

Kerfuffle Therapy

(Kerfuffle - a commotion or fuss, especially one caused by conflicting views.

This title pokes fun at ourselves for taking ourselves so seriously)

This article provides a case study on the 'Trouble in the Merighturong'. It considers what can be learned from a kerfuffle that occurred in a group I'm involved with. The pitfalls identified are generic and particularly relevant to principle or ideologically based organisations.

Introduction

We tend to conflate peace, love, brotherhood, unconditional love and the ideal of 'the people deciding everything collectively' with 'New Age' or 'enlightened' thinking. These apparently simple, straightforward, seemingly obvious and desirable things sound wonderful, but haven't worked out so well for us recently.

So we all need to face and figure out the reality of how, with all of these well-intentioned people and supposedly 'right' beliefs, we still got to the position of not being able to adequately communicate among ourselves. We even got the founder to the point where he felt he had to step in to prevent implementation of his vision vaporising!

We are a belief/ principle-based organisation. Such organisations can provide wonderful places for everybody with the same ideas to get together to find out how they (or some of them) really don't work. That seems to be what's just happened! Being the type of organisation that we are means that we have to deal more closely with personal convictions, and therefore emotions, than organisations set up solely to run businesses or projects. So it will be useful to ignore all the logical arguments for and against the particular issue that generated the steam and instead focus on figuring out how our attitudes and approaches to those principles still subverted us.

This article identifies and addresses five contributing factors:

1. implementation difficulties with some "New Age" concepts,
2. the experienced practitioner confidence problem,
3. differing notions of leadership,
4. approaches to problem solving and
5. not recognising our own individual power.

These are addressed individually below.

1. Implementation difficulties with 'New Age' concepts

I will first give the background I bring to addressing this. I got heavily into the 'New Age' movement in the early 1980s, over 40 years ago. I did every course or therapy I could find, from Primal Scream and Rolfing to Findhorn/ Mystery School teachings and Brisbane Relaxation Centre personal growth courses. The latter greatly helped me deal with marriage breakup. I eventually stopped, knowing it would take me years to fully integrate into my life what I had already learned. Now, although I no longer have my hippie 'uniform' of flowing shirt, harem pants and beads, I didn't reject the useful concepts I learned.

But after 'believing' so strongly in this for so many years, I was stunned to find that the whole 'New Age' movement had been Controlled Opposition, encompassing Billy Graham as well as many other major luminaries of the time! I learned this from X-Factor winner and former

Masonic insider Altiyan Childs in his 5-hour video at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Eeo-82Eac8> which demonstrates this most uncomfortable truth very clearly.

It was a shock realising its ideology was yet another enormously elaborate, sophisticated, globally coordinated production, staged especially for our 'benefit' across decades. It was designed to keep us entertained, inwardly focused and nicely distracted away from the control that was actually being exerted over us via that and other ideologies and their associated narratives. So, we might perhaps need to be a little wary of blindly applying 'New Age' concepts universally. We need to be as sceptical of these as we are of applying some authoritarian corporate attitudes and techniques. The difficulty is now in recognising or working out which of both sets of techniques actually work and which herd us back into the coercive control paradigm.

We also need to recognise that this ideological and psychological operation was done so well, that some people who were controlled opposition will not have known it. The system controllers simply allowed, even encouraged (and possibly funded) them to continue with their passion for their strong but incomplete belief, as it would contribute to the general confusion necessary for divide and conquer strategy of the coercive control paradigm to be implemented.

To address this, we need to consider how Controlled Opposition is generated. One 'good' way is to develop and publicise a perspective/ view/ narrative/ knowledge/ ideology that contains perhaps 80 to 95% truth, while omitting the remaining critical facts. Trust and belief cannot be generated by falsehoods. But the remaining 5 to 15% is what will give us the full truth enabling us to succeed. So that's what we can't be allowed to know - if we are to be kept coercively controlled through opposing each other - so our masters don't have to and can pose as our 'saviours'. So, we need to seek out the % that's been left out.

2. The experienced practitioner confidence problem

As we all live in the coercive control system, we all risk being 'enlightened' in some things we've woken up to, while still missing some other key points. We will be tempted to think we know it all when we don't necessarily – or at least, not within all contexts. We may well know sufficient in the contexts we're familiar with working in. We will think that the knowledge we have worked hard to gain there makes our judgements 'right' or 'more perceptive' more often than 'others'.

We may even think that because we are so perceptive there, we're naturally perceptive in everything else. This will cause problems if we are actually an amateur at things we think we're automatically good or 'professional' at. And sometimes, a little knowledge is more dangerous than none at all. This can pose particular difficulty for volunteer organisations where there is no pre-screening out via typical job suitability/ selection processes. But this amounts to the same thing as the experienced practitioner problem – people's self-confidence getting away with itself.

This self-confidence can be a trap, because it drops our egos into an unwitting emotional attitude of superiority. When our knowledge and successful experience have led us to recognise something as being blindingly obvious and immutably true, we'll easily fall into the 'contradict and condescend' approach, sharing the benefit of our own perceived and internally verified wisdom, and just wishing others would 'wake up'. This is faux personal growth - seeing what everybody else needs to do while remaining self-assuredly asleep to other contexts or key points lurking in our own blind spots. We may even take great offence if this is suggested by others. We will likely see everybody else as needing to reflect and grow personally, while not

needing or wanting the disconcertment of recognising any need for personal growth within ourselves. We think we're already there so we're not in need of it!

This can trick us into jumping at shadows and fighting phantoms that don't exist, when the enemy is actually within. It can ensure we don't identify the right problem. What we see as knowledgeable confidence, others may see as ignorance, arrogance, controlling or hijacking.

Unfortunately, personal growth is generally about coming to realisations we didn't previously see. Life provides us with the frustrations and roadblocks necessary for us to be brought to see them. It confronts us until we learn. If we have those things in front of us and feel emotional charge regarding them, there's a fair chance that life is desperately trying to get our attention, to look at something we find uncomfortable and are oblivious to. We get many such uncomfortable reminders before we push life into concluding it needs to give us an even more forceful lesson – as per the old Mystery School 'maxim' that if we can learn our lessons by listening, we don't need to have them dramatized. Those circumstances will persist or keep repeating until we realise and start genuinely asking what it is that life is trying to tell us - that we really, badly, truly don't want to learn! Whether all this is true or not, it is a most useful assumption as it enables us to regain control of situations by modulating our own actions and reactions. Might that not be the essence of this self-governance business that we're all trying to figure out? There is great benefit in developing the humility needed to push through these personal discomforts.

It's very difficult for personal growth to be done in public. Attempts at public resolution easily devolve into protagonists pointing to their logical reasons, while they continue missing, or being unable to see or understand the other logic that happens to be in their blind spot. When cornered, people will generally defend their thinking, proclaim their view is 100% correct and absolutely universal in every other context, and stridently try to prove it. But when it's not universal, or there's some underlying fundamental that's missing or being overlooked, no amount of continuing that approach will work – whether in private or in public.

So how do we handle the inevitable conflict of experienced confident practitioner egos interacting and going incandescent?

Well, in relation to our recent difficulty, I don't need to hear any more justifications about why the other view was wrong. I'm satisfied with whatever grasp I have on the various views. It's enough for me to know that life has brought those parties together for its own purposes, for them to grow. I'm happy accepting that two lots of well-intentioned people somehow got into an accidental pickle, and there but for the grace of God go I. But what could benefit me greatly is, if and when they are eventually ready, hearing in public what they came to recognise had been their blind spot, and how and why they hadn't appreciated the other view. That may well help me with something I haven't yet realised that I might need to learn.

For me, the answer (in kerfuffles among well-intentioned people) is always how did I not see the context that the other person did. I'll have no chance of either convincing them or self-correcting if I don't do that. We are all in charge of ourselves. We all have the power to make ourselves more sufferable when things start to get heated if we instead choose to focus on understanding the other's context. If we're all saying that we're all learning, and those words actually mean anything, why make such heavy weather of it and not want to learn anything ourselves?

With so many experienced practitioners in our midst, the ego conflict problem is one we inevitably had to confront. I feel that's the barrier we have to hurdle to make the quantum jump in consciousness necessary for us individually, and our group collectively, to succeed. If we can do that, we will have benefitted from the kerfuffle and turned it into a positive.

We may need to be asking ourselves "Am I so well developed that personal growth is for everyone else except me? Might my ego have become engaged without my even realising it? Might this be telling me I have a blind spot?" If we think "I don't have any blind spot!", well consider this: you can't see what's in your blind spot and don't know you have one because that's what a blind spot is!

3. Leadership

I'll first clarify a few terms. To lead is simply to show the way. Leadership is the ability to show the way and to induce others to follow. This is different from management which is the act of taking charge, and strategic management, which is the act of taking charge of the pattern in a series of future actions.

Leadership is a neutral tool. It can be used for 'good' or 'bad'. But for any organisation to succeed at anything, it cannot avoid having all of those things just defined. The fact that we see so much dreadful leadership in the world does not mean we should have none.

The difficult question then becomes how to marry leadership with the principle of having all important decisions made by the people.

The answer is to conceptually separate the organisational structures and operations we set up for achieving things, from the process for deciding what they are there to achieve i.e. determining the will of the people.

The former operates hierarchically with some control whereas the latter doesn't. Both have to be present and coexist peacefully. Getting everyone to decide everything will be a disaster. Aside from bogging things down completely and producing paralysis, it will end up resorting to the tyranny of voting to decide intellectually challenging matters. Decisions will then be made on the basis of the number of uninformed, hoodwinked, disinterested and possibly bored or prejudiced people, that some smooth talker has managed to con! Democracy is not a universal panacea.

At our current state of development, and within the consciousness imposed upon us by the existing coercive control system, which we are still working out how to extract ourselves from, the 'brown's cows' approach to leadership (i.e. being not necessary because we are all connected to and following source and so need no leader) is doomed to fail. Unless and until a sufficient number can reach the necessary level of understanding, operation and mental connection, such an ideal will remain aspirational. It's not false or wrong. It's just too advanced to be universally useful for us right now. It doesn't accommodate our current context.

That doesn't mean we should be looking to and relying upon some great leader to save us. But it does mean we need to take on some of the means of achieving things that the existing system has very well developed. It knows how to get stuff done! The problem is that a lot of what it does is the wrong stuff. But there's no problem with some, perhaps many of its techniques (80 to 95% possibly?), and there is little point in us reinventing the wheel when there are so many other problems needing to be fixed. We just need to make sure we don't throw the baby out with the

bathwater by focusing on the tool used to commit atrocity, rather than on identifying the real enemy, which is the intent/ paradigm/ philosophy driving it.

4. Approaches to Problem Solving - when it isn't needed or it's the wrong problem

There can be times when we might take the words of a request for help too literally and imagine we are actually being asked to solve the problem when that's not really what's meant. On such occasions, we don't need to ride in on our Knight's white horse, take charge and micromanage them through our solution! (It is both easy and lucrative to do this in consulting, and the big four accounting firms make a killing out of doing this, generating dependency wherever they can). But when a child/ partner/ colleague just needs to be comforted, reassured or supported in some way, they may then (even want to) solve the problem for themselves, or realise it's not so insurmountable after all and it might just go away. They might just need the growth that comes from facing that challenge and who am I to deprive them of that opportunity?

The 'white horse' approach is certainly useful for achieving things quickly. But the danger for those of us with corporate leadership or consulting backgrounds doing this, is in potentially generating the experienced practitioner interaction problem mentioned above and generating unnecessary resistance from others who are also striving to grow and be self-governing while simply coming at it within a different context.

Furthermore, when we (think we) know it all, we tend to contradict and condescend. How on earth will that inspire and bring other people along with us!

5. Not recognising our own individual power

When we take on leading/ chairing/ organising roles within a volunteer organisation, we accept some obligation to perform. We also accept a time commitment that reduces our other life options. We then focus on doing the job and on all that remains to be achieved, often without recognising the power or social capital that this gives us relative to others within the group. This can lead to unknowingly acting in a way that those in the group without that power may find objectionable or consider an abuse of our power (that we hadn't realised we had).

Conclusion

If we don't see through them, our kerfuffles can lead us to rediscover the very same thing mankind has been rediscovering for millennia. That is, when we find our fancy, idealistic principles (for everybody else) didn't work, we conclude with self-righteous certainty that coercive control is the only way of managing groups to achieve anything. That conclusion neatly avoids dealing with own egos.

Kerfuffles provide us with a wonderful chance to wake up to ourselves! We just need to be prepared to suffer the pain of working out what it can teach us – and forget about what anyone else might need to learn. They can look after themselves and their own growth. We just need to get ourselves out of our very own Truman show that our own egos readily drop us into. If we can't see it and do that, how on earth are we going to get out of the bigger one that the world's in? If we could sort our own out, the rest of the world will be better able to fix itself as well.

The 'therapy' that a kerfuffle provides batters our egos painfully, possibly even more than the physical pain of Rolwing. But it provides a useful 'glass ceiling' that is most rewarding to break through. We just need to overcome our resistance to attempting it. Learning enough to be able to tell everybody else where the problems are and what is needed to solve them is just the

beginner's course. Recognising where and when we need to be doing something ourselves is a whole other matter that our ego will keep hidden from us if we let it. That's where the advanced course is. We never want Kerfuffle therapy, but life will give it to us when we need it.

Finally, the following popped up in an article in one of my feeds as I was writing this. It is perhaps worthy of reflection.

Proverbs 12:18-19 The words of the reckless pierce like swords, but the tongue of the wise brings healing.

Proverbs 12:18-19 Those who guard their mouths and their tongues keep themselves from calamity.

What harm can it do any of us, if we were to strive towards achieving that wisdom?

Recognising the five things above may provide some assistance.