

EMPIRIC MANAGEMENT DENYING LIFE EXPERIENCE OF A RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL'S AUTONOMY

Daniela BELU

“Henri Coanda” Air Force Academy, Brasov

Abstract: : *Democracy is to respect the two fundamental rights of human beings: the right to a favorable environment and the right to assert one's limits. Empiric management is the cancellation of a person's spirit and personality by ignoring their individuality and denying their life experience. It is the violation of a responsible individual's autonomy by the act of not consulting/asking/informing them about the management decisions that will affect their chances of solving problems in their work or life.*

Key words: *Dominating/Influence/Verbal abuse/Repressed feelings of personal impotence/Victory of good over evil in ourselves*

1. INTRODOUCE

Constant verbal abuse “brainwashes” people by victimizing them.

Becoming aware of the fact that verbal abuse, regardless of its context, (family or work), consists of lies, enables the attenuation of the negative statements, particularly if we are dealing with permanent abuse.

The sheer acknowledgment of the oppressive effect of the statements of those who impose themselves by verbal abuse, (reproaches/accusations/criticism/, mocking/ /contradiction of individual experience), followed by the countermanding of trust, represents the passport to freeing one's self from the victimization and a first step to discovering the personal truth that turns the victim into a survivor.

Psychological release from under the influence of abuse, similar to surviving a catastrophe, does not translate into building an identity around the act of being victimized or of having surpassed this particular trial.

It simply means that by surviving, one can realize how that was possible, gaining the right to teach others how to avoid abusive relationships, for instance.

Every abusive relationship has a basic dynamics, pinpointed by the studies performed by ALICE MILLER on the effects of early childhood experiences upon adult behavior.

To this we may add the findings of KAREN HORNEY in the field of ideal self-image.

All studies set out from the hypothesis that both the aggressor and the victim perceive reality as dominating power based.

In the early childhood everybody (with very few exceptions) starts becoming acquainted with the dominating power and, as they get older and start benefiting from quality education, they become aware of the reality of personal power.

Finding the right answer to the following questions becomes an issue:

- Why is it that, leaving from the same initial conditions, that is the reality of the dominating power, some people become aggressors while others become victims?
- Why is it possible for the victim to evolve by becoming aware of his/her personal power?
- Why does the aggressor remain captive in search of the power to dominate/submit instead of seeking reciprocity?

The answer to these questions may be found in the early childhood of people, be they aggressors or victims.

2. THE VICTIM'S AND AGGRESSOR'S CHILDHOOD

Scientific studies claim that the typical victim was brought up in the reality where parents' authority over their children was improperly used, often due to ignorance and with the best of intentions.

Submission and dominating power, as a result of the verbal abuse dominating the child's life, make his feelings/ emotions not to be justifiable or acceptable. In some cases, the young victim may have a neurotic father or one that is not involved in his/her life, or simply absent/indifferent, while in other situations the aggressors are actually the mothers /relatives/ teachers or persons sitting with the children while their parents are away.

The typical aggressor was brought up in the same climate based on dominating power, where one must impose oneself on others by verbal abuse as the sole chance to exist.

What sets the aggressors apart though is the fact that their emotions and feelings have never been validated/ accepted by other persons. Why? Because, in the aggressor's childhood, there was not a single witness who showed them compassion / sympathy in hard times.

That is how an aggressor comes to believe that nothing from what is happening to him/her is right, that everything is fair to him/her and that the sense of pain he/she is getting must not be acknowledged as true/real, as long as no one else around them does.

This is the life lesson learned by the aggressor as early as from his childhood: to prohibit access in the area of the conscience of his emotions /feelings, to deny his own pain, to adapt by remaining captive in the reality of the power of the powerful to dominate the weak, who must be despised and turned into victim as punishment for their weakness.

The deformed children put to death in SPARTA are the most relevant example to contemporary people on the reality of the dominating power in a world of aggressors.

To every child, the parents / relatives / teachers / adults in general, are never wrong. In the eyes of the children these authority figures are God-like.

Therefore, the victim has no other option but to believe that something is wrong with him/her, with the way he/she expresses himself/herself, with the impression he/she has on others or perhaps with his/her emotions /feelings or even his/her perception of reality itself.

That is how, those of us who manage to evolve and enter the reality of personal power without, however, acquiring a typical self-esteem, become victims.

The victim is aware of his/her pain. This is what sets him/her apart from the aggressor. The fact that he/she did not lose the ability to feel empathy/compassion towards himself/herself, allows him/her to feel the same towards another person, which will provide him/her with the reasons to seek understanding and mutuality.

Rejecting the possibility of acknowledging his own pain (emotions/feelings), the aggressor, as child, will not be able to experience empathy/compassion, which is why he will not surpass the threshold of personal power, not even as an adult. ALICE MILLER describes what sets apart the aggressor from the victim as "the absence or presence of a benevolent witness in their childhood", fact that will lead to every mistreated child to become either tyrant, (by directing his repressed feelings of helplessness against his fellow men), or artist (by accepting/acknowledging /understanding his own pain, learning to sublime the emotions in a liberating creation, good for society).

The fact is that aggressors feel, it is in their right to have that kind of attitude towards their victims, apparently not understanding that they are causing them to suffer in order to feel strong by dominating.

This may be explained by the state of helplessness, the aggressor experiences as result of repressing the childhood emotions/feelings that surface in the shape of a compulsive, revanchist behavior, seeking the dominating power.

Although the impotence and pain from his/her childhood continue to not be acknowledged / remembered / accepted because “they must not exist”, they are bound to surface in an uncontrollable way. The aggressor’s mind encloses the agony of a sensible child like a tomb, and the severer the abuse, the longer the repression.

As long as he/she is determined to deny the facts, the aggressor’s emotional life will freeze in the blur of his/her childhood humiliations.

What is the victim unaware of though? The only thing the victim is unaware of is the reason why he/she is hurting.

Thus, he/she comes to believe that he/she says and does something inappropriate/unconsciously that determines the aggressor, (father/ mother/ professor/adults in general) to suffer just like he/she is.

The last thing the victim imagines is that these authority figures cannot look for solutions, because they do not share the same reality.

Victims will carry all through their adult life their childhood doubts, which will surface when, subjected to manipulations in their professional /corporate life, they accept to hear things that may provide them with an answer as to the cause of their own pain.

Although mature persons, the victims have not grasped the significance of the childhood pain. However, they keep in touch with the spirit in the center of their being, which construes the source of their personal power.

Psychologist ALICE MILLER explains that any return of the love/solidarity/ compassion will be useless as long as this crucial fundament of sympathy and understanding is missing.

The aggressor cannot feel for the victim’s pain because he/she does not know how to be empathic, (this is due to the understanding of their own emotions and self-compassion).

The call for love/compassion towards fellow beings is not responded, since his/her actions derive from repressed feelings that determine him/her to punish his/her victims’ weakness by dominating them as it happened to him in his/her childhood, which he/she believes to have deserved for having been weak.

In this compulsive conduct the aggressor is unable to get in touch with his/her feelings but will practice them on someone else.

Thus, the never revealed pain / insecurity / humiliation accumulated during his/her childhood continues to grow in the cold mechanism of rage and determines him/her to take revenge by perpetrating the abuse, at stake being the fleeting sense of power in dominating the victim.

Besides the deeply buried insecurity and inadequacy, the aggressor’s mind also conceals feelings of guilt for having completely separated from his/her mother, through the rejection of the maternal model.

The Oedipus complex generates culpability in the mother-child relationship.

Relinquishing this guilt determines the aggressor to feel he/she has risen above the idea he/she rejected. He/she will despise everything related to the feminine sex in order to justify his/her separation from his/her mother and to minimize his guilt.

The aggressor denies a complex of correlated feelings and hence gets to the point of denying himself/herself.

Who is this aggressor, this person who has invented a new self-image, denying his/her own past? KAREN HORNEY’s studies explain:

- If his fellow men were to define him/her, the aggressor would be hard to know by those around;

- If he/she were to define him/herself, the aggressor would describe him/herself as a person believing him/herself to be an ideal image.

The aggressor's self-assessment is not based on his/her feelings but is in fact the fragile construction of a mind that lacks personal power.

What is the personal power of an individual?

To live sensing/choosing/ creating from the depths of one's being, by becoming aware of one's emotions/ feelings represent the personal power of a man.

By dominating his fellow men, the aggressor seeks a status superior to them in order to avoid being discovered as an insecure / humiliated / blocked / ridiculed / impotent person.

The one committing the abuse hides behind his/her attitude feelings of insecurity / shame / fear / anxiety.

The ideal self-image of the aggressor denies his/her own motives/ compulsions / actions in any of the following ways:

- Although tense/upset/explosive, the aggressor will describe himself/ herself as calm and relaxed;

- Although critical and querulous, the aggressor will describe himself/ herself as tolerant;

-Although indifferent/defiant/cold, the aggressor will describe himself/ herself as an altruist/warm/ unconditional aid of his/her victim

- Although he/she is the one contradicting/ discarding/denying the values, beliefs and experience of those around him/her, the aggressor will declare himself/ herself open to perspectives other than his/her own.

In 1979 psychologist FLEMING mentioned in the specialty publications the results of his research, which proved that only strong personalities are capable of admitting their weaknesses and the mistakes they make.

These are the people who practice their self-confidence.

Someone who deep down believes himself to be weak /inferior, will not be able to do so and the aggressors are secretly very helpless people.

This is why they try harder and harder to deny their feelings, projecting them on those at hand, (from children and parents, to subordinate employees, generally on those who they should take responsibility for) and towards whom they ought to have duties by definition of the official position sought after in society, (family/ company) and which, unfortunately, they often come to fill.

As time goes by, aggressors become more and more reluctant in confronting themselves, out of fear of the painful feelings they would have to bravely face.

Their fear will encourage the accumulation of their fury and self-detachment in the secret corner of their being, which will, in turn, determine them to avoid introspection, thus becoming unable to recognize the source of these feelings.

When these feelings surface, the cause of discomfort is, to the aggressor, the victim. This is the projection. By projecting, aggressors accuse their victims of all their doings, blaming them for whichever abuses they themselves commit.

Why? Because this way the victim becomes what the aggressor once was, hurt and without no one to witness his/her pain. To the aggressors, the victims are merely an expression of themselves.

They see the victims, recalls their own dark feelings, their own vulnerability, all the feelings that "should have never existed" and which therefore must be controlled.

Thus, the victims of the abuse become the object of the aggressors' control and this control becomes the victim's oppression. Where there is oppression, there is projection and where there is projection, there is denial.

The aggressor is afraid of his victim, who represents his own insecurities/humiliations/weaknesses as he is no longer able to display understanding/ empathy/communication skills or the ability to apologize /real preoccupation for the situation he finds himself in.

CONCLUSION

-What can the aggressor do?

He will spill his anger from his unaccepted/denied feelings, indulging a sense of power by dominating, promoting his ideal image while he avoids acknowledging his actions, projecting his repressed feelings on his victim.

Thus, the aggressor's life becomes a battle against the victim who carries his projection.

This, as well as his sentimental side, should not exist. The aggressor cannot see it as it is, and is incapable of perceiving the victim's reality.

Every abuse is the aggressor's attempt to defend himself from the feelings of rage, fear, helplessness of the inner child and to protect himself from knowing his true attitude.

All those who seek the dominating power do it to defend and protect themselves from their own repressed feelings of personal impotence.

Things are not different in the case of authority figures in companies where empiric management is still applied. These incompetent superiors practice verbal abuse on their subordinates.

The feelings of impotence masked by the aggressor are replaced with a self-acclaimed superiority image, using the protection mechanism of either of the below:

1. A RESERVED ATTITUDE by which the victim is dominated with the purpose of maintaining the aggressor's ideal image.
2. CONTRADICTING EXPERIENCES / BELIEFS of the victim, the purpose of which is for the aggressor to protect himself of his own feelings of inadequacy and impotence.

3. BLOCKING/SABOTAGE by which interpersonal reality is controlled with the purpose of alleviating the aggressor's hidden feelings.

4. ACCUSATIONS/REPROACHES are symptoms of the projection by means of which the aggressor avoids the responsibility of his attitude and protects his ideal image by blaming the victim and making him/her responsible for his own feelings.

5. PERSONAL CRITICISM represents the aggressor's attempt to defend himself from his hidden feelings of inferiority and impotence, reinforcing his self-image by claiming his own superiority synonym with attacking his victim's public image.

6. HOSTILE JOKES, by means of which the aggressor aims to feel superior/strong, by blaming/exposing to ridicule/humiliation the victim before the latter would even realize it.

7. SLIGHTING, by disparagement/disdain the victim as a self-defense method against his own feelings of inadequacy /incompetence.

7. DENIAL by means of oblivion, with the purpose of avoiding taking responsibility for the hostility of his attitude and for his dodging, aiming to build his ideal image by maintaining his projection on his victim.

The aggressor does not wish to look into himself. This is his personal tragedy as well as the very cause why he will do what it takes to not acknowledge his shortcomings.

The victim of the verbal abuse in the military management of the corporation is the competent employee, subordinate/superior/colleague, whose rights/expectations were violated/ignored in its psychological/legal contract with the institution, whereas he/she had done nothing wrong towards the employer but rather:

- Exercised discipline at the work place and respected the contractual obligations towards the employer/ company internal regulations/state laws or individual morality;

- Contributed to the improvement of the company image towards customers / providers by the professional competence he/she displayed and the fairness he/she applied in said affairs;
- Achieved professional performance compliant with the assessment criteria for measuring performance that were taken into account in the job specification;
- Displayed a devotion towards the cultures of the military corporation, enforcing them by his/her actions at the work place rather than simply reciting them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Kets de Vries, M., *Leadership, the Art and Mastery of Leading*, Condex Publishing House, 2003.
2. Goleman, D., *Emotional Intelligence*, Curtea Veche Publishing House, 2001.
3. Danile Goleman, Richard Boyatzis, Annie McKee, *Emotional Intelligence in leadership*, Cartea veche Publishing House, Bucharest, 2005.
4. Danah Zohar, *Spiritual Intelligence*, Radin Print Publishing House, Bucharest, 2011.
5. Karl Albrecht, *Practical Intelligence*, Publishing Curtea veche, 2007