

**9.1. Elements of rhetoric.**  
**Higher institute of pedagogy**  
**VII- Olympiadelaan, 25, Antwerp**  
**1992-1993: First year.**

**Contents: see p. 62**

**Sample 1: Rhetoric.**

‘Culture’ includes - if we limit ourselves to what *J. van Doorn/C. Lammers, Modern sociology (A systematic introduction)*, Utr./Antw., 1976; 2, 105/140 (Cultural elements), says of it - among other things, values (o.c., 118). These values play a life role as purposes: one wants to realize them. They also exhibit the role of *norms* (c.f., 112): we judge - ‘evaluate’ - ourselves and others e.g. on the basis of those values and we see in them a rule of conduct. At the same time those values are ideals: they establish expectations (o.c., 115).

**Conclusion** -- This then is an axiological definition of “culture” (“axia: in ancient Greek, is “value”).

**Rhetoric**

‘Rhetoric’ is, in the narrower sense, linguistic theory. Someone who “is well versed in languages, however, establishes (or tries to establish) rapport (which is the signifying aspect of rhetoric): he wants to convince his interlocutor(s) or his audience of what he himself thinks or wants to say (as a ‘message’).-- In this, values play a major role. So that linguistic competence and rapport-building always have a cultural slant.

We will now examine this aspect. We will base ourselves mainly on a booklet entitled “*Sensitivity training*” (Leven en Actie, Ghent, s.d.). It was received with very mixed feelings because it takes a traditional Catholic point of view, but this does not prevent the pure information it contains from being valid.

**Two basic humanities.**

“Sensitivity training” is “exercise in sensing value situations.” -- Such a thing has, of course, presuppositions (Platonic: “hypotheses”).

The first is group dynamics. People are practicing (new) values without seeming to have any preconceived notions (‘seeming: because no one can ever want something without wanting one or more values). The whole ‘dynamic’ (thinking and especially sensing movement) comes from the group of people who are searchingly together.

The second premise is called institution analysis. In searching for some sense of value, one questions the solidity of established society (especially in its political and other institutions) as radically as possible. Which is also called “social critique.”-- Behold the twin main hypotheses of values practice.

**Sample 2: Marxist-Leninist brainwashing . (02/06)**

When we broach this subject, it is not to “criticize” - the umpteenth criticism - a system of living together that - especially since Gorbachev’s reforms from +/- 1985 - increasingly exposes its shadow sides. But to examine the structure of the influence of the sense of value. In other words, to dissect its rhetoric.

**Base lineup.**

Lenin - Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, - nicknamed ‘Lenin’ (1870/1924), founder of Marxism-Leninism and leader of the Russian October Revolution (1917) - once defined Marxism, which he greatly modified, as the synthesis of three Western - ‘oksidentalist’ - rationalisms viz. the English economy, the French socialist revolution, -- both systematically thought in the German dialectic (understand: philosophy of historical movements).-- We presume a minimal knowledge of Marxis-me.

**Lev Trotsky (1879/1940).**

Trotsky, first a supporter of *Lenin* became Stalin’s opponent in 1924; he was assassinated in Mexico.-- In his *Littérature et révolution*, Paris, 1964, he touches on the problem of “systemic change” (understand: the change of mentality).-- *C. Callens, Le rôle de l’information et de l’art dans la société*, (The role of information and art in society), says on this subject as follows.

Trotsky states a fact: the Russian people remain attached to the Orthodox Church. “Notwithstanding the fact that the faith is almost non-existent” he says.-- Here Callens refers to *Emile Male, L’art religieux du XIIIe siècle en France* (Religious art of the thirteenth century in France ), (1899).

Says Male: “By no means does one seek out the church for reasons of piety! No: a church is something bright and beautiful; there are many people present; the songs are worth hearing. The church offers attractive things that one does not find in the workplace, in the family, or on the street. Through its staging, the church acts on the senses - the eyes, the ears, the sense of smell (think of the incense) - and on the imagination.”

**Note.**-- Unconsciously, Male draws with this, a church gathering as a “group”: leader(s) - the priest(s) -, attendees, values practiced in a prefabricated framework (the church building), spectacle that appeals.

Trotsky : It is not enough to stick to criticism of religion alone: what the church offers must be replaced “by new forms of life, new forms of leisure, new performances that raise the level of culture. -- Something that recurs as a motto in all revolutionaries.

Trotsky sees as a substitute par excellence the film which, on the silver screen, presents far more gripping scenes than the church can make you experience.

**Conclusion** .-- One keeps this well in mind in what follows.

***The Marxist-Leninist System Change.***

-- 'System' means, dialectically, the totality. Here, first of all, we are talking about the totality of culture. And this is as ideology. 'Ideology' in the Marxist sense, is 'upper structure' concerning conceptions. The substructure -- infrastructure, substructure -- is the economy,-- economics which, by Marx and his contemporaries, is indicated as very decisive for the mentality of man. An industrial worker has a different role in the production process than his patron. Consequence: his ideas are a reflection of his economic position.

***Bibl. sample :***

-- W. Fairburn, *The Utopia in Chains* (1931 );

-- H. and B. Overstreet, *The Iron Curtain*.

Both works talk, among other things, about the mindset change method within collectivism. The Overstreet's: "The individual has no real life outside the collectives in which he belongs. Wherever the individual may reside, the collective may -- at any moment, without warning -- endanger his future." -- This is now explained.

**1.1. *Group critique.***

Culpabilization.-- The future is compromised, among other things, by "a friend" who is also part of the group. Specifically: that "friend" accuses him, in the "group" of deviating from the pattern of behavior approved by the group -- always that "group".

**1.2. *Isolation (sunk).***

From that moment on, the individual in question - in the group - is an isolated person. From now on he cannot expect his 'friends' to join and support him. "With this, one of the strangest ('bizarre' ) potentially perverse and destructive rituals ever devised has been cobbled together" (Overstreet).

**2.1. *Self-criticism.***

Once accused, a person should not 'defend' himself. His only way out is 'self-criticism': he must accept before all else the correctness of the group criticism.

***Digression.***

One compares the “group criticism/ autocriticism” structure (about which more later) with what *the Bible, Matt. 18:15/18*, exposes as an analogous structure. -- “If your brother comes to sin, seek him out and remind him of his duty in private. If he listens to you, you have won your brother. If he does not listen, take one or two other brothers according to the rule, “The judgment in any matter shall rest on the testimony of two or three witnesses” (*Deuteronomy 19:15*). If he does not listen to them either, turn the matter over to the “community” (“church”). If he does not even listen to the community (church), then he is like the heathen or the tax collector to you.”

***Note.***-- As *La Bible de Jérusalem*, Paris, 197B, 1440, says:

- a.** this is a serious deviation, which has public bearing;
- b.** the “ecclesia”, the community or “church” is the gathering of “the brethren” (understand: believers);
- c.** the pious Jews saw in the gentiles and, among others, in, the tax-collectors (tax-collectors in the service of foreign rulers) “unclean” ( i.e. beings to be shunned),--which indicates that Jesus is simply adapting to the language of the middle.

***Explanation.***

Note: there is analogy, i.e. partial identity, between the Biblical and the Marxist-Leninist models. In all similarity, there is a very thorough difference (here the Biblical salvation message, there the Leninist-Marxist salvation message). But it remains that the structure (deviation, rebuke, choice resulting in reinstatement or expulsion) is abstractly the same. The reason is obvious: any group objective is compromised as soon as at least one member of the group “deviates” from the objective in question;--which forces “the group” to judge.

Consider a class in which a few students are clearly compromising the formative goals of the class (as well as the teacher) by their behavior. And the teacher and the students are forced to take a stand one way or another,--especially in a Marxist-Leninist or other “authoritarian” school system. - If the stated goal (ideal) has any value and must count as a standard, there is no other way. ‘Culture’ requires such a stance. And from the responsible group as a group. Otherwise the group loses its way.

### ***Philosophical analysis.***

Philosophy, traditionally understood, is first and foremost ontology (theory of reality).-- Regarding the values that a group presupposes as standards of behavior and designates as goals, the question arises, “How real are those values? How are those values real?”. In other words, are they not sham values?

That puts first, “What is really real?” (Think of Platon’s “ontos on”, the really real, on which his ‘theoria’, i.e. his philosophical analysis, focused). In other words, “What is only sham?”. This is traditionally summarized by saying that Platon put both being (all that is really real) and good (all that is really valuable) first in his philosophical work.

**Note.** - The crisis of the Soviet system, for example, from 1985 to the end of 1991, has shown that at least part of the values put forward by Marxism-Leninism were only false values: in spite of all possible efforts, “the system” did not succeed in getting the desired goods and services onto the economic market (in contrast to the much despised “capitalist” systems).

In other words: in the purely economic field, the Soviet system proved its weakness. Which indicates a flaw in the premises and in the objectives that stem from them.

**Conclusion:** the system proved to be “unreal. -- At least in purely economic areas. Not to mention other areas. After seventy years of ‘experimenting’ with a socialist formula, the population was not yet convinced by the results of Soviet culture.

### ***2.2. Collectivist socialism.***

In all communist countries, anywhere in the world, the control rituals outlined briefly above play a role. By which every member of a collective, large or small, from the state store to the party, knows that it can be questioned. Because everyone is closely monitored, an authoritarian system is, after all, founded.

In Western eyes this comes across as the creation of a ‘collective man’. After all, by that method the deviant(s) - called ‘reactionary’, ‘individualist’ or ‘dissident’ - is discovered and isolated and there is bitterly little room for an individual human being: “the rights of the human being” (understand: individual) are minimal.

### ***A testimonial.***

Mao Zedong (formerly “Mao Tse Toeng”; 1893/1976; poet - writer, head of the People’s Republic of China 1954/1959, 1968/1976), known for his: “*Red Book*”, writes: “We possess the formidable Marxist-Leninist weapon of criticism and self-criticism.

### ***A party line***

“A conscientiously implemented praxis of self-criticism is a hallmark that distinguishes our party from all others.”

### ***The People’s Democratic Lifestyle.***

“Especially because self-criticism keeps our labor regular and well organized and controlled. Because self-criticism, moreover, initiates a process of perfection that develops a ‘democratic’ style.”- So far verbatim “the great agitator” (nickname of Mao Zedong).

### ***The systematic humiliation of the single person.***

In Catholic church meetings, Mass begins with a confession of sin (sometimes the preacher, in the “good old days,” thundered about the sinfulness of those present and absent). In Puritan (Calvinist) circles, the deep sinfulness so emphasized by the strongly Biblical Luther is the focus.

Yet they did never go as far as the collectivist self-abasement’ After all, the “golden rule” in collectivist systems is that the deviant(s) may only rejoin “the group” if: he/she has humiliated himself/herself thoroughly enough.

Some teachers apply something analogous: a “deviant” pupil is ridiculed, e.g., with sarcasm, by the teacher himself. If the humiliated pupil then shrinks enough and does not give a hoot anymore, only then is he accepted in “the group” again.

### ***Brainwashing (“brainwashing”).***

According to *Dr. L. Freedom, Brainwashing*, “confession” (confession, confession) is a psychological-human “purification! According to him, this would explain the emphasis placed by Communists on what they call “self and mutual criticism,” where the framework is invariably the group.

Freedom speaks here of the (Freudian) structure “resistance/transfer (transfer)/countertransfer,” where the familiar clinical practice of “free association” captures the very essence of the process.-- “Resistance” weakens as the single person is “dismantled” (using a current Derridian term “deconstructed”) insofar as he/she wishes to defend himself/herself.

**Sample 3: communist rewashing among prisoners of war. (07/08)**

We do rhetoric: the question arises as to how Communists “over-witness” prisoners of war thanks to their own language skills of the wrongness of capitalism, i.e. of its false value.

**Bibl. sample :** *Eugene Kinkead, In Every War But One.*-- During the War in Korea (1950/1953), the Communist form of “sensitivity training” (values rehearsal) called brainwashing was applied by the Chinese authorities to American prisoners of war. Not traditional -- police or military -- torture techniques, but group and self-criticism became the method of persuasion to a different model of culture.

**1. -- Black sheep.**

Immediately after capture, Americans were divided into critique groups. Anyone who emerged as a “reactionary” (“individualist”, “dissident”) was met with harsh treatment. They became “the black sheep.”

**2.-- Participation.**

Participation’ was the stake. No group was allowed to eat until all members had participated in confessing ‘something’ (a guilt factor). Or .... comments (‘aanmerking’ is a critical remark) about another member.

Consequence: so as to be able to eat, eventually the group itself exerted pressure on the deviants, who became “black sheep” as soon as they continued to refuse.

**3.-- Confession.**

A prisoner of war could “prove” that he “accepted” communism (and thus was ready for “understanding”) by self-critical confession.-- It was allowed -- oh mercy -- even a triviality. As long as he confessed guilt.

**Appl. model.--** For example, someone said -- in a state of having lost all personal-individual thinking -- that he had “failed to brush his teeth.” On the stroke, “the group” was satisfied in the person of “the leader,” who noted that by confessing “to ‘the system’” he had contributed. By confessing that his teeth had not been brushed, he had “submitted” to the group, respectively the leader.

**Note.--** This is reminiscent of the way e.g. the judicial police subject someone to interrogation until he/she “confesses” anyway. Even then, those police are “satisfied.”

#### **4.-- Mutual distrust.**

Effective, at least, was the method! No prisoner could ever escape.

**Appl. model.--** Only if there is group work can e.g. a tunnel be dug.-- Because the prisoners were literally trained -- “educated” -- in criticism of fellow prisoners, one cultivated informants in Korea. These became, within the group, a subgroup,-- e.g. three or four. They betrayed everything. They were called ‘canaries’: the leader of the group liked to hear them ‘singing’ (passing on information)! Every escape attempt leaked out.

Re-education - once from captivity - showed how strongly - efficiently - mutual distrust had developed and how “friends” were transformed into “enemies.

In such a systemic change, the sacred character that e.g. the Ancient Pythagoreans and Platonists ascribed to friendship loses all reality.

**Note.--** Again: this is reminiscent of the way in which e.g. judicial police try to persuade ‘friends’ (acquaintances) of interrogated persons - rather: “subjected to interrogation” - to ... ‘inform’ - understand: betray - them.

Once they fall into the trap, they too become “canaries” whose songs the interrogators love to hear! Police persuasion uses all means: hours of suggestive interrogation that exhausts so much that the proper thinking of the weary sinks in and the “surrender” comes through, threats, promises.

There, too, the sanctity - versta: inviolability (in the sense of “what may not be violated”) - loses all reality. He who does not want to betray his friend becomes an “unreal” - understand: not adapted to the harsh situation - someone.

#### **“Nemo malus nisi probetur”.**

An ancient Latin maxim favors positive (understand: meliorative) thinking by asserting “No one is bad unless proven so.” -- The method of persuasion of Marxist-Leninist sensitivity trainers (not to mention those of the police and other interrogators) reverses the ancient maxim: “Everyone is bad unless he proves that he is good”.

Thanks to an appropriate “sociometry” (J.L. Moreno (1889/1974), one thus arrives at scapegoating: whoever does not betray, -- whoever does not fold, becomes a scapegoat,-- as René Girard (*La violence et le sacré*) (Violence and the Sacred), (1972), explained.



**Sample 4: Western “groups”.** (09 /14).

By ‘Western’ we mean the liberal model of society.-- As our comparisons with either educational forms or police systems at home, in the West, have already made clear, values practice and the rhetoric active therein also exists in the West.-- With the big difference that a very large variety of ‘groups’ can be found.

We pick out a few types. So pay attention: don’t generalize now for all other ‘groups!’

**Two prepositions.**

(1) A first hypothesis is the small scale group.-- The industrial and information revolutions have favored the development of large scale in our current society.

a. Since the Renaissance (1450+), the Modern State - situated in the international community of states - increasingly becomes the large-scale ‘group’ par excellence. Education, military, relief (retirement e.g.) come into the hands of the state and its ‘bureaucrats’ (state officials). Groups like syndicates are large-scale.

b. The enormous changes in the system that is our society force the individual, confronted with such large-scale systems (groups), into a type of helplessness and powerlessness. “Falling back on the bonds of destiny inherent in the small-scale group - family and relatives, circle of friends, neighborhood - has in fact proved to be a last social anchor in times of need, yet is all too opposed to the large-scale organizations (...)”. (*Helmut Schelsky, Von der Klassen- zur Konsum-gesellschaft (Sozialverfassung im moralischen Vakuum)*, (From Class to Consumer Society (Social Constitution in a Moral Vacuum), in: *Wort und Wahrheit* xvii (1962): 2, 17/26).

**In conclusion**, the small group seems to be a refuge to a large extent, especially in emergency situations.

**Note** -- The sects, for example, the sacred type of small-scale group, have understood this very well: not the large-scale churches, which are too far removed from the daily problems and emergencies, but the nuclei of the sects which try to have a revitalizing effect, form sanctuaries. Like mushrooms they have risen from the ground in all parts of the world.

(2) A second hypothesis is anti-tabooism.-- “Anarchism differs from nihilism. But the borderline between the two is crossed as soon as, for example, not only the authority of state organs but the authority of legislation itself is seized upon.

That very thing the taboo-deconstructionists (“Tabu-Stürzer”) introduce. - Meanwhile, their business has already degenerated into a familiar habit. They have succeeded in filling the term “taboo” not only with the connotation of everything that is primitive, darkly atavistic, backward, narrow-minded, unworldly, but also with that of everything that is merciless, tyrannical, void of content, inhuman.

Because they disgrace all possible rules of conduct which they want to see abolished, as such ‘taboos’, these norms acquire the ulterior meanings mentioned. At the same time they do not only break down the respect that many still have for the rules of conduct, but also and especially the prestige, the inspiring power of the norms.

And, by the way: what are the standards that the anti-tabooists do not want to see abolished? We have in mind, for example, written laws, (...) the state, the customs of society, the maxims of morality, in particular sexual morality. (*Anton Böhm, Die blecherne Pythia (Gefahren zur Zukunft der Demokratie)*, (The Tinny Pythia (Dangers to the Future of Democracy)), in: *Wort und Wahrheit* xx (1965): 10 (Oct.), 577/597).

The author talks about what awaits the democracies, especially the Western model, if, among other things, anti-tabooism gains further ground: no value judgments will be accepted anymore,--whether it is about truth or untruth, good or evil, beautiful or ugly. For such a thing would appear to the taboo-abuser as something “imposed from without”.

In other words: all value however it may be has its origin in the utterly disempowered, “emancipated” individual and his fellow thinkers.

**Conclusion** .-- Now think of the two hypotheses -- the small group and anti-tabooism, and we have the dual premise that governs the kind of “groups” we are now studying in more detail.

***One type of group dynamics.***

‘Group dynamics’ is a neutral and general term - from sociometry - that designates all possible mutual and reciprocal (understand: reflexive) interactions within a group.

This is where the “here-and-now group” is now characterized. “The group is invited to a ‘free’, ‘informal continuing’ discussion,--with no predetermined theme.

Addressing each other is not done with the stiff ‘you’, but with the common ‘you/you’ and with the first name. - Any difference regarding the social ladder is ignored.

To a minimum, all polite formulas are reduced.-- the order is: “to let oneself go”, “to be oneself” as uninhibitedly as possible”. (*P. Arbousse, Bulletin de psychologie* (1959)).-- To the exclusion of all that is “here-and-now” outside the group of the self-experienced,--in the first place the established values and institutions of all kinds.

The only purpose (and at once value) of the meeting -- the gathering -- is “living through an experience” here and now. All that existed before, all that will come after,-- all that is outside the group, is eliminated, “put in parentheses.”

**Note**--When we reread *KF--RH 02* (Trotzky), we find one big difference: Both the churches and Marxism-Leninism group people, but not “informally” but deliberately and purposefully (the churches take biblical values as their starting point: communism takes Marxist-Leninist values). This is because since the fifties (with the American Beatnik’s) both Anarchism and even Nihilism function more and more as “value system” and “cultural ideal”.

The Anarchist puts either the individual (individual Anarchism) or the small group (socialist Anarchism) first as the pre-eminent value. The Nihilist seeks to put first as the only value the disregard of any generally valid value.

Both movements amount to cultivating the “here-and-now” - understand: the denial of all that transcends the “here-and-now,” i.e., the general and the overall (collectivization and system).

**Note.**- So much for group dynamics (*KF--RH 01*).-- In its wake is the settings analysis (*KF--RH 01*), which is twofold:

- a. the “institutional” analysis captures the winding down of established institutions (in the broad sense) through detail analysis,
- b. while the analysis of institutions takes a second form when it prepares - but outside and after the here-and-now group - political militancy and wants to change the whole system at once.

**Note.**-- *Derek Shearer/Ruth Yannata Goldway, De la génération du Moi à la Nouvelle Gauche*, (From the Ego generation to the New Left), in: *Autrement* (Paris), *Série Monde*, 31 (avril 1981, Calif., 223/ 224 (*Les activistes des années 1960 ont survécu*), (The activists of the 1960s survived), says that, e.g., in the USA, the New Leftists have come to constitute the extreme left, “gauchist” wing of the Democratic party, -- far from being attenuated, as their opponents or misinformers sometimes claim.

A bit further, Ruth V. Goldway, who was involved in Santa Monica politics, says that the label “socialist” for this institutional analysis - at least in the USA - is not a favorable one: the word is associated with Marxism-Leninism! “We are ‘democrats’ with a small ‘d’! The term ‘economic democracy’ is much more realistic and effective, (...). To ‘politicize’ the people around simple problems and appealing themata - think of house rent - succeeds.” (A.c.,228).-- Incidentally *Derek Shearer* wrote a book, *Economic Democracy (The Challenge of the Eighties)*.

**Note.--** The decisiveness with which a number of “Economic-Democrats” pushed through their cultural ideal provoked a backlash in the Right-wing camp, namely some type of Extreme Right.

***A few trailblazers.***

We name two among many.

**1.-- *John Dewey* (1859/1952).**

Known, philosophically at least, as an Instrumentalist Pragmatist: things like information or behavioral types are, in his view, “instruments” - not norms - with which one deals with experience. Either they serve to adapt to that experience or to modify it.

Well known is his *Human Nature and Conduct (An Introduction to Social Psychology)*, New York, 1922. This work gave rise to social engineering,--meaning: social manipulation or control of social processes, a curious form of rhetoric.

**a. *Non-directivity.***

Without established customs, without acquired knowledge, without authority build “here-and-now experiences”! But with ‘democratisation’ as the ‘value’, i.e. the introduction of a society without established norms. In which something like a commune does come to mind. To speak with Nietzsche ‘misarchic’, i.e. with contempt for all that is established authority. In other words: with a dose of Anarchism!

**Note --** Educational view. -- The school is first of all the “instrument” of “democratisation” (abolition of all distinctions between classes and positions). She incarnates “social manipulation”. Only then is it ‘instrument’ of education (science-pen, literature, history, geography).

**b. *Dewey, left-facing,***

He took sides with Trotzky (*KF--RH 02*) at the time of his trial in Moscow. Also for B. Russell (1872/1970; in 1940 accused by “distressed parents” of undermining morality), when he lost his chair. - Anarchism, not without a hint of Nihilism!

## **2.-- Kurt Lewin (1890/1947).**

A Polish-German Jew. Emigrated to the USA in 1932. "Human relations" ("human relations") is central. His *A Dynamic Theory of Personality* (1935) is well known. He means experimental situations in which theoretical hypotheses: concerning "social" unrest in the world can be tested.

1945/1947: Foundation of the Research Center for Group Dynamics (at M.I.T, Cambridge, Mass.). Within "the group" cognitive change is possible. After all, our perceptions are based on "established norms", which - according to Lewin - are only simple "conventions" (agreed upon opinions). This gave rise, in the USA, to the Human-Change movement,--started in 1956. We refer to the National Training Laboratories.

**Note.--** A sampling.-- Western Behavioral Sciences Institute (in La Jolla, Calif.) worked with psychologists who modified established opinions, using groups. Especially young people, this institute wants to teach a new value system,-- yes, impose it.

Parents, for example, are usually very annoying in this regard: "Their value system censored around strong morals risks becoming a bigger problem than racial differences." -- One sees it: a new type of rhetoric.

**Deck Names.** -- Names can be cover names at the same time. For example, Sensitivity Training, 14ff., lists what follows: group dynamics, group discussion, integration training, "human relations" interpersonal expertise, interpersonal relations, meeting group;-- meeting without class distinctions, democratic thinking, -- auto- or self-criticism, group confession (concerning the last two see *KF--RH 06*, where Maoism is discussed).-- Sometimes it is called "prayer therapy. -- Terms such as 'evaluation' or 'reflection' may be added here. .

**Note.--** It is clear -- to insiders -- that educational innovation recognizes here one of its main sources of inspiration. It was called, e.g., "democratization of education", "giving more attention to the pupil himself" (who in "the class group" is subjected to value practice or "sensitivity training",--often by leaders-teachers who did not understand the 'logic' (i.e., the premises) correctly because they were "still of the old guard"), "avoiding the spirit of competition" and so on. In which, as Dewey advocated, the learning subjects became second-rate.

**Note.-- The reaction of some adults.**

The adults, of course, react in very different ways. - A beaming action gives us *Helen Swick Perry, The Human Be - In*, New York / London, Basic Books” 1970.-The background is the protest marches against the Vietnam War (ending in 1975), the student revolts, the new, - Postmodern lifestyle and morals of the young in the wake of the Beatniks (1950+).

The groups with which writer became acquainted - from October 1966 to September 1967 she lived with the “flower children” (Hippies/Yuppies) in Haight-Ashbury, near San Francisco - , were “young seekers” (according to Allen Ginsberg), to whom Mrs. Perry apparently “converted. “I, too, was a hippie” she writes.

**A dismissive response**

We read that in the Twelve Rules to Make a Good Criminal, -- from the hand of the Seattle (Wash.) Police Department. We give the primary one from it.

1. Never say, “You can’t.” Your child could, after all, be left with a complex, namely, the feeling of guilt. It could, later, become convinced that the established community is “persecuting” it.

2. Give your child, already during his younger years, everything he desires. Result: it grows up thinking “The whole world is mine”.

3. When your child has coarse expressions in their mouth, laugh at them, because they will feel like “a smarty-pants.”

4. Pick up everything it leaves lying around. In this way you instill in it the certainty that only “the others” are always responsible for it.

5. Let it read everything. Let it feed its mind with “garbage” while you keep your stuff germ-free.

6. Don’t give it a “spiritual education” because it can choose for itself when it turns twenty-one anyway.

7. Argue in front of your child. At least then it won’t get a “shock” when the divorce is imminent.

8. Give it as much money as it desires,---money that above all it does not have to earn itself. It must not, after all, go through the same difficulties as yourself.

9. Fulfill all its needs (food and drink, comfort) in such a way that it certainly never gets “frustrated.”

10. Always take sides with your child: “Teachers, police,-after all, they have something against that ‘poor child’”

11. If it then becomes a bandit(s), say: “I never could do anything about it!

12. Prepare for a life of suffering and worry.

**Sample 5: Western “groups” (precisions). (15/17).**

What precedes is a general, rather theoretical outline. We now fill it with “details. -  
- preferably meaningful details.

**Conditioning.**

Conditioning’ means the fact that the leader/leader, in unity with the led group, creates the necessary (and preferably sufficient) conditions so that the persuasion (instilling new values, -- norms, ideals and expectations (*KF--RH 01*)) must succeed or at least be possible.

**1.-- Marathon Sessions.**

Tired people - we already saw this in the Communist system - react in a more ‘conditioned’ way than fresh-faced people. Or rather, they react in a more ‘sub-worried’ way (the men and women of the judicial police know this very well).-- Now, the sensitivity sessions can last, say, twenty-four or forty-eight hours so that ‘sensitizing’ (teaching new values) takes place without sleep, -- with minimal nutrition.

**2 -- Authoritarianism (“Lead(st)ership”).**

“The great agitator” (Mao) or “der Führer” (Hitler) or the ‘Conducator’ (Ceau sescu),--we know the authoritarianism of Maoism, Nazism or Romanian communism . A certain humanistic language preaches of “charismatic leaders”. In which it is forgotten, if not suppressed, that “charism” is, among other things, a New Testament term that designated the gifts of the Holy Spirit (Pentecost). These spiritual gifts were socially oriented gifts in such a way that the community - the ‘group’ of believers - benefited from them.

Well,

**a.** in the Communist POW camp, for example, the notion is suggested that any support can only be expected from the leader, not from fellow prisoners;

**b.** in our Western training groups, the leader/leader is suggested as the sole representative/representative of “the new society.”

**Emotionalism.**

The second “detail” of a supporting nature is the fact that not Modern “reason,” not even the Antique-Middle Ages “spirit,” but rather the “e-motio,” the (out-of-self) emotional life can and, if necessary, must be dominant.

**Appl. model.--** That can make sense.

1. The participant lays himself on the ground. The other participants put their foot on the head, arms, legs,-- chest,-- lower body. “This is meant symbolically to make one feel that “all power comes from the group”.

2. At that, the feet are removed, the participating is lifted up under wild cries, “I love you.”

The leading figures direct the discussion groups first of all towards the world of intimate feelings. They steer towards ‘experience’: ‘living through’ and in such a way that the private life, the deep intimacy, is exposed. So the so-called ‘emotions’ -- those of the personal-individual conscience included.

In a ‘Postmodern’ seminary for priestly training e.g. one can experience that you - in the group - confess that you come to self-masturbation, whereby the group does not rest until you have spoken your confession (not before God via the priest as mediator, but before the group). In this way man, at least in that type of sensitivity training (one does not generalize), is socialized, socialized.

### ***‘Anti-intellectualism’.***

Emotionalism always includes an element of elimination of reason or spirit. If reflection becomes a little too logically rigorous, some leading figures dare to speak of “an unforgivable folly”.

### ***‘Unmasking’.***

P. Ricoeur, the French Protestant thinker, famous for his study of sin stain, sin and guilt, spoke years ago of the three great unmaskers, namely the Materialist thinkers Marx, Nietzsche and Freud. Each of these thinkers unmasked the Primitive, Antique, Middle Ages and Modern hypocrisies, which needed to be unmasked.

To these three, the ordinary person or the educated was “suspect” at every stage of culture in that he was somewhere guilty of the diffuse, general, and collective evil in humanity.

Economic evil (Marx), cultural evil (Nietzsche), psychic evil (Freud). -- well, one would say that something of those debunking philosophies has been drawn into the groups. Or at least in the leading figures.

More clearly expressed by Binswanger (Heideggerianizing psychiatrist): the laymen do not take members as fellow human beings with dignity but they take them by their weaknesses. And they do so through the confession, which “demolishes the bourgeois sense of honor”,--without hesitation.



Once the Achilles' heel is exposed, the leader attacks - 'aggression' - by cynically blaming the weaknesses. This amounts to culpabilization, the creation of guilt.

**Elaborations.** -- Dropping down, crying like mad, running away to lock oneself in a hiding corner, well barricaded, - traumas (soul wounds) lasting weeks, slumps ("depressions") were noted.

**Note** -- G. Lucas, *Le cri primal*, (The primal scream), in: *Geneva Home Informations* 566 (12.09.1985, xvi), ridicules a dose of such utterances. "Since when have ye uttered a primal cry?" a friend asks me. "By that I mean to say: shouted it out! At home, in the car, in the middle of a forest. Screamed out because things are not going well and that is the only way not to go completely crazy".

To which the author: "Thou art no longer with us! It has long been that Janov's therapy is out of fashion. I've even seen a movie that depicted the method. To be honest: those screamers - one sees them wringing, weeping, shouting - arouse in me more pity than a desire to do the same."

To which the friend: "Thou dost not even ask me the question why I want to cry! My wife has left me!". To which the jeering Luke: "Rather start a new life!". -Far from us to adopt that jeering tone without question! But still: experience shows that many of these "expressions," "emotions," are more self-aggrandizement than real awareness of the situation.

#### **Afterwards.**

Several former leaders/leaders later say that they could not understand from themselves afterwards why/why they and many group members - could 'criticize' the feelings of a group member for hours on end. Why/why they hurt some so deeply and caused so much suffering and humiliation.

One 'explanation': 'peer pressure'. Group pressure is a means - they explained - of counteracting frustrations (disappointments) with a kind of vindictiveness - even sadism and/or masochism - as an outgrowth.

So much for a first set of comments. They prove that, when above we stigmatized 'names' as 'deck names', we have a real reason for that somewhere. The emotionalism mixed with a (left-wing) ideology sometimes disables the healthy logical approach too much.

**Sample 6: Western groups (precisions).** (18/21).

**The concept of “human regard”.**

The term “oversight” means, among other things, “to pay attention to something or someone. “Human regard” means “to pay heed to people.” In French, “respect humain.”

For example, “doing something out of human interest” means “doing something out of fear of the judgment of others”: “What will people say?” It often happens that one’s own individual judgment (of conscience, for example) is given way to that of one’s fellow men. It is a ‘lapsed’ form of ‘humanity’ (Heidegger’s infamous ‘Mitsein’).

**Analysis.--** The person in whom the human aspect strongly prevails is latently (unconsciously or subconsciously) already subject to the fellow men. In the groups this weakness is pre-eminently exploited and the leadership with its ideology turns this submissiveness from latent to patent (evidently).--

In this sense, such an experience in a group does have value in terms of self-knowledge: those who find afterwards that they have “succumbed” to the pressure of the group and have thus abandoned their own assumptions - even the sensible and very valid ones - know at once that they are not “strong personalities” but “value-absorbing beings.

**Note --** In his Biblical-Existentialist way, Soren Kierkegaard has seen this: he talks about “the individual”, who -- before God, i.e. confronted with God -- becomes himself, -- loosened as he/she is from every form, however insidious, of human regard.

**Note --** Agogists, in this context, also sometimes speak of “empowered,” i.e., disempowered, as a condition of well-being.

**A testimonial.** -- The booklet *Sensitivity Training*, 23, provides an applicative model.-- A woman was induced to experience sensitivity training once a week. Here is what she testifies about it.

“Our leader fascinated us with his, descriptions of the study of Pavlov theory. Applied by him in working groups. for human relations.

**Note.--** Ivan Pavlov (1849/1936) was a physician and physiologist. The salivary gland arousals; as a form of “conditioned reflexes” were analyzed by him. Nobel Prize in physiology and medicine 1904.

His thrust, to some extent, parallels Behaviorism (study of externally observable behavior).

**Notes.--** In the terms of the ABC theory of American psychiatrists Ellis and Sagarin, this reads as follows: A is what the group, directed by the leader(s), offers; B is the group member's value unsteadiness or also value unsteadiness; C is the group member's final response. Logical: if A and B, then C (which means that the ultimate reaction C only becomes understandable - explainable - if one puts both A and especially B first).

**Note.--** The woman says that the leader "fascinated" ("captivated" in the literal-psychoic and depth-psychoic sense) through Pavlov theory. Illiterate, non-erudite people (in one field or another) are easily captivated by "learned talk" (that is one of the weaknesses).

Even more, "Timeo hominem unius libri" seems to apply here. The massive self-confidence with which "sophists" of that type pound on incompetents is often due to the fact that they actually know only one theory and do not suspect swap solutions!

Pavlov knows! The limits of the Pavlovian theory (immediately correctives by other, competing theories) do not even get through to the sophist consciousness.

**Note.--** In the dialogue *Euthudèmos*, *Socrates* (Platon) addresses the notorious skill of the Sophists of his day. "The skill of a Sophist is the ability to refute both what is true, and what is false,-- together with the art of extracting it in any discussion. Socrates explicitly calls this 'eristics' (*Monique Canto, trad. / introd., Euthydème, Paris, Flammarion, 1989, 21*).

The term "epideixis", translatable by "self-confident linguistic competence", was applied by the contemporaries of the Sophists (-450/-350) to the speaking and acting of the Sophists. Hence the term "epideictic eloquence" (= 'demonstrative' fluency). - In which the Sophists, under at least one point of view, surpass the "homo unius libri" (man who knows (only) one book (well)) - "Timeo hominem unius libri" means: "I fear the man who knows only one book and swears by that book only". This Antique wisdom can sometimes act as a first saving grace in "groups.

**Note.--** 'Epideixis' can be described by the term "speaking with guts". Guts imprints people who are not experts on the subject.

**Note --** The forefront of trainers, apart from Pavlovism, are the “behavioral sciences”, which - according to Western Behavioral Sciences Institute - “bend over backwards to project hard-to-affect individuals”. Individual behavior, according to some, can no longer be “left to its own devices. ‘Planning’ is the task.

Sometimes the learning subject that the leads take is called “introductory psychology.” Psycho-logy for the purpose of “modification” (of human nature).

**The woman in question continued.--** “When the leader was ready to begin the session, he asked someone from the group to reflect his impressions and views about another member of the group. This meant that we had to speak about a totally foreign person about whom we knew nothing”.

**Note --** The term “light judgment”. -- In the dictionaries this term is lightly given the connotation of “obsolete. Yet the phenomenon in itself is extremely current. ‘Lighthearted’ means “that which is ‘skillful’ (expert) in a short time, without thorough thought or analysis.”

**Appl. model.--** An artist described his marriage -- note the intimate emotional life, object of confession -- which was neither extraordinarily successful nor unsuccessful. “He had highs and lows like most people.” -- After ten minutes, the group decided that the writer should separate. A swap solution was not even given a chance.

**Further report.--** “As time went on, we got to know each other better and engaged in active and intense exchanges of feelings among ourselves.”

**“A hot session.”** -- “The sensitivity training quickly evolved into a hot session.-- Constantly my person was criticized for continuing to defend certain moral values.

An exceptionally annoying, “negativistic” mood ensued such that we did not approach the mutual affection and especially not the love which we initially thought we would find.-- We did, however, comply with the request for “openness” and “honesty”. So as initially promised.-- For what purpose, however? Just to sob very emotionally, and make all kinds of bizarre movements?”.

***“The raw-emotional confession.***

The woman continues.-- “The system of rough-emotion confession causes one’s own problems to worsen. After all, one confesses things one was never guilty of! Just so that “the leader” would be satisfied.

If one confesses only things that are not very enlightening, one is accused of “deceiving oneself” or “refusing to throw off one’s own false masks.” After such edits, one automatically comes to the conclusion “every human being is sick, unscrupulous, depraved”

**Note.--** This stands in diametric contrast to the “positive” thinking proper to New Age: there one thinks oneself and one’s fellow man “good” (= “positive”) until proven otherwise. In the left-wing value exercises it happens that “negative thinking” is given radical priority. Even to the point of forcing ‘sins’ never committed,-- in contrast to the Maoist groups who are satisfied with triviality if need be (*KF--RH 07*). Reread also *KF--RH 08*.

***Hatred of society.--*** The woman: “Sensitivity training steers toward arousing hatred of society in all participants. In such sensitivity training, one should not try to prove that many people are still sincere, honest and good.”

***Progressism.--*** A few decades ago, it sounded “in” when one adopted a “progressive” attitude. -- The testimony of a participant: “It has now been a year since I experienced sensitivity training.

I honestly ask myself : “What/why was I so deeply hurt by others, so deeply humiliated? What/why did I humiliate others so deeply? (...). Very often we thought that all outsiders could not possibly realize the extent to which we were progressing in self-improvement and immediately in general human improvement. We really thought we were privileged. We often shut ourselves up in a kind of feeling of happiness that others could envy us.

**Note --** Here we have, in the midst of Postmodernity, one typically Modern, given: Galileo, Descartes, Newton, Locke, Kant,-- all of them, the great Enlighteners (“Rationalists”), the founders of typically Modern culture” believed firmly in “progress.

**Sample 7: Western groups: (precisions).** (22/25).

The lady's testimony, in previous chapter, shows her value unsteadiness: she confesses, from a human point of view, things she has not done.-- It can also be different. A person can - as a single person - resist indoctrination. 'Doctrina', in Latin, means 'teaching'. Indoctrination is the fact that someone is taught a doctrine "under one or another pressure" or "by means of entrapment". Again: a form of rhetoric. -- The word is "in": a lot of contemporaneous intellectuals who "take a critical stance" are on the lookout to "expose" any form of indoctrination, especially the traditional form.

**A testimonial.** -- Sensitivity Training, 24. -- A student woman, 21, recounts her re-faring.-- "I took sensitivity training for a while. -- This term, however, was not used, but 'speaking course' was. Basically, it amounted to sensitivity training. However, in order to attract students, "the leaders" had avoided the term.

**Aggression.** -- "During the 'course' I was constantly attacked by the leader. Also by all the other members of the group. Simply because I rejected their so-called "new morality."-- The leader, of course, refused to accept my "pure feelings" and my "moral and religious beliefs" as authentic and true: I was accused of not being truthful and honest regarding my attitude on premarital relations (which I, in no way, accept).

I was mocked and thoroughly humiliated. I experienced that (...) the individual with high morals must be cracked and separated from the rest of the group.-- I was not appreciated for my willpower concerning chastity. On the contrary: appalling blame became my portion. -- Mockery and humiliation were provoked by my professor-group leader. I was portrayed as 'conservative 'backward', 'outdated', -- 'false', 'hypocritical', etc."

**Note.--** The terms "honest/unfair" "real/unfair" etc. in the language used by the Anti-tabooists refer to whether or not one realizes, admits, expresses and "confesses" that the urges ("impulses") - such as sex need, attack urge, shame to be bad - are present in every human being and await especially indirect expressions.

The traditional term “honest/unfair” or “real/unfair” refers to either dealing objectively with truth or being truthful or being untruthful. Two uses of language, in other words. With different prepositions.

In short: the sensitivity trainers demand, “in the name of the new morality” (which they present as just as absolute as the traditionalists did with their morality), that “one must want to know that one has bad urges or ‘impulses’”. It is precisely these that they want to blot out.

***The single person.***-- “I did not, however, allow myself to be easily culled. I, in turn, accused the leader and my sharers of trying to break the values to which I adhered,--just to break down. If the destruction of my life principles:

- a. for the group and
- b. especially for democracy (*KF.-RH 12*) meant a victory, then rather to hell with “democracy”! -- I reproached the group for not having any valuable morals, not being able to substitute anything for everything I valued and really loved”.

***Note.***-- Now reread *KF--RH 09/11*, where Anarchism with a Nihilistic tendency was discussed.

***Value-fixed and value-unfixed singles.***

The student woman went on to say that she has found that few - among young people, practically none - demonstrate strong conviction and strength of character when confronted with “absolute morality and ethical relativism.”

***Note --*** The student woman thus typifies the new morality which puts forward both all (ethical) values as relative (= relativism) and, at the same time, imposes itself as ‘absolute’ (= non-relative). Now she describes the human aspect.

“During sensitivity training, most participants completely renounce all the values of which, so far, they have lived superficially without experiencing them more deeply. -- It is therefore understandable that they do not defend themselves against the vulgarities and excesses (= eccentricities) of a training group.

Higher morals must always be defended. The masses do not possess higher morals. Mostly, one renounces - step by step - to, eventually, fall into the lowest common denominator of “the group.” When one then knows what kind of people make up a training group, one can well imagine how big this lowest “common denominator” must be.

**Note** -- One may be familiar with the Antique maxim “Senatores optimi viri, senatus autem mala bestia” (The senators are excellent men, the senate however is an evil animal). Which proves that the ethical resilience of a senator at the time was not considered too high. The maxim still holds true today.

**Sedition:** (‘subversion’).-- What the studentess is about to tell us refers to the ‘subversion’ aspect.-- *R. de Chabot, Peut-on utiliser les massmedia?*, (Can we use mass media?), refers to *Roger Mucchiell., La subversion*, Paris, CLC, 1976-2. Families and schools, enterprises and professional organizations, universities, magistracy, municipal governments, -- army and police are subverted from groups.-- Rhetoric is the great tool.

“Subversion is acting on people’s beliefs by subtle (barely perceptible) means. (...). The prerequisites are the knowledge of the laws of psychology and psycho-sociology (*KF--RH 12v.; 20*),--as well as the skill of dealing with logically untrue propositions but which appear to be entirely true”. (Thus Mucchielli). The infrastructure of this subversion is the media: without press, radio, t.v., it is virtually powerless.

**Opm .--** Add but pop music to that for it is brimming with subversive ‘art’.

Note: according to Chabot, subversion is neither Liberalism nor Freemasonry,-- nor Marxism or Communism or Gauchism. Subversion is a rhetorical tool pliable in many directions. One modifies the value system “in the name of” (we think of Lyotard’s criticism of “in the name of”) one ideology or another.

For example, the media are partly responsible for the ‘image’, the impression of the image that emanates from a politician. By repeating, highlighting day in, day out one literally ‘makes’ the image that the public is presented with. It amounts to a kind of usually very diminishing marketing (salesmanship).-- We now listen, with more intelligence, to the studentin.

**“The leader criticizes everything:**

Family, relatives, friends,-- homeland,-- moral views, religion and faith, asceticism (= mortification). All this is done on purpose: to instill in all members the morbid habit that bears the name ‘criticism’. In this way he wants to bring about a total change in spirit and mentality. -- Such a thing is really subversion.



**Society Criticism.--** “In the established society nothing is virtuous any more; so let us dismantle everything. For example, fidelity to one’s marriage partner(s), family, children,-- homeland, God and religion. All those things. are, Larry.-- In retrospect, the question arises, “Where does the training leader get the nerve to pretend that he has all the knowledge and sciences?” -- Thus the student woman.

**Note.--** The terms ‘criticism’ and ‘social criticism’ are, in this group, apparently not used in the neutral sense. After all, in itself, ‘criticism’ means “the examination of real value.”

That is e.g. rein platonian method. In the Platonic dialogues all opinions - even the most subversive - are discussed. At the beginning, in the descriptive and narrative part that prepares the criticism. As neutrally as possible.

Only then does the value judgment come into play : after all, not all opinions are equally ‘valuable’. This is -- in passing -- typically Antique-Greek ‘democracy’ or rather ‘democratic method’. -- In the group described by the studentin, however, democratisation is first of all a deconstructive or deconstructive, purely rhetorical procedure.

**The Blue Lagoon.--** A Tribute.-- A fourteen-year-old girl (Brooke Shields, known since Pretty Baby) and her cousin (Chris Atkins) are shipwrecked and wash up on an island paradise (Fidji). After a while they fall in love with each other. Result: the girl becomes pregnant.

This movie was once hit 1 with the USA - teenagers. But “established society” was far less enthusiastic: “What can a fourteen-year-old thing with a baby do without established society?”

To which Brooke Shields: “One can call it a film about ‘the rights of teenagers’. After all, the basic theme is a girl and a boy growing up outside the ‘constraints’ - taboos - of the society that is ours.” -- The realizer of the film, Randal Kleiser, sees it this way: “All that this film shows, becomes, for a teenager, universal and normal, Whoever feels something like that as artificial, unnatural or bad, should be urgently referred to the psychiatrist.”

**Note.--** In addition to the fact that both,- Shields and Kleiser, certainly do not suffer from excessive humility, we note that both take a deliberate “critical” view of established values regarding pregnancy.

**Sample 8: bhagwan groups. (26/35)**

Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh is his full Indian name. Bahagwan for short.

***Orientalisms.***

Orientalism' here means "the urge to flee from "the (depraved)" West" and find refuge in "the (gifted) East". In this, of course, there are variants, thoroughly good and ... poorly disappointing.-- we dwell on one such Orientalism.

**Note.**-- The Beatles (1962+), the Rolling Stones (1963+) among others have shown many young people especially the way to the East. -- Regarding Bhagwan, we refer to Swami Deva Amrito (*Jan Foudraine*, the well-known psychiatrist of *Who is of Wood* (1971)), who in his book: *Original Face (A Walk Home)*, Baarn, Ambo, 1979, gives us some insight into what an 'enlightenment group' can be. Note: 'can be'! Because of course there is 'enlightenment' and 'enlightenment' again!

**As an aside**, the term 'enlightenment' in the recent West refers to Enlightened Rationalis-me and has very little, indeed nothing, to do with the (Eastern) mystical 'enlightenment', which (again) situates the solitary human being in the totality of the (perceived as 'divine') kos-mos.

**Note** -- What one does not find, of course, in Foudraine's book, is e.g. the fact that -- in the early eighties -- Bhagwan left his center at Poona (= Indian village 150 km. s.-o. Bombay), -- under the pressure of the creditors,-- under suspicion of group sex, pressure on 'sannyasin' s (= pupils) who sometimes decided to attempt escape and even suicide.

Nor the fact that Bhagwan quickly bought up in the USA, the Enlightenment Rationalist country par excellence -- open to all opinions -- a village of some forty inhabitants, with sannyasin support, to re-establish his enlightenment groups there.-- But let us leave out the gossip and go into the specific group structure.

***The "Enlightened Master".***

This is how Foudraine calls him. This "Indian saint" (Foudraine) at the time proclaimed a doctrine, which incorporated Herakleitos and Socrates, Islam and Sufism (an Islamic mysticism), yes, Jesus of Nazareth, Hinduism and Buddhism, Tantrism, Taoism and Zen, -- Freud, Adler,-- Maslow and many other things.

**Teachings.**-- Foudraine, o.c., gives one sample you: "From birth, the child becomes 'split' by the upbringing. The child is still ecstatic and open but at the same time dependent and delivered.

Parents want “the best” for their child. But they themselves are distorted by life, -- shackled in fears that the surrounding society has also produced in them. They are afraid: their education becomes a dressage to fear. Thus the child becomes estranged from his body and broken because what does not suit parents and society must be split off and repressed. Then it becomes the victim of a society that needs slaves and that it can manipulate and exploit. (...). False values are constantly indoctrinated (...) (O.c., 59).

*Note --* As the reader/readers see: although situated in Eastern mystic framework, this “teaching” is nevertheless very similar to what we heard in communist and Maoist and Western groups.

### **An “Encounter Group.**

O.c., 104/154.- “Encounter” is “encounter. This is “encounter (= intimate acquaintance) both with oneself and with the group. In this case the group lasted seven days (10.30/12.30; 14.30/18.00; 19.30/22.30). Teertha, a substitute of Bhagwan, was the leader. -- A text by Bhagwan introduces: “Become as totally immersed in the group as possible, for what really matters is not the group process but the totality of your involvement. One misses out on the group if one remains observant. (...). One has to let go of the witness, the observer, completely.

If you are angry in the group, you should be angry, not angry. If you are angry, there is still someone observing. If you are the anger itself, the witness” is gone. (...). Either be involved or watch. That is your decision. Only if you “participate” (*KF-RH 07: participation*), will something happen,--not if you remain a witness. (O.c., 105).

Acting on one’s own “impulses. -- Classical rhetoric says that the true orator:

- a. is informed (invention),
- b. has an ordered text (arrangement),
- c. that is stylized (design),--
- d. which he memorized (memory exercise) and
- e. who recites an actor/actress equally (dramatization).

This last element suddenly receives a revival in the groups. -- “I send - says the Bhagwan text - only people to the encounter group who understand that they must break all boundaries. Boundaries around sex, violence, anger, rage, hatred. (...).

If it is “fair,” it will be painful.... (...). It is an attempt to strip from its sheaths everything that has been kept hidden. They are unpleasant things, which we hide. That is why we hide them. The violence, the hatred or jealousy - we hide them because we are afraid that people will reject us if they find out. Not only do we hide them from others, we also hide them from ourselves.” (O.c.” 106).

**Note:** This is one form of “not wanting to know” (as traditional folk say),--one variant of “human regard”. But then “human regard” that goes to suppression (conscious) and even repression (unconscious). By following the (unconscious) tendencies -- impulses -- -- as in an acted confession to others (and, immediately to ourselves) -- we expose them both to ourselves and to others.

**“I hate everyone here.”** -- O.c., 107.-- “Across from me sits a woman (...). Her name is Karima and I believe she is the second to start talking: “I hate everyone here” she says with great conviction. “I have always hated all my peers”. At the word ‘hate’ she bares her front teeth. It is a horrible sight”.

**“A hefty brawl.”** -- O.c., 108.-- “(...) A hurricane of anger. - The angel-faced boy and the dry Scotsman beat on it, the red bearded one strikes back.-- Then it is the turn of Karima who again roars out her hatred. This is followed by a fierce fight between her and several women. It lasts a long time”.

**Eva, the German actress.**-- O.c., 110vv.. -- A movie star. In psycho-therapy for fifteen years. Often suffering from severe depression. With broken marriage.-- “Most of the people in the group (...) at this afternoon session are already half naked. Eva in her blue jeans and white shirt à la Saint-Tropez is, for that matter, a complete dissonant”.

O.c., 114. (... ) A task: we must choose a female partner with whom we feel least comfortable and preferably spend the night with her. I choose Eve. (...). She is staying in Blue Diamond, the hotel (...). We walk together through the darkness (...). Part of our task is that we each have to listen for half an hour to what the partner(s) wants to tell about his/her own life, childhood history and recent experiences, being as attentive as possible, and every now and then - if we want to - we can ask questions.

Eva does not comply with this right away because she immediately starts asking me all kinds of questions (...). I am irritated by this lack of discipline. (...). We order a meal in the hotel. I tell her (...) about myself (...). And then Eva starts a story that lasts at least an hour and a half (...).

It is all terrifying, and she also mentions in passing that she has tremendous fears of being “sexually assaulted” and that her room in the Blue Diamond is of course her “private boudoir” in which she likes to retreat into her “privacy. She tells me that she is not at all serious about the task that Teertha--the leader--has assigned us: “Surely I should understand that.

I don't understand anything! There goes my nice bed! I cannot understand her remarks about “sexual attacks” because I feel like a child that has just been reborn in the loving arms of the group.-- (...) At half past twelve I leave. We walk along the elevator and Eva tries to kiss me on the mouth but I prefer not to.

Back home, I can't sleep and I'm furious. My whole masochistic attitude, -- that whole sweet - boy thing -- like “No! Of course not, you know! No, if you don't want to, then you certainly shouldn't do it. No, I respect your privacy” infuriates me.-- At the very least I could have taken a more stance.-- I rationalize it away with the thought “that I had a very moving experience that completely threw me off.”

But sleep remains out and murderousness increases. Surely you can't accuse a newborn child of “rape tendencies”! I rage and think of the next day. Talk about ‘impulses’! I am so fearful of it. Couldn't I just be the understanding therapist-father when Teertha asks me ironically tomorrow, “And - how was the night, Swami?”.

Surely I've always done that my whole life always that role of the understanding kid, later the therapist. Never once “Goddamn, I won't take that!”. And I turn back and forth on my hard mattress and have fantasies of Eva warming up with a lover in the hotel until the guy goes to sleep nice and rested in that other bed.

**Note** -- It is so obvious that our psychiatrist himself struggles with heavy 'impulses'. Still best that the people who come to such a psychiatrist -- especially women -- do not know very well what goes on in him.

"The next morning, Eva da last to enter the group room. -- She's not quite in place yet or I get up and drag her to the middle of the room. I am livid. Slap her in the face a few times and roar out: "That coldness of yours, damn it! What's the truth? What's the truth?". I remember getting off on that, -- on that word "truth. It certainly has to do with my mother and, in my fantasy, "the truth" about Eve is that she didn't want to spend the night with me because, after I left, she went to a lover who was waiting for her at the hotel.

It was just a fantasy. But at least I am expressing something of my rage;-- finally I let go of Eva - who is acting rather startled - and say with a kind of disgust, "This is nothing. At best, this is a kind of sneezing sound of anger" (...).

I am not seated properly yet or all the female group members jump up and attack Eva. In less than no time she is standing naked in the room, desperately trying to grab a few pillows to cover her breasts with. This infuriates the group members even more because everyone has long been naked. -- Eva doesn't understand any of it.

She also does not understand how much anger her arrogant behavior has already evoked in the group.-- Finally, the scene comes to an end. Eva announces that she wants to leave immediately. (...). No one knows at that moment what Eva will do. Only a week later do we learn that in Bombay she has run directly to the German scandal press which is eagerly using her stories to unleash a mad scourge throughout Germany."

**Note** -- The fact that so many feel -- and allow -- "anger" to rise within them for the reason of Eve's so-called arrogant behavior shows that those "so many" still do not possess the inner peace that does not care about that arrogant behavior any more than is necessary.

Biblical revelation among others teaches us to mortify ourselves by controlling our value judgments concerning all such things as arrogance. "What good is that?" But yes, here we are acting out the immature value judgments.

***“A hurricane of fucking people.***

O.c., 119v.. -- “After every orgy of violence there is a moment’s rest. Teertha then sprinkles around one interpretation after another that now hits the mark in a way that I - as a psychotherapist -- have never seen before.” People literally roll over when he, with a lot of humor, illuminates the situation they have just experienced. (...) It takes away a lot from the seriousness of all the murder and mayhem, the crying and desperate embraces of this afternoon.-- (... )

We have to sleep with the whole group in the group room now. ( ... ). Around me, couples are gradually forming and slowly the talking stills and some couples - left, right, as well as opposite me - are going into ‘action’. Within a short time I am - I feel - in a hurricane of fucking people, in the middle of all kinds of ‘ready-making sounds’. And I resist, am furious and try to reason everything away with remarks to myself like: “You are just older; you are more mature. You just don’t participate in those sneezes of sloppy sexuality anymore. You’re further along. (...)”.

But the sense of loneliness and old age - in the midst of these young people -, the sense of being written off (.....) continues to haunt me. I don’t sleep a wink. (....). All night I stay awake and feel lost”.

***Sudra.--*** O.c., 120vv ... -- A “somewhat belly English woman.” She says she doesn’t understand a thing about all those books of Bhagwan, while the other members understand it well. “When I saw (Bhagwan) for the first time, I was very disappointed because I didn’t see that “blue light” - “that aura” - that should be around him. Probably everybody sees it. But I don’t see it at all I’m not religious at all”. The group screams with laughter. Also Teertha, who looks at her with terrible love. (...)

She seems devoid of any narcissism. She just shines without knowing it herself. She is a nurse in England. (...). Compared to Sudra, I am a complicated man, always teetering on the edge: of “the tragic” and “the melodramatic” (...). Sudra is simply the innocent.--

Teertha asks her to undress and later she stands, with a fat belly, against the wall. “Yes, I thought of myself as ugly. That’s why I got fat. It didn’t matter anymore, did it?”.

***“What the hell are you doing touching my, thighs?”***

O.c., 122.-- “Saki, the young virgin girl, keeps “talking with her head” a lot. Everyone gets sick of it: it is one big intellectual control. But suddenly Teertha seems to have found the opening. She tells about her father: how, as a young girl, he groped her and stroked her thighs.

Suddenly I found myself in the middle of the room stroking Saki’s legs, as she continues to talk: it becomes a “re-experiencing of the trauma” (*note*: soul-query). I now feel like a kind of extension of Teertha,-- empathize with Saki’s words and description of the situation. She cries and kicks as if everything is suddenly happening again. All the disappointment, the break in trust. In my role of imitative father, sweat gushes in rays from my face.

Suddenly Saki wakes up and looks at me “What the hell are you doing sitting on my thighs?” she says. “Ungrateful bitch” I think and retreat, wet with sweat, to the corner of the room, while Teertha now talks to her for a very long time and sits next to her until, shaking with grief, she seems to regain a piece of her body.

We sit and watch it breathlessly: he moves his hands over her body as if groping the inhibited energy. It’s uncanny. I’ve never seen anything like it. But it’s as if Saki is reborn,--becoming a body, a woman -- right before my eyes.-- So the morning continues with one scene after another.”

***Note***-- Saki was a young American girl “very beautiful but rather virginal looking” (o.c., 112).

***“Being Reborn”***. -- The ultimate purpose of this “encounter group, the best on the planet (nowhere is such absolute freedom allowed)” (o.c.,106), is “a total transformation” (o.c., 107). From repressed, resp. suppressed urges and - ‘impulses’ - to ready awareness of it and mastery on a higher level of it. Thus, e.g., Karima, the sad frog, who hates everyone (*KF--RH. 28*), amidst a mass of pillows (as her coffin), is said to “begin to laugh and be reborn for a moment from her depressive bitterness” (...) (O.c.,123).

***Up to there “encounter group”***. -- Also called “kundalini meditation” (o.c., 110),- - with elements of “bioenergetics” (“body-work”) (o.c., 140) or “primal scream-therapie” (o.c., 141).



### ***Psychanalysis in the oriental way***

O. c., 198 vv.. -- Bhagwan, was pushing for a “new psychology” and specifically a psychology that combined both Western and Eastern psyche views.

**a. Freud, Adler, Jung.-** The mind - called ‘I’, ‘mind’, ‘narcissism’ - is ‘sick’ (we saw this in previous samples). Freud and his great followers opened the way to a ‘scientific’ approach to that ‘disease state’ which manifests itself in symptoms, summarized as “people-in-difficulties.” --

**b. Maslow, Fromm, Janov.--** The mind is, thoroughly, “healthy” and what is more -- capable of “peak experiences” (immense happiness, mystical experience). Think the term “Humanistic psychology” -- The East exhibits fragments of such a psychology of the healthy, peak-experiencing man (Patanjali, Buddha), but with a slant that is more deeply ‘religious’ (whatever that ‘religious’ may be) and tends toward meditation and sacredness, among other things.

**c. Bhagwan.--** The spirit is in its’ essence “enlightened spirit” (on its’, Eastern-religious’ understanding, of course). A Gurdjieff, a mystic, went in that direction. His disciple Ouspensky, great mathematician, was too “intellectual” to really push such an enlightenment psychology. Says Bhagwan: “I am Gurdiieff and Uuspensky together”.

**Note -** According to Foudraine: consciousness expansion without drugs under the guidance of a more enlightened mind (think Teertha). With trust and surrender to “the master” (Bhagwan-Teertha) as the main condition.

**An infrastructure.--** O.c., 182vv.. -- With the three-part psychology structure, outlined above, we are not yet at the “bizarre practices” we saw at the ashram. -- “Sex and aggression are the rungs of the ladder to “spirituality” (*note*: enlightenment). If you first saw away the rungs because you find those energy sources dirty and annoying, climbing the ladder becomes very difficult. (...). Our richest source of energy is (...) blocked by prohibitions and fear.

We remain stuck in an auto-sexual stage with such blockages, and our so-called heterosexual relationships become a form of mutual masturbation because of this blockage. They then have nothing to do with the real meeting of man and woman who, in a loving orgasm, experience the cosmic, find the way to God and can experience sex, as meditation.” (O.c., 183).

In other words, to achieve the triple goal--sanitization of “disease” activation of health, and of predisposition to peak experience, “enlightened state,” -- energy is needed. This is situated in sex and violence.

**Note.--** *It is* certain that, in the *New Testament*, Jesus in his way

- a. took away illness (incantations, healings),
- b. by providing the soul with ‘dunamis’ (= energy).

But this “power” is, in addition to being of a natural and extra-natural (= occult or paranormal) nature, first of all of a supernatural nature. Gift of the Triune Godhead. The *Bible* as a whole, and especially the *New Testament*, are wary of the purely natural and possibly supernatural energies in so far as they are not made healthy by the supernatural and its specific life force.

Well, this point of view is nowhere clearly mentioned in Foudraine’s book. Let us be clear: is the energy in sex and the urge to attack, if need be acted upon in a group context, if need be activated by mutual influence, not only a necessary but also a sufficient condition for achieving the stated threefold goal? The results - some touchstone - are not always reassuring on that point.

**Note.--** The suspicion, peculiar to Postmodern anti-intellectualism, regarding spirit (mind, reason) insinuates that spirit, understood as a rational method and as an intuitive force, would not involve any energy. Which also needs to be proven. That anti-intellectual element is also present in Foudraine’s Bhagwanism.

### ***The atmosphere of night dreams.***

Those who read Foudraine’s accounts cannot escape the impression that Bhagwan’s groups come so directly from the sphere of nightdreams: there rule - morally free, without priests and politicians (O.c., 183; 205 (“Politicians are the most corrupt people”), whom Bhagwan so detests - and sex and attack drive, “in absolute freedom” from norms (O.c., 106). According to Platon (and other Ancient Greeks), in those night dreams both the tyrant (dictator) and the criminal arise.

When one confronts unprepared people like e.g. *Eva* (KF--RH 28), *Sudra* (KF--RH 31) or *Saki* (KF--RH 32) so ‘bizarrely’ or ‘brutally’ with the nightdream atmosphere, in which they, too, most certainly live in her un(der)consciousness, -- what does that work out to?

**Note.--** The topic of groups is endless. One more word. *J. L. Moreno, Gruppenpsychotherapie und Psychodrama (Einleitung in die Theorie und Praxis)*, (Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama (Introduction to Theory and Practice)), Stuttgart, 1959-1, 1973-2, 7f., writes: “The oldest and most numerous ‘proletariat’ in human society consists of the victims of an intolerable, non-therapeutic world order.

It is called “therapeutic proletariat.” It consists of persons who are in need of one form of misery or another: psychological misery, social misery, economic misery, political misery, racial misery, religious misery.

The ‘therapeutic proletariat’ cannot be ‘redeemed’ by economic revolutions: it existed in Primitive and pre-capitalist societies; it exists in Capitalist and in Socialist societies.”

It is the great merit of the groups, from the Marxist-communist to the New-Age groups (à la Bhagwan e.g.), to have seen the real extent and content of the misery and to have immediately tried to do something about it. Even if the “therapeutic” methods, which we have gone over in a random (inductive) way, sometimes pose very serious problems.

We have reduced the theoretical aspect to a minimum. In this philosophy of culture we are concerned first of all with what we know of cultural phenomena today.

Still, here’s a quick note for those who want to look into it more deeply.

-- Michel Lobrot, *Kurt Lewin (La dynamique des groupes)*, (Kurt Lewin (Group Dynamics,)), in: *Sciences Humaines* (Paris), 14 (1992: févr.), 10/11, is full of praise for Lewin’s pure theoretical work (*KF--RH 13*) : Lewin situates both in the depth of the soul and in the environment (both one in the same (force) field) both the evolution and the conflicts of a group, however large or small it may be. So much so that a group can function perfectly, without external factors or authorities. Psychosociology was his work.

Further recommended: *Jean Maisonneuve, La dynamique des groupes*, Paris, PUF, 1 968-1, 1 984-7 (dynamist (= Lewinian), interactionist (R.F. Bales), psychoanalytic groups are distinguished;-- the role in the whole of society).

**Note.--** Our purpose was, among other things, to point out the bizarre and even brutal appearing rhetorical methods in some -- not all, far from it -- groups,-- to spare painful surprises for the unsuspecting who indulge in them.

**Sample 9: The mythological group (36/40).**

The traditional magicians/magicians know in their own way -- very well the elimination that we saw at work in the groups briefly outlined above. One model of this provides us with the reading of the Narkissos myth.-- We explain this very briefly.

**Mythology / myth analysis.**

As a story, the muthos, myth, belongs to narratology (also: narratiek, dietetics) or narrative theory.

Myth - like fable, fairy tale and legend - were underestimated, indeed scorned (as an “irrational form of thought”) by classical enlightened rationalism. Romanticism, however, regained understanding of them by situating said story types in life (the basic concept that Romanticism governs). For example, F.W. Schelling (1775/1854; Romantic German-Idealist) says, “Mythology is a product of consciousness which ceaselessly reinvents itself.” (Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology, I, 10).

‘Mythology’ means:

- a. the stories themselves that make up one system, however loose,
- b. the study around those stories (what is also called “myth analysis”).

**The myth.**

The myth is actually destiny analysis. Those who put the notion of “fate” or “fate(s)” first, respectively, grasp the actual approach to myth.-- The myth is, in that perspective, a story that:

- a. assuming observed facts, fate,
- b. think through (think Platon’s theoria or fathom) to the occult and/or ‘divine’ ‘elements’ (= presuppositions) that make those observed facts or fates intelligible. Or, at least, make them more understandable.

**Note --** Expressed in Platonic language: myths are one form of ‘stoicheiosis’ (Lat.: ‘elementatio’), factor analysis.

**Lot analysis.**

The fable which scatters children or imparts a lesson in morality,-- the fairy tale, which is usually longer and laced with wonders,-- the legend, which is usually more pious (and belongs more to the Biblical-Christian sphere),-- these are also three types of destiny analysis, but of the “lighter type” and therefore more intended for the simple (children, for example). Whereas myth, insofar as it purely describes observed facts, is therefore often more raw, more brutal, and thus more intended for adult minds. Yes, certain myths are simply exasperating.

Platon of Athens (-427/-347), following in Socrates' footsteps, has criticized the unenlightening side of myths and he is far from alone in this. Biblical revelation, from the Fall of Man onward, has also been fiercely critical of the degrading influence of the myths of pagan peoples: the deities of the myths are, as a general rule, 'demons'.

Here myth joins the ballad. The ballad, more Nordic-Icelandic-Germanic in origin, does indeed also present idyllic (light-filled-happiness) scenes and fates, but its center of gravity is clearly in the tragic realm: fate, demonic anger, etc. - just as in the myths - are the order of the day. The ballad is therefore not 'children's literature'. The balladic genre is typically adult fare.

**Note.--** It is not surprising, then, that the great Antique Greek tragedians -- Aischulos of Eleusis (-525/-456), Sophocles of Colonos (-496/-406), and Euripides of Salamis (-480/-406) -- drew abundantly, for their tragedies, from the myths and their anankè, i.e., the bizarre necessities or contingencies.

**Conclusion.--** The myth (also the other named types of texts) is a model of life:  
**a.** : The original, life, as it is in fact,  
**b.** is illuminated by a model of it (i.e., something that provides information about it),---so that life occurrences become more understandable and at once more bearable.

This immediately implies that myths play a serious role in religion and in magic and mysticism. - This does not prevent - e.g. for children - myths from being recited as if they were fables, fairy tales or legends. The myth is ambiguous like everything else that exists.

**Note.--** "Modern man will be a myth eater ('Mythenfresser')" (K. Marx).

In Marxist parlance, "myth" means a set of conceptions (ideals, if need be), as "ideology" alienated from the naked economic-social states" and thus "unreal," but such that these conceptions - like the myths among the Archaic people - exert great spiritual influence on the psyche, including that of present-day humanity.

Think of "the Liberal myth of (economic) progress" and the Progressism that goes with it, since the XVIII century Enlightenment-Rationalists (cfr. the Encyclopedists).

Similarly, there is “the Socialist myth of ‘the Great Evening’, by which, after a violent Socialist revolution, the miseries of the Bourgeois era would be put to an end (‘Evening’). Which is again one type of Enlightened-Rationalist Progressism. Here the myth is ‘worldified’ (secularized) and the description resp. explanation of it is purely human scientific.

Different is the case with “Der Mythos des Xx-sten Jahrhunderts” (The myth of the Xx-th century), by Rosenberg, the Nazi: with this, Nazism goes back to before the stage of the Churches (Beyond bells) and before the stage of the Enlightened rationalists. Primitivism, i.e. a kind of repriming or return to an idealized primordial stage, dominates here the concept of myth. Which does not prevent the Nazis... from also integrating the most Modern achievements (think of Modern science and technology). - In this it is similar to New Age.

***The narkissos myth.***

***Bibl. st. :*** P. Grimal, *Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et romaine*, PUF, 1951-1, 1983-9.-- World-famous is the myth of Narkissos (Lat.: Narcissus), especially since Freud and his depth psychological reinterpretation, who saw in it above all the myth of the urge for money (self-importance, “narcissism” (also called “narcissism”), self-righteousness, self-centeredness).

***More than one version.***

A myth is usually found in a multitude of versions (text types).

***Note --*** Before we give the egocentric version, here is the alterocentric one.

Narkissos was a young man who loved his sister passionately and even resembled her strikingly. However, the girl found a fated premature death. To never forget her “effigy,” Narkissos, bent over the water table of springs, thinking of his sister, stared at himself.

However, instead of thus permanently immortalizing the image of his deceased sister in his mind, his life force (in Greek: ‘dunamis’, i.e. that by which one lives and survives) diminished to such an extent that he withered away.

***Note.--*** Why is the concept of dunamis (life energy) so central to the myths (and to the ballads)? Because people control fate only thanks to that life force! A wrong way of life (like that of Narkissos) corrodes it.

*Note.--* One of the ground structures in this version seems to be the systechie “disappointment (‘frustration’)/sorrow” (and not “frustration-.aggression”). Narkissos reacted too “weak. In other terms: there is a fatal “immanent sanction” (= inwardly determined punishment process) at work for the life-force, by which Narkissos prepares himself for destruction. By giving in to sadness (omen) does not follow life and survival, but death (sequel).

***The self-centered version.***

**a.** Narkissos was the son of the nymph Leiriope (Liriope) and the river god Kèfisos (Cephisus). When he came into the world, the parents consulted the blind seer or ‘mantis’, Teiresias (Tiresias) about his fate. Teiresias replied, “He will live until the day when he sees his own image. Only later would all understand what precisely this pronouncement of fate actually meant.

**b.** Narkissos’ appearance, as a young man, was of a rare beauty (which caused him to commit “hubris” (borderline transgression)). As such, he was the meeting point of countless young girls and nymphs. To which Narkissos repeatedly rejected.--until the nymph Echo (echo) fell radiantly in love with him. Yet, again, Narkissos repeated his disdain and even libel. Echo withdrew into solitude, -- emaciated (from heartbreak) more and more,-- until of her only a mournful -- plaintive voice remained. Such was her life force weakened.

But Echo had sisters! These were deeply shocked by the whole event and turned to the goddess Nemesis. This goddess continues as the goddess of, among other things, “divine vengeance” and especially of “distributive justice” (which punishes transgressions for good, as in the case of Narkissos’ beauty, or for evil, as in the case of Narkissos’ contempt for the female sex).

*Note --* Narkissos did not share the erotic sense of value that the girls and the nymphs, in Heathen myth, harbored. That will get him the expulsion from “the group”.

The goddess Nemesis took it upon herself to provide “justice” to the haughtily rejected mistresses by striking Narkissos - as in magic - in His life force, automatically eliminating him from the community. Immediately, Teiresias’ destiny prediction would be fulfilled.

### ***The divine outpouring.***

**a.** ‘Divine’ here means “all that emanates from and/or resembles the deities of Paganism” (called “unclean spirits” or “demons” by the Bible).

**b.** “outsmart someone” means “anything that takes someone by their weak spots and snatches them up, without them realizing it.” -- This is a very frequent theme in the myths. Kristensen is one of the rare scholars of religion who has dealt with this in detail.

### ***Shift by inspiration.***

In order to affect someone’s life force, as magic still does today, one can instill in him/her a thought that has a treacherous “negative” effect.

When Narkissos went hunting, Nemesis gave him in at a spring to quench his thirst: he then saw, for the first time, in the face of water his countenance, with all its beauty, reflected. On the stroke he fell dumbly in love with his own image. When he wanted to embrace it on the surface of the water, however, it became a caricature. Yet, out of complacency, he continued to stare at it. So much so that he forgot to eat and drink. As a result, his life force crumbled.

### ***Disguise.***

He was transformed by the deity into a flower that took root at the spring: the Narkissos flower (narcissus) mirrors itself, in the spring, in the spring water,-- flowering, to die, in the fall.

### ***Mythical explanation.***

Beauty, in the myths, is treacherous, like the beautiful Lorelei who lures and prepares ruin.

**a.** The local god Hades (usually translated by “Hades”) or still: Plouton, the underworld god, is known in Pulos (literally “gate”), in Elis.

**Note --** More than one town or village or district was considered a “gate of hell” because it was believed to be the dwelling and ruling place of the underworld deities. Thus we understand immediately what Jesus means when he says that “the gates of hell” will not overwhelm his church.

**b.** The universal god Hades, the Underworld god, rules over the entire underworld or “hell” (by which is meant not just the place of the damned), along with his wife Persefonè (= Persefoneia), the Underworld goddess.

Well, the Narkissos flower was, mythically speaking, the flower of Hades: whoever plucked it - unconsciously or consciously - suddenly saw in his imagination and mind the earth open up, the god himself ascend and fetch him/her. Do we think of Kore, Zeus’ daughter, e.g..



**Sample 10: The mythological group (explanation).** (41/43).

**The deity judgment.**-- Usually one says “deity judgment” (but we want to underline that “god” is masculine and “deity” both masculine and feminine.-- Narkissos undergoes a “judgment” because of the mythical deities (here mostly feminine): they investigate: the cause and “judge” that he should be “banished from the group” by means of the worst thing one can magically experience, the striking, in a deadly way, of the life force or “dunamis”. -- We explain briefly.

**The concept of “atè” (deity judgment).**

**Bibl. st.:** A. Bailly E. Egger, *Dictionnaire Grec-Français*, Paris, 1903, 300s. (ateo, atè).-- When we arrange the multitude of meanings of ‘atè’, an obvious religious-historical structure is revealed.

**A process.**

‘Kinèsis’ (Lat.: motus), process, is a progression with a built-in sequence. One can sketch like this:

- a. as a result of a misstep or whatever,
- b. a deity (in the very broad sense: souls of the dead, heroes are included) causes a blindness (twilight consciousness, delusion, even madness) thanks to a wrongly operating idea, which, if followed (involved) by the afflicted, causes calamity (accident, miscalculation,-- in; all cases “wrong end”).

**Semasiology.**

Now that we know the intended process, we can determine the meanings of the word or group of words (semasiology),

a. ‘Ateo’.

Means, “I am controlled by a deity-inspired delusion and commit mischievous acts.”

b. “atè”.

- a. The deity who causes the outcast process (as a punishment goddess).

**Note:** What we have been taught ... by Nathan Söderblom, the religious scholar, with the term *Urheber/ Urheberin*’ (causer/ causer),

**b.1.** The twilight state, insanity, which is the first effect of divine intervention.

**b.2.** The wrong end, the calamity, which follows.-- Such are the most striking meanings.

**Note.--** The Erinues’ (Erinyes, goddesses of fate), so feared by the believing Greeks, o.g.v. antiphrasis (render a by non-a) called ‘Eumenides’ (benevolent goddesses) - we think of the Roman furiae (furies) -, sometimes belong to the goddesses indicated by ‘atè’.-- *Platon, Guest meal* 195d mentions Atè.

*Note* -- Known is the Old Roman maxim: “Quos Jupiter vult perdere dementat” (Alwie Jupiter, the Supreme God, sends down, he robs of his senses).-- It is one application of the ‘atè’.

***Herodotean commentary.***

***Bibl. st.:*** G. Daniëls, *Religious-historical study of Herodotus*, Antw./ Nijmegen, 1946 (including 27/38 (Herodotus’ view of the government of the gods)).

*Herodotos of Halikarnassos* (-484/-425) is known for his *Historiai* (literal investigations). Immediately he became the “father of historiography” (W. Jager says: “the father of land and ethnology.”).

**1.** Herodotos is Milezier: the visible and tangible, ‘secular’ (earthly) phenomena are, the given; the ‘archai’, the presuppositions, are the requested. In doing so, Herodotos emerges as a mythic-theologian: often, in and through the phenomena that everyone can observe, he tries to uncover a structure that governs (and thus ‘explains’) the events he depicts.

**2.** That structure (in Platonic terms: idea) is called ‘kuklos’, circle(loop). The phenomena:

- (a) start small,
- (b) become larger,
- (c) to preferably reach a peak, which at the same time covers a boundary crossing, for a short period of time,
- (d) such that afterwards, suddenly, they become small again or even void.

Narkissos, viewed with Herodotian eyes, exhibits a cycle in both the alterocentric and egocentric versions.

In the alterocentric version: a delusional image takes root in his mind, increases to reach an intolerable peak that becomes fatal to him. He believes that, by staring at himself, he will preserve his sisters’ image for all eternity.

In the egocentric version: in response to the exceptional beauty that is his own, there grows, in his mind, the vain thought that he may surrender himself to self-importance,-a self-importance that not only lives complacently but causes every mistress not only to reject but to scorn.

This peak provokes the reaction of Nemesis which “levels” (Daniel’s), evens out, evens out, in the spirit of distributive justice. Which ‘belittles’ Narkissos, i.e., here, makes him smaller in order to instill in him the right measure, But precisely because of this, he is ostracized from “the group.” With his hubris, boundary crossing, he no longer fits into “the group”.

### ***Herodotos's steering structure.***

As E. W. Beth, at the time, and others made clear, the Archaic and Classical Greek thinkers thought from a steering or cybernetic point of view, among other things.-- We are now drawing out that gradient structure.

#### **a. *The rule (telos).***

“Just as the deity in nature tries to maintain a certain uniformity and order by the wise division of forces, so also in the lives of men she has drawn certain boundaries whose violation she will on no account tolerate”. (Daniel, o.c., 28v.).

#### **b. *The deviation (parek basis).***

“When, however, man does not take these limits into account and exceeds his limits, he encounters the ‘phthonos’ (*note* : Lat: invidia, ‘envy’, better: ‘intolerance’) of deities.” (Daniel, *ibid.*). I.p.v. ‘fthonos’ Herodotos also uses the term “nemesi ek theou”, rectifying or feedback intervention because of the deity.

#### **c. *Feedback, recovery (rhuthmosis, epanorhtosis).***

This has already been insinuated: the tolerance concerning deviations of the deities has limits! When boundaries are crossed ‘atè’ takes place, judgment of the deity (which we explained in more detail above).

### ***Conclusion.***

With this structure of ancient cybernetics - which one still finds e.g. in *Aristotle, Politics V: 5* (constitutions which deviate from norms provoke correctives) - we have given the structure which we saw e.g. in Narkissos' doom, its full frame of thought (basic structure). Only if we assume as a presupposition a certain purposiveness (with norms and expectations) based on values (see *KF--RH, 01*), can we discover a certain ‘logic’ in the myth of Narkissos (as in many other lapses).

**Note.--** We saw that the deities of the myths were, usually, demonic beings who “knew good and evil” (as Genesis says), i.e. felt at home both in good and in evil. Herodotus, as later on e.g. Platon, already somewhat purifies the concept of deity: he considers the gods and goddesses free from the sin of envy! Similarly, *Platon (Faidros 247a)* said that “envy is situated outside the chorus of deities”.

If one does this, then one must introduce a dual concept of deity: there are, then, good and evil deities. Yet this is a revolution in mythic theology. Cfr. Daniels, o.c., 31.

**Sample 11: Ethno-religious model of group dynamics.** (44/48).

Ethnology, ethnology, is concerned with description and explanation of Primitive and Archaic phenomena, with Modernity playing as the norm: all that is "Premodern" belongs, fundamentally, to the domain of cultural anthropology.

That the mythical group is still a living reality today, we want to show by what K. Pfund, *Ich, Waibadi, Regenmacher, Zauberer und König*, (Me, Waibadi, Rainmaker, Wizard and King), Kreuzlinger, Neptun, 1982, tells us about the banishment of magic and ancestor belief from "the group". The book is a kind of ordered travelogue that goes deeper into the culture -- values, goals, norms and expectations -- of the people of the Trobriand Islands, -- between Port-Moresby and Rabaul (Papua New Guinea).

On these: twenty-two islands, of which Kiriwina is the largest and Tuma - quite separately - passes as the island where the 'spirits' (souls) of the ancestors live, there is, according to Pfund... no question of 'deities', but rather of ancestor cult (manism) as the background of the magic prevailing there.

Waibadi, the chief magician and at the same time rainmaker (he controls the weather; think of Jesus calming the storm), is at the same time, because of kinship, the most important person after the king (the son of the oldest sister of the sovereign becomes king). The matriarchy, maternal law, after all, still dominates the culture (as in Archaic Europe). Waibadi is pretty much the central figure of the interesting book.

**Note.** - The role of the father is limited to being the first friend in the life of his children. That he is not related to his own children by blood' (in the Trobriand conception) is already evident from the fact that the child belongs to the 'totem' of his mother ('totem' is magical clan affiliation). He does have a sexual monopoly over his wife.

Above the network of clan associations stand the invisible ancestors who intervene in everything as supreme "deities" (because, although Pfund avoids the term "deity", the role of the ancestors amounts to this).

"Wizards and magicians are the guardians of the ancient laws thanks to which their people were able to survive." (O.c., 72). One cannot better characterize the primordial religions and its magics than with the term "survival."

### ***Killing.***

O.c., 204/220 (Todesmedizin), (Death Medicine). -- We dwell at length on the last chapter; for it shows how “magic” employs natural means, if need be, in order yet to achieve the so-called “magical” goal.

*As an aside:* scholars regularly hear one claim that magic and its ‘mentality’ (‘level of consciousness’) belong to the merely primitive ‘stage’ and will continue to belong to it. That, in other words, magic does not actually evolve. One feels, behind that assertion, Modern Progressism and Evolutionism, of course (which have not been proven to be true without question). We will now see. what is true of that.

### ***The occasion.***

Waibadi sends out messengers to the heads of a number of places to see them by themselves and to sound out their opinions. -- Says Waibadi what follows.-- The weather was not favorable. Which caused the yam harvest to partially fail. Which in turn caused his weathercraft to be questioned by the people.-- The ancestors then immediately unable to get the desired share of the harvest. Consequence: disaffection.-- Behold the ‘pre-node’ of the whole dynamic.

### ***A.-- The magical-religious explanation.***

Primitives know very well the fact that phenomena require interpretation from presuppositions. How does Waibadi explain this? -- The spirits are upset because one of our best magicians -- so he says -- allowed himself to be seduced into a vicious murder, namely Ilamueria from Wawela. He shamefully abused the trust of his ancestors: he shamelessly used the insight they bestowed on him as an inheritance for a murder.

Well, he left and escaped his punishment. As long as this is so, our ancestors will not favor us. Therefore, it is our duty to subject him to the rightful punishment. Which - my friends - we must make clear to our tribesmen.

### ***The spirits are upset.***

This for the reason of the audacious intrusion of a “dim-dim” (stranger, white man) into the (sacred) caves of Labai, the cradle of our people. He paid, incidentally, with his life. The white crocodile was never to be seen again because the spirits recalled the animal to their island.

### ***The spirits are upset:***

And this to Bodulela’s suicide. No one assisted her in dealing with her grief over Tokosikuma’s death. She was left alone with her suffering. We who are sitting here and now have also fallen short.

*Note --* One sees it: the religious confession of guilt is there, already in that Primitive stage (Cfr. *KF--RH:06; 16 (Ricoeur); 21*).

**B.1.-- *Waibadi moves to the small clinic in Losuia.***

The heads have gone home.-- A little later Waibadi leaves for a little clinic (with eighteen beds).-- He has a conversation with Orayaysi, sentence cousin, nurse at the clinic. After that conversation, the thought finally occurred to him how Ilamueria could be punished. More than that, the longer he thought about his plan, the more it struck him as the inspiration of spirits.

But to carry it out, he needed the skill of Ephraim Christmas (from the tribe of Tolai (New Britain)),--a convert who was vice-chief of the clinic. Disgusted, Waibadi questioned Efralm about the types of illnesses in the clinic: nine malaria, some tropical ulcers, one limphangiitis, one chronic bronchitis, one childbirth, one witch (hyperaesthesia) and one ... ankylostomiasis (hookworms), viz. David from Kavataria.

“Thou didst speak of hookworms. (...). As far as I know, they bore into the intestines. Please tell me how one can determine such a thing, for one cannot see them anyway!”

“That’s the high art of diagnosis. Typical signs, meanwhile, are anemia and, usually, on the legs skin lesions.”

“When hookworms take hold in the intestinal system, there should be signs of that in the stool? Or not!

“The microscope is needed for this purpose: the excrement must be dissolved in strongly salted water. The food particles settle out. The worms float to the surface”.

Waibadi knew enough.

*Note.--* From this already it is abundantly clear that “the magical mentality” does want to learn and immediately ‘evolve’.

**B.II.-- *Waibadi’s skill in the matter.***

Years before, a European doctor Waibadi had explained the life cycle of hookworms.-- In the “popu” (excrement) are the eggs from which the larvae develop which, once in the earth, grow further into microscopic creatures. Until they stick to feet and legs and penetrate the skin,-- resulting in severe itching.

They enter the blood vessels and thus the lungs and finally the intestines. They are then eight to ten millimeters long. They become sexually mature, suck themselves into the cellular tissue and feed on the blood resulting in rapidly occurring blood anemia.

**B.III. - "... A perfect murder should be possible".**

Scholars claim that "the magical mentality" still belongs to "the infant stage," We will see what is true about that.

Suddenly discovered -- increasingly Pfund said -- a further aspect of hookworm disease: with the help of these hookworms, perfect murder must be possible. -- Imagine: an unwanted person is infected inconspicuously,-- e.g., by feeding him hookworm-containing food! Only after a long time does his malady become visible,-- when no one thinks of deliberate contamination or finds traces of it anymore! Which food to choose? It must not be boiled e.g. (so as not to destroy the eggs)! "Suddenly Waibadi stood still: 'Coconut milk! Yes, coconut milk!' Ilamueria would be trapped".

Orayaysi, the niece, listened in amazement to her uncle's words (...). He urgently needed excrement and it was from David from Kavataria.

In the Trobriand Islands, where physical cleanliness is one of the highest commandments, the inhabitants make a detour, if possible, around the place where popu lies.-- "So it had to be about magic!" Although Orayaysi's studies in Port Moresby had instilled great doubts about magic, she was nevertheless astonished again and again how, now that she was living back in her native land, she came under the spell of the ideas of her youth.

**C.I.--"Tell me what I have to do".**

Tomeyawa from Lalela on the island of Kitava -- a great magician -- is invited through a messenger.--"I have had you summoned because I have been directed by the spirits of our ancestors to erase the scandal of Ilamueria.--You, Tomeyawa, have the honor of participating in the judgment passed on Tuma (*opm.*: the island of the ancestor spirits).

The great spirits have decided to have Ilamueria recalled to the spirit realm. Since he lives on Kitava, your name was mentioned as that magician who alone (besides myself) may be initiated into this enterprise.

Thou knowest that thy role in this will bring thee great honor in the afterlife. So tell me if we can count on thee”.

“My cooperation is a certainty to the great spirits and to you. Tell me what I have to do. (...). I have always observed the laws of those who have gone before us and ensured that all totems live according to them. The instructions due to the great spirits that I hear through your mouth, I will punctually carry out”.

**Note.--** And manism (ancestor worship) and totemism (clan affiliation) dominate the behavior of magicians. These three -- manism, totemism, magic -- form a triad that is found virtually everywhere in Premodern cultures.

Waibadi: “I give you here an instrument that the white doctors use to inject medicines. Thereupon he takes half a coconut, into which he had poured some water, and showed Tomeyawa how to use the syringe.-- Once his fellow magician has mastered the technique, he says, “Thou hast it fixed. I now give thee a remedy which the forefathers made me become. (...). Thou shalt invite Ilamueria to thee. (...). Thou shalt give him a coconut to drink which thou hast prepared a short time before. (...) Thou hast the syringe with the medicine which I will give thee.

**Note:** The liquid with the hookworms in it - filled and pressed it into the coconut milk. (...). The magic remedy thou now receives has never been used before. It works slowly.” -- Waibadi prepares the medicine -- a term containing antifrasis -- with what Orayaysi had provided him and gives it to Tomeyawa.

### **C. II.-- “Professor, the patient from Wawela has just died!**

Later Waibadi visits Prof Whitmore (who studies the morals of Trobrianders).

Waibadi stood up and pressed Whitmore’s hand in farewell. (...) In the doorway stood his cousin Orayaysi. Surprised, she looked at him: his presence in Prof Whitmore’s study confused her. (...).

“Professor, the patient from Wawela, the mage Ilamueria, has just died.” Waibadi lowered his eyes to make imperceptible any twinkling that might betray him.--”What was he suffering from?” -- “Ankylostomiasis. Hookworms!” growled Whitmore.

**Conclusion.--** The killing agent was anything but magical. It was a natural killing agent. Only the framework in which, was ‘magical’.



**Sample 12: Zombification.** (49/57)

The group dynamics peculiar to the vodu(n)religion, in Haiti, is very clearly exposed in the praxis called “zombification.”-- We dwell on it a little more extensively to sharpen the concept of “primitivology,” (ethnology) necessary to properly understand the issues surrounding “Pre- and Postmodernity.

1. One does not think now that primitivology is so recent. *Helmut von Glasenapp, The non-Christian religions*, Antw./Utr., Standard, 1967, 216, says that already Poseidonios of Apameia (-134/-51 ; Patronizing Stoic, forerunner of later Neo-Platonism) seriously dealt with the phenomena in ‘Primitives’ and its presuppositions.

And *Otto Willmann, Geschichte des Idealismus, I (Vorgeschichte und Geschichte des antiken Idealismus)*, Braunschweig” 1907-2, 696, says: the Neo-Platonics (250/600) in search of “theosophia” - i.e. wisdom derived from deities - tried to find precursors of their own way of thinking, not only among earlier and early Greeks, but far beyond (Egyptians, Iranians, Indians).

2. Modern research only begins with the Jesuit J.F. Lafitau (1670/1740).-- The Moderns, in their ethnocentric way, discover “the savages” later called “the natural peoples” (Herder (1784)) and, still later called “the primitives.”-- Immediately the framework is indicated in which we situate the study of zombies.

**Bibl. st.:** *Wade Davis, The Serpent and the Rainbow*, Amsterdam, Contact” 1986 (//*The Serpent and the Rainbow*, New York, 1985).

We are 1982: Wade Davis, a student of ethnobotany (the plants of the Native Americans in particular), is assigned by his professor at Harvard University to investigate on the spot how people make zombies, -- with the hypothesis that this is done by means of poison that generates a phantom death.

**The occasion.**

Starting point: the incontrovertible fact that zombification is more than a sensational imagination for horror movies. See here, briefly, the data.

1. **Clairvius Narcisse.**-- His death certificate dates from 1962. In 1980 he walks alive in the market of l’ Estère.

**Description.**-- “Physically, he seemed to me to be in good shape. He spoke slowly but clearly. When questioned about his experiences, he told roughly the same story I had heard from Dr Nathan S. Kline (Prof Evans Schultes had sent me to this psychiatrist and psychopharmacologist in New York).

However, he added a few unusual details. A scar on his right cheek, near his mouth, had been caused by the nail that had been driven through his chest. What was incredible was that he remembered that, throughout the ordeal, he had been conscious and that, completely “paralyzed,” he had heard his sister crying.

He recalled that his doctor had declared him dead. -- Both during and after his funeral, he had constantly felt as if he were hovering over his grave. That had been his soul -- he claimed -- ready for a journey that had been interrupted, when the bokor (*note* : ‘sacred’ man),-- in Haiti the man of (black magic) and his assistants had appeared on the scene.

He did not remember how long he had been in the grave when they arrived. He thought “Something like three days.” They had called his name and the ground had opened up. He had heard drums,--a pounding, a vibrating sound. And then he had heard the bokor singing.-- He had barely been able to see; they had grabbed him and beat him with a sisal whip.

Then they had bound him and forced a gag into his mouth. He had been carried off on foot by two men. For half the night they had walked in a northerly direction. Until they had come across another group of people who had taken Narcisse under their wing.

By night they had walked, by day they had hidden. Thus he had been handed from one group of people to another. Until he had ended up on the sugarcane plantation that would be his home for two years”. (O.c., 65v.). Cfr. also o.c., 85vv..

So much for the first copy.

## **2. Francis Illeus (“Ti Femme”).**

Declared dead on 23.02.1976 as a thirty-year-old. Officially determined by a court officer.-- In April 1979, farmers at the market in Ennery had seen her wandering around and seen that she was “a zombie.” The farmers were from the Baptist mission station in Passereine and had reported her to Jay Ausherman, the American at the head of the mission station. The latter went to Ennery and found an emaciated Francis sitting on the floor in the marketplace, holding her fingers in front of her face.

The judge in Ennery, not knowing what to catch and with someone who was “dead by law,” was only too willing to put her in the care of Jay Ausherman. Ausherman passed her on to Lamarque Douyon, the psychiatrist (1961: Centre de Psychiatrie et Neurologie).

Then she was malnourished, mute and “negativistic. For three years Douyon had tried to activate her recovery with hypnosis and anesthesia. Yet her faculties were always minuscule. Her eyes remained “fixed on the infinite.” One could see from every gesture how much effort it took her. She did speak now, but softly, in a high, thin voice and then only when Douyon urged her with gentleness.

***The pre-deadly symptoms.***

What do people who are zombified experience some time after the “attack” of which they are victims? “At the time of his alleged death, Narcisse was suffering from digestive problems, pulmonary edema, uremia (poisoning due to waste products in the blood that are normally eliminated through the urine), hypothermia, rapid weight loss, increased blood pressure.” (O.c., 134;-- 63, 118).

-- Honestly, “to die of”!

*As an aside*, the Japanese sometimes eat the fugu fish (balloon fish) resulting in poisoning. Davis notes that the tetrodotoxin poisoning peculiar to it includes “virtually all” of the same symptoms as those peculiar to zombification.

***Autoscopic near-death experience.***

O.c., 156vv.. -- “He had the feeling all the time that he (Narcisse) was floating above his body. When they buried him in the cemetery, he kept floating above the headstone, -- constantly aware of what was happening.-- He was content. He was not afraid. He felt that his soul was about to embark on a long journey. And his soul was indeed traveling -- he claimed -- and making long trips across the land -- timeless trips, unreal and yet extremely real.

His travels took place in a great number of ‘dimensions’ and yet: they brought him back to the grave every time.-- His concept of ‘time’ was completely lost on him: his grave was the only axis around which his existence revolved. -- Which is also the case in tetrodotoxin poisoning!

*As an aside*, “auto.scopy” means “to see oneself (the body and what one does with it) as an exited person (soul). -- As one knows, this happens several times to operated upon people who, after such a soul journey, recover and tell everything.

### ***The myth of Er.***

Platon, *Politeia* x (614v.v. ).-- The last section of Platon's *Politeia* recounts an Orphic-Pythagorean myth, freely edited by himself, about the afterlife.

"The story of a man of character, Er, the Pamphylian. In a battle he was killed. When, ten days later, the already decomposing remains were cleared away, his was still intact. It was brought home to be buried. But, on the twelfth day, when it lay on the funeral pyre, Er revived.

When he was fully conscious again, he told what he had seen in the afterlife. As soon as - he said - his soul had left the body, it traveled together with many others (...)".

**Note.--** One can see that the Antique Orphic-Pythagorean tradition had phenomena very similar to what zombies recount. - Cfr *R. Baccou, trad., Platon, République, Paris, 1966, 379.*

### ***Other testimonials.***

The Eskimos, like many Indians, Samoyeds, and Finns, claim that every living being, yes, even every object possesses a subtle shadow (image) -- "an incorporeal effigy."-- Thus literally *H. von Glasenapp, The Non-Christian Gods, Antw./Utr., 1967, 225.*

**Note.--** The "accompanying image" is not the soul, but what is "emitted" by the image-giving reality and "seen" or "felt" by sensitives and "visionaries" (mantically gifted). Thus the subtle soul itself, in its own way, emits an image.

**Note --** A similar doctrine proclaimed Demokritos of Abdera (-460/-370; atomist): aliens, e.g., give off 'eidola', effigies, which are often received by humans.-Cfr. *W. Rödl, Die Philosophie der Antike, 1 (Von Thales bis Demokrit), (The Philosophy of Antiquity, 1 (From Thales to Democritus)), Munich, Beek, 1976, 193.*

So much for the perceptibility of the soul, central to the buried state of the zombies.

**Note.--** One can also consciously cause the out-of-body experience, oneself: *Carlo Ginzburg, De Benandanti (Witchcraft and fertility rites in the 16th and 17th centuries), Amsterdam, Bakker, 1986, especially 41vv..*

Both the Benandanti and the witches (whom they fight) step out - including after rubbing themselves with "ointments and oils" just before they fall asleep, and live through journeys (including meetings), about which they can recount.

***The zombie existence.***

O.c., 154vv.. -- “Clairvius’ matamorphosis from human to zombie was a very special example of Voodoo death. -- Through the incantation of a sorcerer, a prolonged process was set in motion, during which the victim’s greatest fears were exploited and the community’s faith that empowered this fear was mobilized until, finally, death ensued.

In the eyes of the Haitian peasants, Narcisse really did die and that which, magically, was unearthed was no longer a “human being.” -- Like many magicians in the world, the bokor who plotted his death possessed a prop,--in this case an ingenious poison (...). Nevertheless, it was -- in the final analysis -- not the powder that sealed Narcisse’s fate, but his own brain”.

**Note.--** Davis underscores, in this text, the influence of the conceptions of magic, voodoo, zombies, prevalent in the group.

“To Narcisse, a zombie was a being without a will that lingered on the border of the natural world,--a being that could not express itself either as a spirit or as a human being. Zombies do not speak; they cannot take care of themselves and do not even know their own name. Their fate is slavery. (...) A fate (...) that is literally worse than death: the loss of physical freedom that slavery brings, and the sacrifice of personal autonomy (self-reliance) that results from the loss of identity. (...).

And, to spare the deceased such a horrible fate, the relatives of the dead sometimes reluctantly mutilate the corpse (*note*: think of the nail they chase through the wood of the coffin to actually kill) if one suspects that “foul play” has been played. Unless, of course, the family itself is involved in the zombification”.

**Note.--** As it turns out, the zombie is still “a living one” after the exhumation but “no longer himself” (loss of identity), but economically useful for routine -- labor of the simplest type,-- at a farmer’s house, for example. -- “And yet: given the availability of cheap labor, there seems to be no economic motive for creating an underpaid labor army.”

**Note --** In other words, Davis insinuates that the reason for zombification lies elsewhere. Not in economic calculation.

***Zora Neale Hurston's hypothesis, Tell My Horse (1939).***

In a monograph by Melville Herskovits on Voodoo society, she read that, in the valley of Mirebalais, secret societies - think e.g. of our "lodges" - existed that "terrorized" the local population. According to Herskoville, the well-known Africa expert, these secret societies used methods that referred to the Zangbeto, a secret society that he knew from Dahomey (since 1975 Benin, in West Africa).

The Haitian societies were so inaccessible that Herskovits had only found out the names of two of them with the greatest difficulty, -- namely, "bisago" (reminiscent of "bizango," the name of a secret society) and "les Cochons sans Poils" (the Hairless Pigs).

***Hurston*** was a young American black and ethnologist, born in an all-black village in Florida,--with an understanding of "the roots" of her Negro culture. She was therefore able to do fieldwork, particularly "participating observation", in the Deep South of the USA.

She also went to Haiti. Applied the same method but with very limited success, "According to her informants, the Haitian secret societies met secretly at night,---called together by a special high-pitched drum. The members recognized each other through ritualized greetings learned at initiation and through identity papers (passports) (...) (O.c.,239).

Notwithstanding her African method, Hurston did not find out that it was these secret societies that were doing the zombifying. But her study set in motion.

In 1976, Michel Laguerre, a young Haitian anthropologist, succeeded in testing Hurston 's hypothesis. Some peasants, once invited to become members, had been converted to Protestantism: they dared to speak! They said: secret societies exist in all parts of Haiti, each with a precisely defined territory.

Names: Zobop, Bizango, Vlinbindingue, San Poel, Mandingue and Macandal. Invitation and initiation was condition of membership. Both women and men belonged. There was an authoritarian organization. But - contrary to what Hurston had thought he knew, these societies were - not criminal.

On the contrary, they were the conscience par excellence of the peasantry, a more or less political structure of the voodoo population. Its first task was: the protection of the community.-- “Like the secret societies in W. Africa, the Haitians were, in Laguerre’s eyes, the main arbiter where culture was concerned” (O.c., 242).

*Note.--* In a very similar vein, *K. Pfund, Ich, Waibadi, Regenmacher, Zauberer und Konig*, Kreuzlingen, 1982, 72f. writes: the magi are largely the ones responsible for the welfare of society. Pushing through the order of the tribe regarding ensuring the maintenance of the weak, old, deficient. Observing the office of policeman, judge, and punisher in a society that ... has no prisons. The support of people in their work. The religious ceremonies that provoke the assistance of the spirits.

### ***The culture gap.***

We already said it: Premodern and Modern are separated by a gap.

**a.** The rural population saw in zombification, for example, anything but crime, quite the contrary. It was because of recognized groups a social sanction in response to a border crossing.

**b.** The main medical authorities and the Westernized élite saw in zombification a crime that had to be eradicated.-- “There was no doubt that in West Africa, poisons were used by judicial bodies to punish those who violated the codes of the secret societies. Hurston had raised the possibility that the secret societies of Haiti were applying the same kind of sanction.” (O.c., 243).

### ***Narcissus’s border crossing.***

O.c., 155v. -- In his inherited territory - lakou - Narcisse was expelled for the reason of a quarrel concerning the sale of inherited land. His brother -- and his entire family -- disagreed with him. Numerous quarrels with his brothers ensued. He had made money, but did not want to help his family. More than that, he had compromised numerous women (according to Angelina Narcisse, his sister; o.c., 88v.).

His brother had ‘sold’ him to the bokor. -- Such is ‘crossing taboos’, and -- in Antique Greek -- ‘hubris’, boundary crossing (see o.c., 289, where a sevenfold list of taboos is rendered: exceptional gain, stealing another’s wife, disrespecting equals, speaking slanderous language etc.).

### **'Taboo'**

Originally "tapu" (South Pacific).-- Since Freud's Totem und Tabu, a psychologized concept has been in circulation (in a pre-moral stage, a person projects from an inner conflict something "to be avoided" into something).

**Bibl. st.:** Hutton Webster, *Le tabou (étude sociologique)*, (The taboo (sociological study)), Paris, 1952.-- All areas of life are shielded by shunning - taboos: spirits, the dead (death itself),-- strangers,-- authority figures,-- sacred things (temples, tombs, objects of worship),-- sexual relations, pregnancy, childbearing, -- separation of the sexes, -- foodstuffs, -- property. -- Linguistically, "Thou shalt not" or "To shun." -- Webster distinguishes two main types, i.e., what is taboo due to deities or so, and what is taboo "automatically," i.e., of its own accord.

**Final sum.--** All that is inviolable, i.e. that which may not be violated, is taboo.

### **Religious background.**

Davis dwells at length on religious presuppositions.-- For example, he says, a.c., 192, that voodoo is animism. Animism usually means "belief in souls and spirits." Voodoo has a more elaborate spirit teaching and a more elaborate soul teaching.

The 'loa's' (pronounced: lwa) or spirits - deities if you will - are many in number and function deities (Usener): Ogoun is the fire loa, Agwe the loa of the sea. Erzulie is the loa of love drive. Ghede is the loa of the dead. E.d.m..

### **The soul is multifaceted:**

n' âme is the soul insofar as it founds the biological body (after death it slowly moves into the organisms of the earth);

z' étoile is the soul as far as the remnant of a previous life as a lucky star, in the high heavens;

ti bon ange is the soul as far as source of individuality (willpower, character);

gros bon ange is the soul insofar as it is bathed in the overall cosmic energy.-

The ti bon ange is the target of magic. This is all the more understandable since the ti bon ange easily exits (e.g. during sleep in dreams; also after a sudden shock, when one feels 'empty'). Especially during an intoxication, 'trance', when a loa enters the voodoo trailer, the ti bon ange (what we call the individual soul) is rendered inoperative.

Hence the high concern to shield the ti bon ange from (black) magic. The zombification has something to do with the isolation of ti bon ange by the bokor.



### *Narcisse's escape.*

O.c., 86v.. -- Narcisse explained that he had been sold to a bokor named Josef Jean who had held him captive on a plantation. Along with a large number of other zombies, he had toiled there, from dawn to dusk, as a laborer on the land. The only rest they had was for the only meal they had been given per day: they had eaten the normal peasant food,---such that salt was absolutely absent (*note*: salt, in Haiti, is a revelation agent in occult matters).

A coincidence marked his “liberation”: a prisoner had refused to eat for several days; he had been repeatedly beaten for rebellion. While he, now, was being beaten once more, the zombie managed to grab a heel with which, in a fit of rage, he killed the bokor.

After the death of their “master,” the zombies had run off, in all directions. After he had been released, Narcisse had stayed in the north for years, then moved south, where he had lived for eight years. Although he dared not return to his village -- for fear of his brother -- he had written many letters to his family,--who never replied. Until when he learned that his brother had died. The community, upon his return, was shocked. The villagers had scolded him. To protect him, the authorities had put him away in prison. At that point, Dr. Lamarque Douyon admitted him to his private clinic. Cfr. *KF--RH 51*.

*Note* - Unlike the method in the Trobriand Islands, where there is no prison, the bokor system amounts to a kind of slave labor.

### *The zombie powder.*

*Bibl. st.:* *Cedos, Recherche. -- Rebondissement dans l' affaire de la "poudre à zombies, (Rebound in the case of the "zombie powder), in: Journal de Genève 06.03,1989.--*

**1983:** Davis obtains, from the hands of five “magicians,” the magic powder. Ground bones of a disinterred child, minerals, plants, critters (toad, tetrodon (= coffin fish)) are in it.

**1986:** Some specialists find “nothing”; others dare not publish anything. Until Dr. Rivier (Lausanne) discovers that if one does not process the powder with water, it contains small fragments of cutting minerals that open the skin and cause the poison (TTX = tetrodoxin) to enter the blood.

**Sample 13 : Biblical group dynamics. (58/61)**

Already *KF--RH 04* this theme was touched upon briefly.-- We are now deepening this a little.-- Instead of theorizing, we are taking situations. In order to shed some theoretical light on them.

E.g. *Matt 2:1/8 (The picking of ears on the Sabbath)*.-- At that time Jesus was going through the harvest fields - during a Sabbath. His disciples had an appetite and they went out to pick the ears and eat them.

This the Pharisees observed, whereupon they said, “Behold thy disciples do a thing which is not allowed on the Sabbath!” -- but Jesus: “Have you not read what David did when he and his retinue were hungry? How he entered the house of God and they ate the bread, which neither he nor his retinue were allowed to eat but only the priests? Or have you not read -- in the law -- that -- during the Sabbath -- it is the priests, of all people, who break the Sabbath rest in the temple, without being guilty? -- And I say to you, here is one who is greater than the temple. Had ye truly understood what it means, “Mercy will I and not sacrifice,” ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For ‘the son of man’ is the lord of the Sabbath”.

As *La Bible de Jérusalem* rightly says: not the picking of the ears, but rather “the labor” on Sabbath, was, in one possible interpretation of *Exodus 34:21*, forbidden by the Jewish casuistry (moral-case interpretation).-- Jesus acting as “the Son of Man”: i.e., as one who exhibits the behavior of a human being (and not -- as it is said in the prophet Daniel -- the behavior of animals),-- who knows that, after His humiliation, He will be glorified, is already acting, before that glorification is fully there, as “the Lord of the Sabbath.

**Note.--** Which reminds us of *Acts 17:31*: “Look! God closes His eyes to “the times of ignorance.” He now lets men know that all, everywhere, are subject to repentance in that He has set a day when the universe will be judged “with justice,” -- by a Man whom He has destined for it. For which He has given proof to all by raising Him from the dead”.

**Note --** In other words, the Jewish culture of those days had its values, standards, ideals and expectations system that Jesus apparently replaces with a different values, ideals, standards and expectations system,--at least in part.

**Note.--** Reread *KF--RH 56 (taboo)*.-- The hyper-restrictive interpretation regarding Sabbath rest - it continues, among “orthodox” (right-believing) Jews, to this day: pressing an electric contact on Saturday, e.g., is “sin” - is clearly one sample of typically Biblical taboo view. Just as strict and narrow-minded as with “the Gentiles”.

**Note --** It is as S. Paul clearly insinuates, *Galat. 4:3*: “We too during our immaturity, -- we were subject to the “elements of the world”. According to *la Bible de Jérusalem*, “elements of the world” means all that is presuppositional of this earthly world order of which the value system of the Jewish Law is one application,--value system which, among other things. has as its premise extraterrestrial spirits - cf. *KF-- RH 45 (ancestral spirits)*; (*56spirit teaching*) - commonly called ‘angels’, in Biblical language, which by means of the Law (*Galat. 3:19*) tried to keep the universe, including Judaism, under their power. Jesus, as the supreme judge, as we have just seen, anticipates the end times in order to break that will to control.

***A second sample.***

*John 8:2/11*.-- The Adulteress.-- At the dawn of the early morning, Jesus was back in the temple. All the people came to Him. He sat down and taught.-- Now the Scribes and Pharisees brought a woman caught in adultery and placed her in the circle.-- To Jesus they said, “Master, this woman has been caught in the act of adultery. Well, in the Law Moses has commanded us to stone such women. Ye, now,--what have ye now to say?”.

This they said to put Jesus to the test so that they could find him guilty. -- But Jesus bent down to write with his finger on the ground. But they persisted with the question. Whereupon Jesus arose and said, “That he among you who is without sin cast the first stone upon her!” -

Jesus bent down again and wrote on the ground. When they learned this, however, they left, one after another, -- starting with the most elderly.

He was left alone with the woman still in the circle. Jesus straightened up again and said, “Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you?”. She: “No one, Lord.” -- Jesus: “I too do not condemn you. Go free without yielding to sin any more”.

**Notes:**

**a.** The taboo, again the sign of the cosmic elements that bring casuistry to a head and thus culpabilize without end, is here quite a bit more “inviolable” than that of Sabbath rest.

**b.** Since Jesus as He performs, sets Himself up as a deviant - vis-à-vis the value system, viz. To banish Him. -- That’s that eternal group dynamic!

**Third sample.**

*Luk. 7: 36vv.*-- Anointing by a sinner. According to connoisseurs of Scripture, this is an event that only Luke, the Greek physician, recounts. See here the essentials.

A Pharisee invites Jesus to “dinner”. “Look a woman who, in the city, had the fame of ‘sinner’!”. She had a jar of perfume with her. “The eyes full of tears she went after Him, to His feet. She set herself to weeping so that her tears fell down on Jesus’ feet. But she dried off with her hair, -- covered His feet with kisses and ... anointed them with the perfume.

When the Pharisee (...) saw this, he said within himself, “If this man were a prophet, he would know who this woman is who is touching him and what she is: ‘a sinner’!”

Yet Jesus (...), “Simon, I have something to say to you. (...).” The sequel is known: Jesus forgives her her sins, insinuating that she -- seen from the end-time moral point of view and from His right-wing position -- loves much more than the distinguished Pharisee.-- Which the attendants grasp and do as a borderline violation: “ Who is He that He ventures to forgive sins?”

**Opm.--** *G. van Rad, Theologie des Alten Testaments, I (Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Ueberlieferungen Israëls)*, (Theology of the Old Testament, I (The Theology of the Historical Traditions of Israel)), Munich, Kaiser, 1961, 428, tells us - with *Jerem. 18/19* - that the law characterizes priesthood, where the word characterizes prophethood and insight characterizes wisdom.

Immediately we have three text types. In his *Theologie des Alten Testaments, II (Theology of the Prophetic Revelations of Israel)*, Munich 1961, 314ff, the expert von Rad elaborates widely on a fourth type of text, namely the apocalyptic genre. One of the characteristics, practically speaking, of an apocalypticist is clairvoyance (giftedness).

What others, feel to be “mysterious” or even “bizarre,” is to the revealer (“apo.kalupsis” is literally “disclosure” (of what is veiled, occult, hidden)), “clear” - transparent.

And indeed, “Jesus did not trust them because He knew everyone and did not need to be told about anyone, because He Himself knew very well what was going on in people.” (*John 2:24/25*).

So St. John is very clear: Jesus, as judge over the living and the dead, was gifted: He saw through - like all good clairvoyants - people. - It is striking that S. John emphasizes the distrust: “Now while He was at Jerusalem, during the Passover, many believed in His name,--at the sight of the signs which He performed.” (*John 2:23*). In other words: His “success” was pointed out just before that! (Cfr. *Jn. 9: 39/41*). Success, in apocalyptic context, is easily ‘suspected’. ‘Naïve’, then, Jesus was by no means when He ‘judged’ - passed judgment - on the Sabbath rest, on the adulteress, or on the woman with her jar of perfume.

### ***The elimination.***

After the three samples - the Gospel is full of such samples - it is clear: Jesus’ presuppositions, however traditional (at first glance), are only partially the same as those of his Jewish milieu. Not only that: He simultaneously acts consistently according to those presuppositions! -- Which was to provoke conflict, for sometimes it concerned matters of principal.

“The feast of Easter and the feast of unleavened bread was to continue two days later. The chief priests and scribes sought to find out how they could apprehend Jesus by outcry to put Him to death. For they said within themselves, “Not in the midst of the celebration! There might be another uproar on account of the people!” (*Mark. 14:1/2*).- - If Matthew correctly reflects, Jesus “knew” without being informed (*John 2:24v.*).

“He said to the disciples: Easter--you know it--is coming in two days. The Son of Man (*KF--RH 58*) will then be betrayed to be crucified.” (*Matt. 26:1/2*).

*Luke (22: 3vv.)*: “Satan entered into Judas, the Iscariot viz. one of the Twelve. He went to consult. with the chief priests and the commanders how he would deliver Him to them.” -- As always in “the world” as it is: treason!

***Table of Contents. 1992/1993.***

0.-- Rhetoric (01).-- Culture is values (goals (ideals), norms and expectations), Philosophy of Culture (= CF) is the study of them.-- Rhetoric studies the practice of values (= sensitivity training), -especially through language skills, but also in action (through exile e.g. from “the group”). We denote this by ‘RH’! -- Two human sciences as a starting point:

- a. group dynamics (Dewey, Lewin) ,
- b. institutions analysis (= social critique).
- 1.-- Marxist - Leninist brainwashing (02/06).
- 2.-- Communist brainwashing of prisoners of war (07/08).
- 3.-- Western groups (09/14).
- 4.-- Western groups (15/17).
- 5.-- Western groups (18/21).
- 6.-- Western groups (22/25).
- 7.-- Bhagwan groups (26/35).
- 8.-- The mythological group (36/40).
- 9.-- The mythological group (41/43).
- 10.-- Ethnoreligious model of group dynamics (44/48).
- 11.-- Zombification (49/57).
- 12.-- Biblical group dynamics (58/61)

---

It is clear, after studying these twelve chapters that culture always goes hand in hand with community: values are advocated not by one person but by superiors. Culturology is therefore always sociology. But immediately it is abundantly clear that values constitute the soul itself - which Platon, following in Socrates’ footsteps, stated very clearly - So culture study is invariably psychology.

Behind these two so-called human sciences - group dynamics and social criticism - lies a triad: individual / group (community) / culture. -- The study of those three in one, interwoven, is what is at work throughout those twelve chapters -- samples, to make it - for beginners -- not too difficult.

**Note** -- The Antiques, whom one sometimes despises so much in the name of these human sciences, called this triad “ethics / politics”. Ethics, insofar as the individual, the group and the values must correspond to conscience -- what is the individual, the community and the “value” without conscience? -. Politics, insofar as all this took place within the ‘polis’ the city-state, -- the very small-scale ‘group’ in antiquity. Which still remains actualizable.