

Newsletter 20: The Rejected Feelings (Loneliness)



August 2017

Dear Friends of the spiritual movement,

In our exploration of the path of self-knowledge in this newsletter, we come back one last time to the rejected feelings. In later letters we want to turn to specific aspects and transitions within the process of self-knowledge and then finally to our Innermost, which we hope to open up through this venture.

Of course, there are many other emotional facets within the realm of rejected feelings - such as despair, sorrow, disappointment, rejection, being not understood, hopelessness, being lost, neediness and many more - that would be worth paying our attention to. They are all expressions and offshoots of the pain and woe that people always like to avoid. However, since everyone adept in self-knowledge must anyway walk the entire path in substance and in person and cannot rely on the theoretical knowledge of others, it will suffice here to discuss only the most important rejected states in more detail. Within this process, every aspect of this intensive journey will anyway reveal itself to any serious explorer. And the principle behind it, which always remains the same, will also become increasingly clear to them: behind every defence and resistance, if we investigate carefully, we always discover repressed states, which in the case of defensive feelings, such as anger and hate, suppress other original rejected feelings, such as sorrow and shame. That these rejected feelings are still responsible for a certain evasion of reality and thus alienate us from our Innermost, is something that we will outline more clearly in a few months' time, when we get to know the core within ourselves.

As previously said, today we want to turn to the deepest feeling in the realm of rejected states: loneliness. On the one hand, because it comprises something equivalent to the ultimate rejected feeling, that which you will eventually encounter in every confrontation with rejected feelings. And on the other hand, because it correlates, as a rejected feeling, with the defensive state of pleasure orientation that we looked at earlier.

Loneliness is the innermost content of all that is rejected, that which we most want to avoid in all our defensive actions, yet whose acceptance ultimately shows a very special beauty. Loneliness is almost pure original pain as it occurs within us when we are hurt, and hence it forms the opening gateway to the ever sacred and whole Innermost, the core of our being.

Pain is as much part of our authentic original nature as the desire or longing that we examined in connection with defensive states (in particular, pleasure orientation). These are not feelings created, influenced or corrupted by fearful thinking. They appear in us by themselves in innocence, and they soon disappear again if we let them be, just as we can see with small children who get hurt. They cry for a moment and then merrily keep on playing.

The problem that self-knowledge ultimately uncovers and overcomes is that all emotional reactions - including the to some extent the real feelings that we call the rejected feelings - are either created by the thinking that initiates them or are transformed from original pain. Hence we begin to fall out of innocence, which means that the resulting hurt does not immediately 'fade' again, cannot heal again, but is increasingly banished by the thinking into the unconscious, where the original hurt can no longer dissolve itself, but is instead further distorted, manipulated and preserved. Thus, under the guidance of anxious ego-based thinking, innocent

and genuine woe first give rise to feelings of a rejected nature such as sorrow and abandonment, and from out of these rejected feelings arise the subsequent defensive states such as self-pity and jealousy, and then from these defensive states arise obstinacy and resistance by means of the power of thought and further rejection and repression of defensive feelings. If these feelings become more dense and subsequently even more armoured, isolated and deposited in the body and if they also succeed in wrapping the initial fear to a large extent in unconscious stupor, we finally have the perverted normal person who is only able to function like a robot, a zombie, in conformity, conditioning and habit.

This whole tragic misguided process is revealed by self-knowledge and reversed by the power of seeing, of pure perception. Misguided because every child in our world - a world conditioned to this self-isolated form of existence, to illusionary separation - is massively injured by the confrontation with the zombies that educate it and is conditioned anew and pushed in the direction of this kind of conformity. If they were born into a world not based on fearful defence against reality, there would still be a certain ego-formation that would take place. But any pressure to conform would lead in the direction of a functional ego, transparent in its transient nature, which could be abandoned again at any time in favour of the original state of non-separation. Quite apart from the fact that the original pain that induces this ego formation would remain moderate, since the child would not be received by zombies lacking compassion, but by whole compassionate beings.

The original state that self-knowledge helps to restore thus knows little or no feelings and only little fear. A correspondingly loving and paradise-like environment would not encourage the emergence and consolidation of such feelings. Instead it would help to quickly dissolve them every time they arise.

As soon as the person adept at self-knowledge comes into contact once again with the deep loneliness that slumbers in every rejected feeling, the dissolution of his structures of suffering is likely to be imminent. Nevertheless, as we have seen before, many seekers get stuck in this 'most stupid' place, just before the finish line. This may be related to the basic stupidity and ineptness that most of us display throughout the process, or even to a lack of evolutionary maturity. We've already considered all this before. However, perhaps this strong defensive mechanism of pleasure orientation may also play a role here. It ensures that we never definitively break out of the system of conformity, but rather remain at the very least addicts who can continue to be exploited.

The defence mechanism of hedonism, the addiction to pleasure, uses the basic human trait which the warriors, as already mentioned earlier, call the nearly invincible laxness of the human condition. We like to let ourselves go, we love looking for comfort and alternative satisfaction, we are lazy and often prefer not knowing exactly about things. We usually do not pursue self-knowledge seriously. On whatever grounds this may be based, whether founded on evolution or on conditioning, it is only important for us here that there needs to be a counter-balance, which we must develop within us by applying the warrior's attitude.

This is also part of self-knowledge: being concerned about the instruments that are helpful and can support us on our way. As we recall from our previous excursions: warrior training, meditation, community building, Tantra, psycholysis, etc. Those adept at self-knowledge will concern themselves with all these themes in order to escape the abyss of dependency and addiction.

Earlier we talked about love as a black hole that draws in and purifies all that is discordant and inharmonious. Loneliness, if it is not fully integrated, can become another black hole, one that draws us into darkness rather than light. Not taken in full, loneliness does not show us its beauty, will not become our friend, the one who again and again shows and helps us find our way into the light of the Innermost, into love. Not taken in full, it leads us instead into the

maelstrom of substitute gratification, into addiction, into the pleasure addiction that forms one of the strongest defensive structures in us and in society, a structure that quickly reintegrates us and subjugates us to the rules of conformity when we get hooked on it.

Taken in full, loneliness becomes one of our most important teachers, the inner voice that shows us where to go, what is appropriate, what is true and what is false. It leads us into aloneness, into blissful aloneness, in which all the qualities of the Innermost that we later want to learn to understand can blossom in us.

It takes a lot of stillness to hear its voice. Loneliness is the primal source that stands before the primal source within us. Repressed, it becomes a destructive force in us that destroys us, but if understood and loved, it supports us again and again.

Loneliness unites within itself all other rejected states such as abandonment, exclusion and being short-changed, such as powerlessness, helplessness and being at the mercy of something or someone. It brings it all to a single point. It is a black hole whichever way we deal with it. If we allow it to devour us because we have surrendered to it completely, we go through the pain of annihilation and thereby renewal. It is an act of dying. If we allow ourselves to drop all our defences against loneliness and thus be drawn beyond its event horizon, it ultimately spits us out into a new story, into a new life, into a paradisiacal world. Loneliness leads us into true being an outsider. It places us outside the corrupt and spoiled humanity that is trapped in the madness of ego-mania and conformity, and helps us to establish ourselves there. Loneliness will always be with us, it is a faithful friend who will always remind us when we are about to relapse. Integrated in full, it is no longer painful, but rather affectionate like a mistress. It is the love that always stays with us.

Not taken and instead rejected, loneliness becomes just as much a black hole, a maelstrom that truly destroys us and in no way brings renewal. Not integrated and instead rejected, loneliness becomes a demise into dependency and addiction, which can, when present in a milder form, lead those adept at self-knowledge into this stagnation in development, into this 'most stupid' place we have spoken of, where we can remain stranded on the path of self-knowledge.

Not taken in full, loneliness remains an eternal restlessness in us, a circling around ourselves, an endless search for a way out of it. The paradise of the Innermost, the enlightenment, is therefore withheld from us. As a result of this disturbance, thinking can never become completely still and therefore it not only contaminates the loneliness - which thus becomes an inner, rejected problem area - but also corrupts the pure flame of desire and longing, of the natural essence behind all striving for pleasure, by luring it in the wrong direction. The desire or longing, which has been distorted or misguided by thinking into hedonistic behaviour, forms - for as long as it remains uninfluenced by thinking - a passionate force in us, a flame without smoke, that supports and drives us in our yearning for what is true, noble, real and good. Like loneliness and alongside loneliness, desire and longing strengthen the pull into the black hole of love rather than the illusionary abyss of addiction.

Lost in this abyss, even if only a little bit lost - as happens to warriors, who never completely defeat the third enemy, never completely make their power their own, never learn to ride the tiger - we remain stranded in the 'most stupid place'. Trapped in an endless loop of suffering, just outside the gate to paradise: the gate to inner paradise, to enlightenment, as well as to outer paradise, to liberation from the wheel of fate. The paradise to which the gate can only open, when all searching has found its end in arriving, and when the thinking is thus completely silent in the state of meditation.

What do you think, my dear friends? Are you up to the task? Do you want to be up to the task? Does the beauty of this invitation attract you? Does the notion of this beauty that we

sometimes get in, for example, psycholytic experiences, in wonderful tantric or communal togetherness, in the gift of a deep relationship of love – does it help us? Does it help us to persevere on the stony path of eternal failure that leads through all the abysses of defensive and rejected feelings? Does it help to maintain the hope that it is actually possible to get from one shore to the other, even if one sometimes loses the overview completely in the fog of emotional aberrations, in the darkness of illusions created by fearful thinking?

May the power of integrated loneliness carry you to the other shore, dear friends

Samuel Widmer Nicolet

Appendix:

What is spirituality?

(and the intellectual honesty of Thomas Metzinger?)

Lecture by Samuel Widmer for the 3rd International Congress 2017 on Spirituality, conducted by Avanti and the TTSU

What is spirituality?

If one were to ask every person here this same question, one would probably get many different and above all vague and unclear answers. There is hardly a term that I use in my vocabulary that is as diffuse, hard to grasp, and unclearly defined as the term spirituality.

Of course, we are referring to an attitude or belief that is related to our insight into the essence of the undivided nature of all things, with the recognition that everything is one and made of love. But we also use the terms Tantra and psycholysis for the same view of life and for the practice of the way of life that compellingly follows as a result.

That is why I was very happy last year to find a book and a person behind it who, in my opinion, is able to present very coherent thoughts on this subject. Even though I might not agree with his entire philosophy in other respects, his statements on the essence of spirituality as outlined in the epilogue to his book, make me agree with a resounding YES and bring a certain degree of precision to the supposed vagueness that usually surrounds this area of life. I would therefore like to summarise and comment on them here as an introduction to the subject.

Thomas Metzinger, a philosopher and head of the Theoretical Philosophy and Neuroethics Research Centre at the University of Mainz, is considered one of the most distinguished academic philosophers of today. In his book "The Ego Tunnel"¹, he defines spirituality as the opposite of religion. He sees today's widespread spirituality as an essentially epistemic (i.e. directed towards a specific knowledge goal or specific knowledge) attitude of spiritual persons, – that is to say an attitude directed towards specific knowledge that for the spiritual seeker is to be gained not in theory but through practice.

"Spiritual people want to know, not believe," he says. "They are concerned with an experience-based form of knowledge that has to do with inner attention, body experience and the systematic cultivation of certain altered states of consciousness." The content of the knowledge goals is aimed at liberation and enlightenment and is described as a special form of self-knowledge – self-knowledge that is reflexively directed towards one's own consciousness. It is about consciousness itself, the point where the subject-object structure is dissolved and one goes beyond the first-person-perspective.

At the end of the lecture we will talk about Metzinger's attitude towards changed states of consciousness and thus towards psycholysis as a spiritual aid.

He cites the questions that preoccupy spiritual seekers: "Is spiritual practice a method or rather a letting go of all methods? Does it require effort or is it effortless? How can you see real progress? And can one distinguish between spirituality and illusions, delusions and self-deception?" Ethical integrity – the serious pursuit of a pro-social, ethically consistent lifestyle observed in behaviour – is cited as a criterion for answering these questions. However, from a scientific point of view, there would be little to say about the desired knowledge, that is the content of spirituality's knowledge goals, since it is hard to communicate in words or justify through argument. The meditation practice associated with spirituality thus involves: ethical integrity through self-knowledge, a radical, existential form of liberation through self-

¹ Thomas Metzinger: Der Ego Tunnel/ Eine neue Philosophie des Selbst: Von der Hirnforschung zur Bewusstseinsethik; Piper, 2014(09)

knowledge, as well as training and self-improvement. The spiritual attitude strives for both knowledge and ethics.

"The spiritual attitude is the ethic of inner action for the sake of self-knowledge," summarises Thomas Metzinger.

It is interesting that Thomas Metzinger, as a scientist and academic philosopher, recognises and honours Krishnamurti as one of the greatest non-academic philosophers of the last century. He sees him as an absolute classic philosopher in a potentially new domain of "Theory of Meditation".

Krishnamurti accepted the incorruptibility of the self as the only spirituality. Metzinger also sees incorruptibility as a "semantic core of a truly philosophical concept of secular spirituality", for which he is striving: incorruptibility in relation to the representatives of belief systems who want to bind meditation to any form of theory; also incorruptibility in relation to the purely ideological forms of rationalist reductionism that would prefer to discredit all non-scientific forms of gaining knowledge; but above all else also an incorruptibility in relation to oneself that remains independent of all theories and ideas.

"But what does it mean to be incorruptible, especially not to be corrupt towards oneself?" he asks. Is there such "inner decency", a clearly identifiable spiritual quality of honesty? Because this should form the basis for ethical integrity, which could serve as a criterion for answering the above-mentioned questions.

He defines intellectual honesty as the attitude of not being prepared to "lie to oneself". He associates it with "decency, sincerity and honesty", with "inner decency", and calls it "a conservative way to be truly subversive".

He is convinced that the representatives of organised religions and all theologians lack intellectual honesty. Intellectual honesty, as he understands it, means that one "does not pretend to know something or to be able to know something that one cannot know, but that one nevertheless possesses an unconditional will to truth and knowledge", especially when it comes to knowing oneself.

It is also a question of moral integrity. In spirituality, just as in science, the "ideal of intelligent, rational reasoning" is about "ethics of inner action for the sake of knowledge" with the aim of "increasing spiritual autonomy". Therefore, a spiritual approach cannot be separated from a truly scientific one.

Thus, in connection with spirituality, we like to talk of intuitive science, as C.G. Jung called it at the time, that can only be based on our own experience and its honest appraisal.

In his remarks on spirituality and its connection to intellectual honesty, Metzinger cites Krishnamurti as well as Immanuel Kant, who stated that it is about "the purity of the intention to be honest with oneself". For Kant, intellectual honesty is "the innermost core of morality", "the essence of the will to ethical integrity". He calls it "the idea of moral goodness in all its purity" and reminds us with this statement that "man, as a moral being, is committed to truthfulness towards himself" and that true spirituality has not only a lot to do with science, but also with strict, old-fashioned rationalism, the conservative way of being truly subversive, as Metzinger calls it, and as we have always seen it. In this context, Metzinger also reminds us of Kant's moral concepts, with which he attempted to understand dishonesty. He spoke of "inner lie" and understands it as a "mere lack of conscientiousness".

Metzinger can also rely on Nietzsche, for whom intellectual honesty formed "the conscience behind conscience". Nietzsche sees that "the will to truthfulness in its highest form" allows us to "face the fact that we are radically mortal beings" and to overcome all self-deception in this respect; or in other words, to discard "the delusional and the systematic denial of finiteness" in our self-knowledge.

To differentiate between religion and spirituality, Metzinger refers finally to the philosopher William Kingdon Clifford. With Clifford's help he condemns the classical standpoint of organised religion in contrast to that of spirituality. He sees fideism – the purely religious point of view, based on which it is legitimate to hold on to convictions not only without positive arguments in favour of them, but even in the face of strong counter-arguments – as "refusal of any ethical attitude to internal action", as "lack of inner decency" and thus as a mental illness. This is because fideism is about "deliberate self-deception, systematic wishful thinking or even paranoia". In contrast, Metzinger recognises the honesty of spirituality as a form of "mental health", as "intellectual integrity".

Metzinger writes:

"If one lets oneself go in the complete absence of positive theoretical or practical reasons and allows oneself to simply hold on to a particular belief, then one has already abandoned the whole idea of ethic of inner action. One rejects the project of intellectual honesty, one rejects, at the level of one's own spirit, not only rationality but also morality. Not only does this change one's own opinions and convictions, but also ultimately the person as a whole loses their integrity. And that's what I meant at the beginning by saying that intellectual honesty is what theologians and representatives of all types of organised religion simply cannot have. Perhaps this sentence initially sounded like cheap polemics or provocation for the sake of provocation itself. But it is about a simple and clear factual point, namely the "principle of self-esteem" – which is, that one does not lose one's dignity and spiritual autonomy. Above all, of course, this statement concerns not only the traditional churches, but also a very large part of the so-called "spiritual alternative culture": much of what has emerged in recent decades in Europe and America lost its progressive impulse long ago. Today it only stabilises the status quo, is characterised by infantile complacency and crude forms of intellectual dishonesty. If one is *seriously* interested in the question of the possibility of secular spirituality, one has to consider all relevant empirical data and all possible counter-arguments. Philosopher William Clifford said in 1877 regarding people who do not do this: *"If someone deliberately avoids reading books and the company of other people who raise critical questions, then this person's life is one long sin against humanity."*

Metzinger pursues clarification regarding honesty and narrow-mindedness, as understood by followers of belief systems, by honestly asking himself the classical philosophical and spiritual questions "Does God exist?", "Is there life after death?" and "Is there such a thing as enlightenment?" and comes up with the honest answer that we do not and cannot know anything about it.

Although I agree with that, I cannot fully agree with his reasoning on these issues. In it he remains too intellectual and too limited for me. I do not think that he can use the fact that someone has not awakened to a deeper vision to justify that this deeper vision does not exist. But we do not want to go into this here. I hope that others will do so in their contributions over time.

Metzinger sees religion as "the deliberate cultivation of a system of delusion", "the dogmatic and fideistic refusal of an ethic of inner action". In contrast, spirituality is for him "the epistemic attitude that is concerned with knowledge". This is why he regards spirituality as the opposite of religion.

To me, however, spirituality is original, genuine religiosity, a religious attitude that goes hand in hand with the fundamental scientific attitude and is based on honest research and the search for knowledge both inside and outside. To see spirituality as the opposite of religion, would for me, create a new duality and division in the unity. For me, spirituality is mysticism and thus the innermost essence of religiosity. Religion as a belief system, as it is understood today, is thus actually a derailment, a disease, that affects this oneness.

Metzinger believes that science, providing it has not already become a religion and slave to fideism, is in harmony with spirituality, since both proceed from the same value concept. Both know "the unconditional desire for truth – for insight and not belief" and commit themselves to the "ideal of absolute honesty towards oneself".

Like us, Metzinger hopes that something like "secular spirituality" will be able to become prevalent among people in the coming decades or centuries and save us from our impending downfall. The fact that we are "stubbornly acting against better knowledge" on a collective and often also individual level and that, despite the pressure of time, our outdated conditioning simply does not allow us "to act effectively as a community and develop the necessary political will", leads us to failure. Mankind is thus becoming more and more a victim of its own self-deception and simply cannot adequately respond to the great challenges it faces, even though it has an intellectual insight into the expected consequences and also experiences them at the level of personal consciousness. The question arises as to whether humans, in a spiritual attitude of honesty, could find a unifying strategy in the search for the right answer at the level of common action; whether they could succeed in uniting spirituality and science; and whether humanity can be brought together to any extent to achieve a unified rational, reality- and truth-based perspective. Like us, Metzinger is rather pessimistic about this.

As is to be expected with such an optic regarding spirituality and the honesty or incorruptibility on which it is based, Metzinger also supports psycholysis. Among other things regarding substances and the alternative states of consciousness triggered by them, he bemoans that the "vast majority of people who ultimately have to make the political and legal decisions in question [regarding psycholytic substances and their prohibition or approval] unavoidably do not understand to any extent what they are talking about". He also asks whether "we should accept that someone who is looking for valid spiritual or religious experiences – or who just wants to gain a personal impression for themselves – has to break laws and take all the risks associated with unclear dosages, chemical impurities and dangerous constraints" and concludes that "many aspects of our current drug policy are completely arbitrary and ethically untenable."

However, I do not agree with the solution he is proposing regarding the lifting of prohibition. In this respect, he persists with the traditional belief of scientists and people in authority and wants to leave the field to the specialists. In my opinion, the shamanistic tradition, which is inextricably linked to true spirituality, belongs back in the hands of humanity, which does not need any mediators in either instance. For it is precisely the creation of such authorities that ultimately leads us away from the healthy path of finding knowledge through spiritual search and towards the sick dogmatism and fideism of established religions (or sciences?).

Prohibition and the war on drugs do not primarily have the function of discouraging people from intoxicating themselves, but above all else serve the purpose of keeping us busy on an insignificant side-track, so that we have no energy, or do not feel the desire, to draw the consequences from the spiritual and world-changing rapture of hallucinogens and empathogens.

Of course, the problem with spirituality, as with science, is that these disciplines can also become "religions" in the fideistic or dogmatic sense. The difficulty we have to overcome is revealed in the question: how can each person check their honesty, so that they will not lie to themselves again. I would not completely trust Metzinger in this respect either. But his reference to Krishnamurti's accuracy and incorruptibility should suffice here.

Where I cannot follow Thomas Metzinger and the current trend in the whole of science – and especially in consciousness and mind research as well as in the neurosciences – is the categor-

ical negation of the spirit. There seems to be a division, a misunderstanding, that prevents insight into the reality of the oneness of creation and creator, the oneness of observer and observed, the oneness of the will to self-organisation and the result of self-organisation. I would like to discuss this issue with such intelligent, scientifically educated and sincerely interested people like him so that I can understand what causes the obvious disguising of the truth on this point.

It leaves me perplexed when Thomas Metzinger writes that "we are ego-machines, natural information processing systems that have emerged in the course of biological evolution on this planet. ... Obviously the evolutionary process that created our bodies, our brains and our conscious mind was not a purposeful chain of events. We are gene copiers with the ability to develop conscious self-models and form large societies. ... But there was no intention behind this whole process – it is the result of blind, upward self-organisation". No intention, but upward self-organisation! For me, there is an obvious contradiction. Self-organisation is in itself an aligned and universal intention, a will to survive, to grow, to select the more suitable. When Metzinger writes that "if the process that created the biological ego machine had been initiated by something like a person [a god], then one would probably have to describe this person as cruel, perhaps even diabolical. Everything looks like we have never been asked whether we want to exist, and we'll never be asked whether we want to die or whether we are ready for it. In particular, we have never been asked whether we want to live with *this* combination of genes and *this* type of body. And finally, we have certainly never been asked whether we want to live with *this* kind of brain including *this* very special kind of consciousness. Actually, it's high time for a rebellion. But everything we know so far points to a conclusion that is simple but difficult for beings with our spiritual structure to accept: evolution has simply happened – without foresight into the future, coincidentally, without plan, without direction and without goal. There is no one to be despised or rebel against – not even ourselves", then I agree with him that there is no division between creator and creation, no person or something similar in the background that would have pushed the whole thing, but I experience it in such a way that he maintains precisely this division and does not know how to overcome it in his thinking. How else would he arrive at wanting to be asked or wanting to complain? If we ourselves are part of this self-organising process, why should we be in conflict with it? Of course, evolution has simply happened. But obviously it is spirit, universal purpose and directed power. But not behind it or outside it, but inherently.

Metzinger talks about the demystification of the self and the world and sees the danger that we will end up being unable to see the magic – that is, love – in our contact with our fellow human beings. "The cat was let out of the bag a long time ago," he concludes. "We are gene copiers, bio-robots that have arisen in the course of evolution on a lonely planet in a cold and empty physical universe. We have a brain, but not an immortal soul, and after about seventy years the curtain falls. There will be no life after death, no punishment and no reward, and in the end, each one of us is alone."

Spirit and love seem to be lost once again in today's philosophy and science. No wonder, I think, when all the magic seems to vanish from the mystery that surrounds us and which we are. Is this due to the old authority problem with a creator god, whom we have rightly dethroned and abolished, but where we unfortunately forgot to also bury the conflict with him?

Finally, I would like to give you a summary in the form of aphorisms that I put together for the announcement of our congress on spirituality and psychotherapy. They are intended to list the most important points regarding the question of "What is spirituality?":

1. Spirituality begins in the pelvis.
2. Self-knowledge, on which True Psychotherapy is based, unfolds naturally and of itself into the realm of spirituality, providing it is seriously pursued.

3. Spirituality is an attitude that is concerned with insight into the essence of the inseparability of everything.
4. Spirituality, in contrast to established religion, is original genuine religiosity, an attitude that goes hand in hand with the demands of science and knowledge-oriented self-knowledge (or psychotherapy, as the case may be).
5. Spiritual practice is not a new method, but rather it consists of overcoming all methods.
6. Spiritually-oriented people rely on insight, not faith.
7. If something can still save and reunite us human beings, it will be spiritual science or secularised spirituality.
8. The spiritual attitude strives not only for insight, but also for ethical action based on this insight.
9. Even those who are spiritual die in the end. (or: spirituality does not protect us from death!)