Dangers of Transpersonal Psychology: A Reply to Ken Wilber

ALBERT ELLIS

This article is a reply to Ken Wilber's critique of Albert Ellis's "Fanaticism that may lead to a nuclear holocaust," which outlines some of the dangers of transpersonal psychology and psychotherapy.

Since the editor has given me only 240 lines to reply to Wilber's (1989) diatribe against my objections to transpersonal psychology (Ellis, 1986), let me very briefly reply.

1. Wilber may be surprised to know that I have read scores of books and articles by "respected writers in the field" of transpersonalism, as cited in my forthcoming book, The dangers of transpersonal psychology (Ellis & Yeager, in press).

2. I was once close to logical positivism but since 1976 have followed Karl Popper and W.W. Bartley, who upheld critical rationalism (or critical realism), which holds that scientific theories are to be stated so that they are falsifiable—as the theory of logical positivism is not stated.

3. I am opposed to science — and to all kinds of dogmatic isms (Ellis, 1962). As Wilber admits, believers in science and absolutism "tend to be fanatics." I am glad that he endorses this main point of my criticized article.

4. Wilber wrongly quotes me as saying, "We must incorporate therapeutic teachings and bring them to the masses." Using rational-emotive therapy (RET), I said had better, not must. Bringing antinunestuboratory teachings to the masses is not utopian, as Wilber claims, though convincing all of them certainly may be! And I certainly would not force the world's population to learn RET — only encourage them!

5. I do not "approach religion as if it were a disease . . . to be cured at all costs." Instead, I oppose religiosity, which I have defined as a dogmatic, fanatical belief in theological religion (e.g., Christianity) and in secular religion (e.g., fascism and Freudianism) (Ellis, 1982, 1985).

6. Wilber denies that mysticism has dogmas or formalism that claim to be the best and only way to describe reality. Some mystics, such as Buddha and Wilber, are, of course, open-minded. But how about St. Augustine, John of the Cross, Joseph Smith, H.P. Blavatsky, Emanuel Swedenborg, the Fox sisters, Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, Jim Jones, Sri Swami Rama, and so forth?

7. Virtually all mystics, as Wilber notes, believe in an "absolute spirit," and, as he also states, "believers in absolute systems tend to be fanatics." Again, he endorses one of my main points of view!

8. Wilber claims that mystics "call Spirit many who is really one" and that therefore they are tolerant of diverse religious beliefs. But if you firmly believe that there is only One Truth, One God, and One Spirit you can easily fight, censor, and per-secute any group that holds pluralistic or different views. Many mystical cults are combative!

9. Wilber contends that when asked what absolute reality is, mystics respond with silence. What mystery? Not St. Augustine! Not Madame Blavatsky! Not Khomeini!

10. Wilber says that mysticism is undogmatic because "it relies for its validation on direct experience." But direct personal experience unbacked by other more objective experimentation is unfalsifiable and dogmatic! Science, contrary to Wilber's allegation, does not rely on personal direct experience but on repeated observations. The "direct experience" of mystics includes highly biased, dogmatic interpretations and conclusions that are usually vague and nondisputable.

11. Wilber notes that "zealots and fanatics come in all flavors (Nazi doctors, for example) just as there are religious fanatics." Right. Secular religionists, as I pointed out previously (Ellis, 1982), can easily be fanatical and terroristic. But I hypothesize that whereas relatively few scientists are fanatics (and have strong religiosity when they are), a much higher proportion of mystics are dogmatists and zealots; and that zealotry tends to be a concomitant of profound mysticism and pious religiosity. I would also guess that zealots and bigots tend to be significantly more mystical and religious than do liberals and democrats.

This hypothesis, of course, merits empirical study. But, as I note below, such study had better be carefully done.

12. Wilber cites many leading philosophers, psychologists, and scientists who are mystical. True. But I could easily cite some outstanding people, including scientists, who piously believed in astrology, Tarot card reading, clairvoyance, psychokinesis, ghosts, reincarnation, UFOs, astral projection, psychic surgery, exorcism, gurus with godly powers, and other "psychic" phenomena.

13. I still would uphold the view, which Wilber quotes me on, that even the greatest thinkers and psychologists who hold transpersonal or transcendental ideas not necessarily but very often "promulgate almost exactly the kind of absolutistic ideology that is devoutly held by the religious and political sectarian who may some day atomically annihilate the whole human race." Many of them do hold this ideology that encourages the sectarians to think in the confused, absolutist way that they think — and act! Wilber keeps pointing out that not all transpersonalists are devout, absolutist, or violent. Of course they are not. But my point is that if we thoroughly examined a thousand transpersonalists and another thousand nontranspersonalists, a significantly higher percentage of the former than the latter would be found to be dogmatic, bigoted, and violence prone.

Before such a study is actually done, however, let me warn that many transpersonalists who answer any questionnaire about
their dogmatism and hostility will very probably claim to be open
minded and tolerant—just as many religious people claim to be
happily married when it is dubious that they actually are. So
let the researchers beware!

14. Wilber claims that morality is based on human sameness.
We do good for others because we realize, with Schopenhauer,
“that we all share the same transcendental self or conscious-
ness.” This is drivel, since the human sameness on which mo-
rality is often based is a very down-to-earth, observable human
sameness and has nothing to do with the transcendental or
superhuman concept of self or commonality.

15. Wilber points out that most Eastern followers of reincar-
nation and karma “don’t even like to kill insects, let alone peo-
ple.” He forgets that some of these followers devoutly believe
that they will be rewarded in their afterlife if they *do* kill the
disbelievers and “heathens” in this life—and that they will be
severely punished if they don’t!

16. Wilber states that I give “four suppositions that are sup-
poused to define the entire field” of transpersonalism. For brev-
ity’s sake, after the editor had cut down my originally longer
paper, I mentioned these four concepts in my article, but I in-
clude no less than 35 basic transpersonal ideologies in my forth-
coming book on the dangers of transpersonalism (Ellis & Yeager,
in press). And I do not believe that *all* transpersonalists subscribe
to these concepts, but as far as I can see, virtually all of them
subscribe to many of these ideas.

17. Wilber: Ellis “cannot give so much as a single case of a
person describing himself or herself as a transpersonal psy-
chologist who has ever engaged in terrorist or similarly grave
antisocial activity.” In my book on the dangers of transpersonal
psychology (Ellis & Yeager, in press), I cite scores of instances
where transpersonalists definitely did resort to terrorist and to
similarly grave antisocial activity.

18. Wilber quotes a few transpersonalists who do not strictly
go along with my statement that “absolute reality exists, and
when we find the true doctrine that reveals it, we reach absolute,
invariant, unchangeable, ineffable truth.” But he fails to note
that innumerable transpersonalists do subscribe to this view or
something close to it.

19. Wilber states: “I do not know anybody who thinks rein-
carnation has been empirically proven.” Well, his contacts are
strictly limited! I personally know and have heard of many be-
lievers in reincarnation—e.g., Shirley MacLaine—who are pos-
itive that they and other people have talked to dead “spirits.”
Although lan Stevenson was agnostic about the issue of re-
incarnation, hundreds of other investigators have been quite
convinced of its “empirical” existence.

20. Wilber takes me to task for saying that transpersonalists
believe that “all living and inanimate things merge into one
fundamental unit.” But he merely shows that he takes issue with
my word merge. Many mystics do see all things as merging into
one unit. Thus, Deikman (1972, p.1), a mystical-minded psy-
chiatrist, says that mystics believe that “the awareness of a tree
is not different from our own, it is continuous with it and aware-
ness is the origin of the entire system.” And Taoism, the world’s
most popular form of mysticism, definitely holds that inanimate
matter and animate life are one, and essentially merge.

21. Wilber: “Most transpersonalists are extremely sympathetic
to science, and wish that the spirit of scientific enterprise—a
certain honesty, integrity, and openness in research—be used
as much as possible.” No, transpersonalists often give lip service
to science and use scientific findings (as Fritzof Capra does) to
illegitimately bolster their mystical beliefs. But Webster’s New
World Dictionary defines mystical as “of obscure or occult char-
acter or meaning” and “beyond human comprehension.” And
it defines transpersonal as “based on a search for reality through
spiritual intuition.” Surely this is not science! Modern philo-
sophies of science, moreover, while abjurating logical positivism,
hold that to be “scientific” a hypothesis had better be falsifiable.
As far as I know, none of the truly transpersonal theories are
falsifiable.

22. Wilber says that I do not understand the crucial difference
between regressive pre-rational states (which presumably in-
clude the dangers I have accused transpersonal believers of fom-
enting) and “higher development trans-rational states.” No, I do
not quite understand this difference, though I have read his
well-written article on the pre-trans fallacy (Wilber, 1982). As far
as I can see, both states are equally mystical, magical, and trans-
personal. But even if Wilber is right, he himself (in his pre-trans
fallacy paper) accuses many transpersonalists of adhering to the
pre-trans fallacy, so that he substantiates the major point of my
criticized paper. For I did not say that *all* transpersonalists are
dangerous but that a great many are. Apparently, Wilber agrees!

As can be seen, I hope, from the above comments, Wilber’s
critique of my critique has much heat and little light. Exactly
what I would expect of most transpersonal thinkers!
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