

Emergence Home	Therapy - Healing	Learning - Teaching	Healthy Relationships	Weight Loss - Fitness	Addictions - Recovery	Love - Forgiveness	Human Nature
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------

Emergence Questions of the Week

02/ 13/ 06

These Questions, On "Motive,"

Were Asked After Reading the Article:

"The Conscious, Subconscious, and Unconscious, a New Look at an Old Metaphor."



- Is why logic used only to avoid suffering ?
- Is there a conscious way to extend a child's birth-to-age-two period?
 - What are the twelve BLock Markers?

Do you know?

This Week's Ten Questions

[These questions were posed by David A.]

[Question 1] In order for a person to be using why logic, must he be trying to avoid suffering?

[Answer] Consciously? No. In fact, the idea that someone is consciously trying to avoid suffering is an oxymoron. Suffering denotes unconsciousness. What I can say about what you have just asked me though is that your statement is perhaps one of the more common rationalizations people make for using why logic.

So what underlies these rationalizations? In order to answer, I need to discuss the nature of motives and of suffering itself. I'll begin with this. Emergence Personality Theory sees only one true motive; the desire to resolve the painful aloneness we felt in the moment of birth. This motive, and the suffering which underlies it, is considered to be the source of our primary drive in life. As such, it is also considered our only "pure" motive. More over, we experience this pure motive every time we feel a connection end.

Here, then, is the experience of going from the connected feeling of Layers 10 and 9 to the terrible aloneness of Layer 8. This experience is our primary suffering, and resolving this suffering is our primary motive.

Then there are our secondary motives. These two motives first appear in Layer 7, the layer of "need." Before this, we have no needs. We are either connected or alone. So what do we "need" here?

Unconsciously, we still need to resolve the pain of our aloneness. However, the pain of this aloneness is so great, we humans rarely experience it consciously. So how do we stand it this pain? We use our two

"secondary" motives; our character type, and our social priorities. These two motives then are the two basic ways in which we, from the moment of birth onward, experience our "need" to resolve our aloneness.

Up to this point, we have pretty clear motives. We have gone from Layers 10 and 9 to Layer 8, then into Layer 7, and these experiences contain both the root of all suffering and our primary and secondary motives, both of which exist as the ways in which we try to deal with this suffering.

What happens next though is the problem with regard to seeing motives clearly. You see, beyond these initial four layers, peoples' motives get so convoluted as to make it literally impossible to empirically sort through them. Why? Because in the next layer; Layer 6; we experience visual inabilities to fully experience the information in our lives. literally, some of the information we experience gets BLocked.

Then, in the next layer, in Layer 5, it gets even harder for us to determine our true motives as, in this layer, we begin to see visible evidence for why we what we do. What evidence? Our symptoms. So what do we believe is our purest motive? The desire "to be free of symptoms."

This then is why we say Layers 10 - 7 are the inner, personal layers, and why we say Layers 6 & 5 are the middle, medical layers. Thus, to say a person is trying to avoid suffering is, in its most basic form, to believe that our symptoms are the source of our suffering. They are not. Our suffering comes from our inability to resolve our experiences of aloneness. That we believe otherwise comes from what I've just said then; that the first visible evidence we have of our suffering is our symptoms. This is why we blame our suffering on them. And why we, by nature, continue to develop more and more "civilized" ways to deal with these symptoms. All the way up to "why logic."

As an aside, in the field of personality theory, Henry Murray is considered by many to have come up with the best taxonomy of human motives. His list include things like "achievement," "autonomy," "sex," and "nurturance."

So are these things really motives? Not really. Why not? They do not pass the Emergence truth test. They do not "infinitely vary yet never change." Moreover, were you to look at what is beneath these attempts to classify human motive, you would find they all lead back to our stated primary and secondary motives anyway. They all lead back to [1] resolving ones aloneness, [2] satisfying ones Character Type and [3] fulfilling ones Social Priorities.

Finally, to answer your question more directly, no, suffering is not the only reason to use why logic. And if you read last weeks questions, you'll find I've discussed how therapists use why logic to slow down the therapeutic process.

[Question 2] If it is in our nature to want to know how or why something happens, is this why logic or natural why?

[Answer] Both. And perhaps what makes this idea so confusing for most people is that both kinds of "why" questions can be asked using the same word; "why." For instance, when your two year old asks you "why," she is asking a natural why question, a "why is the sky blue?" question. However, were you to now ask me why your wife gets mad at you, you would in all likelihood be asking me a why logic question as in, "What is motivating her to do this?" Or it might be more honestly stated as, "What is

wrong with her that she does this?"

Fortunately, discerning the difference between these two "whys" is easy. Why logic questions always include the experience of after-seven time, meaning, the idea of cause and effect. Natural why questions never include after-seven time. Thus the answers to natural why questions can always consciously and effortlessly get followed by the statement, "This is just the way it is."

Can you imagine yourself saying, after a particularly meaty fight with your wife, that what she did is just the way she is AND feeling absolutely OK with that she is this way? Of course not. Can you now begin to see the spiritual depth which exists within natural why questions, in that they always have much in common with our deepest spiritual expressions of blamelessness? And with how children experience the world. Therein lies their innocence.

[Question 3] What are the twelve markers for a BLock? Can there be more that we still don't know?

[Answer] Here's the list.

[1] **Vivid Recall of a Painful Event:** The First Category of BLock Markers

[2] **An Inability to Picture a Common Everyday Childhood Event:** The Second Category of BLock Markers

[3] **Hating an Ordinary Life Event:** The Third Category of BLock Markers

[4] **Under-reacting to a Loving Event:** The Fourth Category of BLock Markers

[5] **Under-reacting to a Violent Event:** The Fifth Category of BLock Markers

[6] **Having No Choice:** The Sixth Category of BLock Markers

[7] **Feeling Urgency During Ordinary Life Events:** The 7th Category of BLock Markers

[8] **Feeling Abandoned During Ordinary Life Events:** The 8th Category of BLock Markers

[9] **Feeling Trapped During Nonviolent Life Events:** The 9th Category of BLock Markers

[10] **Repeatedly Making the Same Painful Error:** The 10th Category of BLock Markers

[11] **Feeling Markedly Older or Younger During Ordinary Life Events:** The 11th Category of BLock Markers

[12] **Feeling Compelled to Do Ordinary Acts:** The 12th Category of BLock Markers

As for there being other BLock markers, yes, in theory, there are an infinite number of ways to typographically categorize our BLocks, all of them more accurate than any currently existing typology of wounds such as the DSM-IV. In what I've written about BLock Markers though, I simply state that I stopped at twelve as this seemed like more than enough ways to get inside a BLock. Especially if you use more than one of these BLock Markers at a time.

[Question 4] Can we feel psychological anesthesia without the presence of why logic? If so please give an example.

[Answer] No. Why logic always results in some degree of "psychological anesthesia." Which is to say, it always results in some degree of personal detachment, both from self and from others.

[Question 5] At its core, is the presence of why logic what makes you say that we can never recall the real or actual facts or words of an argument or fight?

[Answer] Yes. In fact, whenever you see why logic, you can assume the person who is using it is experiencing some degree of blocked visual ability. This, after all, is why "why logic" exists. It exists in us because we are compelled by nature to fill in the voids in our ability to picture things. In other words,

we all, by nature, will feel compelled to fill in the missing visual information in our life experiences; for instance, to know the real facts or words of an argument or a fight. Given we are not in Layer 1 that is, where we cease to care about ourselves personally.

Is why logic ever accurate though? In a literally, logical sense, yes, at times, it is partially accurate. Often times, it is even very beautifully logical, in a cold and literal way that is. However, it is also always the rationale for civilized blame and as such, assumes human beings are at times "bad," at least in the moral, psychological, or philosophical sense. People are not bad. Things they do are at times bad, and hurt people hurt people. Hurt people are not bad people. Broken? Yes. However, seeing this idea as true can be very, very difficult. In fact, seeing this truth happens to be one of the main gifts our theory of personally offers; a way to develop the ability to see past blame, so that we can see the true nature of our suffering and nothing more.

Know, I, like all human beings, cannot always see things this way, even knowing what I know. Knowledge does not make one more than human. At its best, it only makes one a more conscious human, and a more conscious human is still human, none the less.

[Question 6] If so, can we never trust our memory of an argument because there was the likelihood of why logic at play?

[Answer] Here, the answer is simple. Does what you remember blame someone, either you or the other person or both? Then what you remember has missing pieces and is thus flawed logic; logic based on less than all the parts. Hence, what you conclude from this logic will be flawed as well.

On the other hand, to entirely doubt oneself would be to experience a terrible paralysis. We do, after all, still have to live our lives in world largely dominated by why logic.

I would say then that the thing to remember here would be that Emergence Personality Theory offers ideals to which we can aspire rather than laws or rules or ways to judge our goodness or badness. Remembering to allow for the possibility that we may be using why logic is probably the best most of us can do most times, given that suffering hurts us so badly at times that it "compels" us to look for where this suffering is coming from.

Said in other words, why logic often does include some actual facts. However, it is also always missing at least one or more critical pieces of information. These critical pieces of missing information are what make our why logic conclusions so flawed. Thus, while why logic can contain truth, it is always a poor "second choice" to the literal, visual truth.

In other words, I think it is better to blame than to not exist, but much better to exist blamelessly even if only for moments, as this blamelessness is what all love is based on. Not on detachment. Or on cold facts. But rather, on consciously warm blamelessness.

[Question 7] Is there a conscious way to extend a child's birth-to-age-two period, the time wherein they experience only Layers 7-10?

[Answer] In theory, yes. And to some degree this idea describes what happened to me, albeit by an accident of birth. I have somehow remained mainly in Layers 10 - 7 for most of my life.

Is this a good thing? In and of itself no. In fact, it has been (and often still is) extremely painful at times.

It has also been one heck of a wild ride, though, and one I would not in hindsight change.

[Question 8] If this were to happen, what would be the child's long term developmental benefit?

[Answer] The perpetual gift of wanting to know the natural why about everything in the world. The state in which I believe people like Newton and Da Vinci lived for their whole lives. Imagine being them?

[Question 9] What would be the risks of doing this?

[Answer] Being significantly different from other human beings always hurts terribly. And being unable to understand why other people do not want to know the natural why about everything creates a painful barrier between the 10 - 7 type person and the rest of the world. Unless, of course, the world see the benefit in what the 10 - 7 type person creates with their gifts. In which case, the world at times then wants to analyze the brain of the person as soon as they die, perhaps believing there is some actual physiological source to their gift.

Sadly, there is a rumor that this happened to Einstein's brain. And if it is even remotely true, this is sad beyond belief. To relegate his genius to some mere physiological properties is to dehumanize a truly wonderful man. And his wonderful gifts.

[Question 10] If I write a book on raising children would you be willing to assist or guide me?

[Answer] Does a bear go in the woods? Let's go, fellah.

P. S. As usual, your questions are really well phrased and once again, reading them has made me smile. Thanks so much for your efforts Dave.

P. P. S. Perhaps you AND your wife could write this book? A dialogue about raising children from both the man's and the woman's perspectives?" Or all three of us? From the man's, woman's, and shaman's perspectives?

P. P. P. S. Perhaps we could dialogue this book into being in this same way we do the homework, by posing questions and offering answers, but in this case, limiting the questions we ask to those about raising children. What a heck of a gift to the world this would be!!!! Wow! This totally fits my idea of what our group exists for. Wow again!



This page last updated on
February 13, 2006

Emergence Questions of the Week: On Motive

© 2006, Steven Paglierani. All rights reserved