wrong. One thing is for certain, most everybody loves to be right and very few people like to be wrong. This being true we can be sure that we'll not hinder people to us or win their cooperation by making them wrong. In fact, the best way to get all but the most masochistic people out of our lives is for us to criticize others continually. Being criticized when we are right may be unbearable, but being criticized when we are wrong is even worse. As the likelihood of our being right increases so does the need for us to be tactful and diplomatic. We cannot expect others to be receptive to our views while they are busy defending their self-esteem.

This brings us back to responsible speaking. As our perceptions are shaped by our values and corresponding feelings we need to claim ownership of those values and feelings. Also we need to allow others to have different values and feelings. Statements like "that's stupid!" or "any idiot should know better than that" are not at all helpful in opening up communication channels.

The best way to illustrate how responsible speaking works is to give an example of how it worked in my experience. When I was in the military I always felt frustrated because I didn't believe that management showed enough respect for my ideas. Also, I vowed that when I got into a position of management I'd show more consideration. After what seemed like many years, my turn did come and as can be expected many unsolicited ideas were brought to me. While many of these ideas proved useful there were many others I didn't think were practical. In an attempt to be democratic I tried to explain why they wouldn't work. For every reason I used to show how the idea wouldn't work they would have three reasons why it would. In the meantime productivity was dropping which left me feeling impatient. I knew I had a problem; I also knew the old authoritarian approach was not the answer because it was the failure of that approach that led to my getting the job in the first place. After some thinking about that problem I had a realization. Many of the ideas presented that I didn't like

still had at least some possibility of working. The truth of the matter was that I didn't feel comfortable putting my name on the idea. Therefore, although it could be argued as to whether or not the idea would work, there was no room for argument about my feeling uncomfortable with the idea. The next time I was offered an idea I felt uncomfortable with I simply said, "That idea could possibly work, but right now I feel uncomfortable with it." Much to my amazement the reply I received was, "Oh, ok" and that was that, no hurt feelings or animosity and very little lost production. After that I had many opportunities to use this technique and I never once got into trouble with it.

To summarize then, three important points of responsible speaking are: first, our feelings and values determine how we react to another person or a situation. Second, making others wrong only serves to alienate people from us. When we are too judgmental and opinionated, people have little reason to hope for a meaningful dialogue with us. And finally, by claiming ownership of our feelings and values we can communicate our positions without making the other person wrong. When the other person doesn't feel they have to defend themselves they can direct more of their attention toward hearing us out. As Berry Neal Kaufman says in his book titled, *To Love is to be Happy With*, "It's hard to be loving when we are busy attending to our fears."

The other half of communicating is listening, possibly the biggest half, as we are given two ears and one mouth. Unfortunately, speaking seems to be more fun for most of us. A university once decided to offer a class on speaking and a class of listening at the same time. The speaking class attracted so much attention that they had to add two more classes. On the other hand, the listening class had to be canceled due to lack interest.

Maybe this is why many people are paying eighty dollars an hour or more to a psychologist or psychiatrist. The supply of good listeners is so small that they command high rates, not only materially but non-materially as well. While I haven't collected eighty dollars for an hour of my listening skills, I have been told by different women that their main attraction toward me was my ability to show a sincere interest in them and make them feel understood. Here I might add that many men loose out on opportunities for friendship and romance because they are trying to be interesting instead of being interested.

Ultimately we tend to judge others not by what they are, but how we feel when we are with them. There is more to effective listening than just saying, 'Yeah, I heard you,' this kind of response generally means, 'Hurry up and start talking again so I can resume my daydream.' Another term for effective listening is reflective listening. When we listen to someone, we need a way to let that person know what we heard them say and to verify whether or not we've heard them correctly. If someone is saying one thing and we are hearing something else our dialogue will not take us far. By the same token, it's hard for someone to move onto the next issue if they are not sure we've heard the first one. Like responsible speaking, effective listening techniques are simple, but powerful.

Effective listening begins with putting our own issues on the back burner so we can truly concentrate on what the other person is saying. Although many people claim to be able to listen to several channels at once, I doubt that most of them can do it well. Besides, when we give someone our undivided attention we are in effect telling them that they are important.

Once we have our attention focused, we start listening for two things. One, we learn about the situation or the story line, and two, we need to listen for the feelings associated with that story line. Without being aware of these two things we have no way of applying the effective listening techniques we are now ready to learn.

The first part of effective listening technique is the lead-in phrase. These are some of the phrases that can be used: "I hear you saying"; "It sounds like"; "Are you saying"; "Am I correct in understanding", and the list goes on as far as our imagination will allow. It's very important to develop a number of phrases so we don't drive ourselves silly and also so it doesn't become painfully obvious to the person we are listening to, that we are using a technique.

Let's say for example that a friend has just failed the post office exam and she's very depressed. Here I might add that this friend is very lucky that you just finished listening to this tape. Up until now she's had two types of responses. Some people have said, "Oh you poor thing", or "Oh that's terrible", or "I am so sorry." These are the representatives from the sympathy camp. Others have said, "Oh don't take it so hard. After all, it's only your life's dream going up in smoke." These are the representatives of the cheer 'em up school. Now that she's with you her luck is changed. You now how to be empathetic instead of sympathetic, you know that all you have to do is understand, you don't have to fix anything.

After listening to her for a while, you'll respond, "you sound genuinely depressed about failing the Post Office exam." From here any number of possibilities may develop. Maybe she's angry with herself for not studying harder. Maybe she's afraid this may mean that she's not good for anything else either. As more developments unfold we respond in the same basic format. For instance, 'I hear you saying you really feel small compared to your younger sister who is just elected president of the United States.'

Of course we can only go so far with this before our dialogue runs out. You may not believe this but there are professional therapists out there who venture no further than reflective listening. I've talked with a number of people who have expressed dissatisfaction because although they didn't want a prescription, they did want input from a source other than their own heads. While reflective listening is very valuable and important, if taken too far it becomes a pouring from the empty into the void. If we are listening closely after a while we'll start to notice trends that link isolated events together to form a pattern. Another possibility is that our own experience may help the other person consider the different perspective, or it may serve to reveal more basic understanding of the situation.

The magic phrase that leads to the next phase of effective listening is, "And I wonder...." If for example, referring back to our friend who just failed the Post Office exam, our feedback may go something like

this, "You sound genuinely depressed about failing the post office exam, and I wonder if you are afraid that this is the only way you can achieve your dreams." The phrase, "And I wonder if," is a neutral phrase that allows us to offer ideas without putting the person on the spot. If we guess wrong they can easily correct us and make another attempt at explaining themselves.

Summed up the techniques are: "I hear you saying" and "I wonder if." Also, as I stated earlier, effective listening not only helps make problems more clear and understandable, it can also make good events feel more real.

Then of course, there is the phenomenon of thinking out loud. This is what I call giving ideas the air test. I've watched many crash and burn immediately upon leaving my tongue, but I've also watched other ideas gracefully take flight. In either case I've always been grateful to the friend whose listening skills gave me the luxury of using the air test on my ideas.

Friedrich Nietzsche, although not particularly successful at relationships himself did offer one bit of good advice. He suggested that before we marry we need to ask ourselves whether or not we can converse well with one another, after all the greater part of marriage is spent in conversation. Actually, the greater part of life itself is spent in communication with other human beings. Responsible communication leads to peace and prosperity while irresponsible communication creates conflict and poverty. It's not my intention that this tape should be the last word on communication. My hope is that through this material we can acknowledge that what we don't know can and does hurt us, and then set out to correct any deficiencies. While it is true that paradise can only be built one person at a time, I believe that if the energy we now spent in conflict were turned into life supporting productivity, this planet could support fifty-billion people comfortably.

That pause you just heard was three years slipping by. This is Larry Barnhart, speaking from my studio in August of 1991. I'm still pleased with this tape overall, so I decided to simply update it with a few comments.

Earlier I mentioned that both government and private charities are often inefficient. While that's true I nevertheless place undue emphasis on that point and failed to emphasize the primary issue. Both government and private charities maybe be inefficient, but there's an essential difference. If we object to the inefficiency of a private charity we can simply withhold our funds. On the other hand, if we withhold their funds from government charities we risk losing our life savings and going to jail.

Therefore, efficiency is a secondary argument. Ethics and individual liberty is the primary argument. One day a beggar petitioned about his complaint, "Your majesty the people are not giving me enough alms," immediately the King shouted to his guards, "Quick! Get this man a sword so he can collect more alms." To this, the beggar cried out: "Oh no your majesty, I can't do that. I'm an honorable man. You're the King, that's your job." To this the King replied, "If it's not honorable for you what makes it honorable for me?"

At one point in this tape I compared the backwardness of the southeastern part of the United States to the northeast. The key point was the idea that slavery actually retards economic growth because those who have the freedom to be creative don't have the need for creativity, while those who have the need for creativity don't have the freedom. Since I completed this tape three years ago I've learned that the first steam engine was invented by a man named Hero around the year 100 AD. Hero was a mathematician in Alexandria who was very inventive. In his book he described the steam engine he had built well enough for a modern model to be constructed that could attain speeds up to 1500 RPM. Of course that model didn't have much power left over for work, but it was a good start.

According to a book entitled, *The History of Invention* by Trevor Williams, people have asked why our ancestors failed to go from there to develop engines like those of the 17th and 18th centuries. In reply, Mr. Williams commented that the abundance of cheap labor, including much slave labor, was certainly a disincentive to the development of power driven machinery. There is much that could be said related to this issue, however, for the purpose of updating this tape it'll be sufficient to ask you a simple question: If slavery didn't exist in the first century, where would man king be today?

The ideas in this tape are very basic, but someone once observed, "The difficult we figure out eventually, the obvious takes much longer." Consequently experts in learning psychology suggest that we must review new material at least six times, before its meaning becomes real enough for us to apply those ideas to our everyday lives. In closing this tape I want to thank you for taking the time to consider these ideas. Until next time, may you have a prosperous and satisfying life.