

<sup>13</sup>Semantic Response: s.r., abbreviation. Since thinking, or internal computing, is involved in responding, this is the generator of the response. A s.r. can be relatively quick or it can be very complex and extend over years. As an act, the production of the film Star Wars and its current<sub>1999</sub> quadrilogy, clearly represents a very complex neuro-semantic response by George Lucas to a creative and financial enterprise in the face of the fact that he is an independently wealthy man and the necessity for doing so is zero.

<sup>14</sup>. . . . bore, bored, bored. Out of our research, we have now concluded that this is the le grande insignia of the self-important person. We are quite sure that you have met them in your life.

<sup>15</sup>AHDD: Attention Hyperkinetic Deficit Disorder. There is no evidence logically to support this dog tag. The child can focus his attention. The problem is that it is not on the teacher or in classroom work. So now, how do you get the child to focus his attention where you want him to?

<sup>16</sup>Gurudev Shree Chitrabhanu was the first Jain priest who left India to teach in the West. It is from his work that we have derived the Gurudev Manoeuvres that are singular in their power of healing with people who have been severely violated and abused.

<sup>17</sup>The concept of a meta-language was set out in the work CHANGE by Watzlawick, Weakland and Fisch of the Mental Research Institute, Palo Alto, California. To this date<sub>1999</sub> we know of no counter-argument to discount what they laid out about the significance and importance of a metalanguage.

When two people are in conversation, you need a language about language to understand what they are saying. Such a thing is known as a metalanguage. When an engine is giving trouble a technician has to have plan about the engine in his head to deal with the engine. The plan about the engine is the meta-engine.

The first metalanguage was the Meta Model produced in 1975 by John Grinder and Richard Bandler. We were to refine and augment it to produce the WWF-ML in 1993.

Michael Hall and Bob Bodenhamer. Greek Philosopher, Aristotle laid out the philosophical formats of Causality. For this, it is that Alfred Korzybski named it the Aristotelian system.

<sup>7</sup>12 logical levels of the A system is delineated in the work Don't Ask WHY?! Each logical level is a driver for its unique form of semantic ill-formedness. Let us cite an example. The 5<sup>th</sup> logical level is SHOULD. It is the representative for our modal operators. Modal operators are the drivers of our EXPECTATIONS. Have you ever seen a person whose expectations were not fulfilled. In extreme cases, the person can completely lose it. And this is insane.

<sup>8</sup>A massive co-contributor of human semantic ill-formedness: The function of self-importance in human semantic ill-formedness was delineated in our paper, The Neuro-Semantics of Human Madness - What Had To Be For The Holocaust To Be, Part I. See [www.neurosemantics.com](http://www.neurosemantics.com).

<sup>9</sup>They deified him: The act of deification could only be done by the Senate and the people of Rome, i.e. Senatus Populus Que Romanus (SPQR). If a person, who as a member of a people can Amake@ a God, you better believe it that such a person must be very self-important. Here, we, have a tautology in which the semantic ill-formedness of the condition feeds itself.

<sup>10</sup>HOPs, a concept proposed in, Don't Ask WHY?! that delineates the neuro-semantic engine of human ontology across thinking, states and meta states and human actions.

<sup>11</sup>Their lives are to serve him. Does this remind you of some children that you know who have that unique dispensation in which they enjoy the Aright@ to throttle the lives of their parents. Yet when you try to mitigate the situation for the sake of the parents, they hasten to say, AOh no! You have no idea how good and kind he is!@ This is nothing but denial that in turn subserves the condition of insanity.

<sup>12</sup>Semantic Reactions: abbreviated s.r. AReaction@ is a derivative of the days when the whole of human semantic neurology was seen as an extension of the knee jerk reflex. In the reflex arc one saw a reaction to a stimulus. There was no thinking or internal computation (i.c.) involved in the process. Korzybski invented this term to index that our reactions are reflexly connected to the meanings that we have towards people, things and events. Thus, in one case, a girl bitterly complained about her mother and her view of how she felt her mother had mistreated and denied her. Her mother silently put up with her daughter's assertions for quite a while. A moment came when she had enough. She breathed into her chest. She simultaneously sat up and pulled her shoulders back. She raised her chin. Then she thinned her lips and arched her left eye brow. At this, her daughter shut up, rounded her shoulders, lowered her chin and rested it on her chest and she seemed to sink into the chair into a diminutive helpless shape. This description is of an s.r.

may be, he won't?! You never know with Richard. As Yoda says, "Future, difficult to see."

Alfred Korzybski: Science and Sanity:

"But, in his self-love, exaggerated self-esteem, he overlooks his own shortcoming, and blames everybody and everything but himself. In the face of >injustice=, he becomes discouraged, timid, or bitter and pessimistic. He is unable to discharge his duties, and becomes a disappointment as a father, husband, friend, and, ultimately, as a human being and citizen. Bitterness, disappointment, and painful semantic shocks pile up on all sides under such conditions."

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup>Sin does not really have a place in the agenda of most people's lives today. We define >sin= as any act that violates a rule that exists within the general corpus of moral rules that a social group subscribes to. Perhaps this definition will tilt people to re-evaluate morality and find a place for >sin= in people's thinking.

<sup>2</sup>First cardinal sin: It is an ancient wisdom of the Christian faith that cited pride as the first cardinal sin.

When a person suffers from a disease, e.g. tuberculosis, he seeks a cure. He does not want it. However, self-importance is the only disease that we know in which the person afflicted with it, wants it and even wants it even more. In our culture<sub>1999</sub>, the disease of self-importance is placed at such a high premium that it is clear that we have all abandoned ourselves, utterly and completely to its sickness. We are sick and do not know it.

<sup>3</sup>Humility: There is a difference between being humble and being humiliated.

It is said that a warrior is humble. In his humility is his road to power. Such a person cannot be humiliated. Pride on the other hand is the road to aggression. For each of us is the choice of which it is to be, by power or by aggression?

<sup>4</sup>Alfred Korzybski, a 20<sup>th</sup> century giant who has contributed in incredible ways to our insights in the domains of human epistemology and ontology. He created the field of General Semantics. The foundational work for this field study is Science and Sanity.

<sup>5</sup>Alfred Korzybski and Cause and Effect, Part I - IV and the CONCLUSION are published in the electronic journal of the web site [www.neurosemantics.com](http://www.neurosemantics.com).

<sup>6</sup> Aristotelian system, according to us, is the thinking by Causality (a.k.a. Cause and Effect, Causal Modeling, Implied Causative, The Question of Why and the Blame Frame). The AAristotelian System@ is not so understood in General Semantics, or by

I waited for him to catch his breath. Then I said, "It was because of that piece of paper."

"What piece of paper?" he asked.

I replied, "The piece of paper that you got from God that said: 'I, God, hereby declare that in your life time, the woman you marry will never cheat on you.' Signed, Sealed, God."

He spluttered back, "I . . . I never got that piece of paper."

In a more calm voice I replied, "Then, in that case, you are just like the rest of us. We are all in the same class on the same boat, no third class but, certainly, no first class passengers."

No child is born with self-importance. It is like any disease. You have to catch it.

However, this is the only disease that we know that once you get it, you will just love it above everything else. It is the only disease that we know that you will do anything and everything to preserve, enhance and promote. Indeed, there are any number of books and workshops on self esteem. Then with it, we become monsters to others. As Bandler said:

"Importance is a great way to justify being mean and destructive, or doing anything else that=s unpleasant enough to need justification."

In being mean and destructive, we remain unaware that we are. And we remain so even when we are doing anything else that=s unpleasant. We remain unaware because we have the justification for doing so. After all when you too are a molecule of this thing and you are in an ocean of billions upon billions like you, how can you possibly be aware and understand it differently?

Before concluding, we would like to end by sharing with you our bewilderment about ourselves that it has taken us so long before writing this. Bandler wrote what he did about self-importance in 1985. It has taken 16 years for us to catch up with him. In doing so, it seems as if we have come out from under a cover of mystical and mythic power. Perhaps understanding this comes from a combination of two things. First, we suffered with our own self-importance. Yet we could not see the crap for the dung. Second, we were trapped within the scope of our level of awareness and the horizons of our consciousness. Within this bubble we fancied ourselves that we knew everything and that our thinking was sane, sound and well grounded. Even a man blown before the winds of his cocaine intoxication is unquestionably sure that his thinking is sane, sound and well-grounded.

Finally, having not been in contact with Richard Bandler since 1978, if anyone can advise him of this paper, or forward it to him, we thank you. We like to think that he will smile that it has taken over a decade for his words to find fruition in this paper. Then,

Everything he wants is to be the best. That which he receives is also to be the best. If it is not, you will hear of how he disparaged your gift and even you.

The Myriad of Manifestations of Self-importance:

One day, we encountered this one. It was a patient who complained of difficulty in speaking in company regardless of whether it was in a family, social or work situation. He was then a 27 year old Canadian man. We were very curious about this behavior. Certainly we did not accept the more usual conclusion of the label that he is shy.

Using meta-language<sup>17</sup>, we determine in a few questions that the root of his problem boiled down to: "If I don't say anything, they won't think anything." His ego was so invaluable to him that he would and could not endure anyone responding with a negative evaluation of what he might say and of him for saying it.

Later we encountered what we now believe to be the ultimate manifestation of self-importance. We had returned to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia with our two girls. We were only 7 days in KL. So we pre-arranged an "at home" in our hotel for my family to come and visit us. In the process of the "at home" it became clear to me that one of my cousins was not going to come.

Since it is important to "save face" in the east, I knew that my enquiries about him were being smoke screened.

When the "at home" was over, I picked up the KL telephone directory. There was his name, home address and office address in bold type. He had risen in life to be one of the directors of the Kuala Lumpur Stock Exchange. I rang his home number. Though I had not spoken to him in years, I still recognized his voice. I quickly picked up from the tonality of his voice that something was amiss. So, I applied the meta-language questions to him. Shortly, I discovered that two weeks prior to our return to KL, his son had returned from England. After picking him up at the airport and returning home, the son unpacked and came down stairs to talk.

The dad asked him, "Is it true that in the 20 years of my married life with your mother, she has been having this affair with this man?"

On hearing. "Yes!" his entire world collapsed. He had been cuckold for 20 years and everyone knew, even his son. His loss of face was unbelievable. By the time of my phone call, he had not been to work. He had not shaved. No one dared to come to him or ring him.

On the phone to me, he went on to protest his fine and excellent ways over the years in marital fidelity to his wife. And now this has happened to me, he powerfully and angrily protested. Then over the phone in anguish and pain he screamed and screeched to me, "Why me? I ask you Dennis, WHY ME?! WHY? WHY? WHY ME?!"

Suddenly, one in the group becomes very angry and berates you for offending him. You feel confused. You wonder aloud seeking support, "But what did I say." Yet your plea makes no difference to the injured party. He becomes even more irate and insane.

Well, now you know. What you said, he took to be a mortal and unforgivable scratch to his self-importance a.k.a. ego.

A person will value his self-importance above all else. He will do everything and anything to protect it. The Jain priest, Gurudev Shree Chitrabhanu<sup>16</sup> taught:

You may think, "I have only a little ego left." But, if someone insults your ego, that brings up anger. You may flare up and use harsh words. A person with ego has some deceit as well. In order to prevent his ego from receiving a puncture, he will do deceitful things. In that ego, there is also greed, to become more and more powerful, and to keep others in a subordinate position.

A self-important person will never allow another to be his equal. He will do everything to ensure this. Ever had such a >friend= like this? In the course of our lives, we have had a few of them. We found them truly irksome. Now, let us ask you, "Would you really like to go through life like an irk?"

If you are married to such a person, how long do you think you can endure this state of affairs? In the end, the only thing you can do is probably shake your head in dismay, pack your bags and leave. The self-important person will feel utterly surprised, confused, and shocked. He will feel devastated, angry, bitter and frustrated. He will then blame his partner for everything, and anything and much more.

The unsanity is worse when the self-important person identifies with his physical body. This means that his position is, "I am my body and my body is me." Self-importance is now identified with the body. When this is the case, it does not matter an iota if you have a Ph.D. I have such a client now who is wracked with fears. He fears to be in any life situation that he thinks might entail an "ouch" for him! Qui Gon Jinn told Anakin Skywalker, "Your focus is your reality." So this man=s entire reality is the insane focus not to place himself in the at risk position of pain in his life.

With self-importance at such a high premium, he will do anything to protect, guard and preserve it. On one hand, he lives a life of a hunted animal. He is said to be shy, but he has no chums. On the other hand he has to live separate and apart from other. Now he is said to be reclusive and he lives an isolated life.

A self-important person is not to be kept waiting. If he is, you will know the sting of his impatience and anger. However. A self-important person can and will keep you waiting with no concern.

In all known cultures and civilizations, slavery has been a feature. There was slavery in all the high and ancient civilizations of Egypt, Sumeria, Rome, Persia, India, China, Japan, Peru, Mexico. It is only now, after all these millennia have we finally emerged to reject it. It would seem that this has happened by a change in our Korzybskian semantic reactions (s.r.)<sup>12</sup> and our neuro-semantic semantic reactions.<sup>13</sup> For me, the idea of owning another human being is offensive and repugnant. However, someone with an exaggerated self-importance will not think or feel this way.

Self-importance makes a person absolutely sure that he knows all there is to know. This ushers in bigotry. He becomes quite sure that there is no one who knows better or more than he. This sends out curiosity. Do you know of someone who is always trying to show off that he knows more than you? There is never anything that you can say that he does not seem to have a better prescient riposte.

There is no one who can teach him anything. And, he is not prepared to learn from anyone or anything. He always knows that what he knows is always right. In NLP we say that such a person is stuck. But, he is quite unaware of it.

Is it possible to have a collaborative enterprise or endeavor with a self-important person? If he dares to risk co-participating in achieving a common goal, you know whose name is to be on top. Do you think your ideas and ways have a chance to play. All Amajor@ ideas and ways can only be his. You will be left with the crumbs.

How may such a description manifest itself in actuality? Well, think of children who are pampered to the power of <sup>N</sup> by their parents. These little darlings are put on such high pedestals that they go to school knowing in an undoubted way that they are above everyone. Now they find that they have to sit attentively to learn from a teacher. But they know all that there is to know. So they feel bored, bored, bored<sup>14</sup>. The threshold of their boredom rises; they are looking here, looking there and looking everywhere. Their minds are focused on doing something else. They do so and distract the class. They are brought to heel by the teacher. They are now agitated, irritated and angry that the teacher has dared to confront them.

This partial description is the unsanity for that dog-tag known as AHDD<sup>15</sup>. The conventional treatment for this is Ritalin. However, the Neuro-Semantic Programmer see it as an algorithm that has to be applied to discount the self-importance. You wonder, "which way will work better?" Ah! Such is life and the choices and choices that we encounter!

The person with self-importance values it above all things in his life. Woe to you if you scratch it by accident. Have you ever been in a social situation talking with a group of friends and acquaintances? Then, you say something that, in your mind is either fair and objective or tangential and humorous.

"Importance is a great way to justify being mean and destructive, or doing anything else that=s unpleasant enough to need justification." (underline added)

And of the 12 logical levels of the A system a.k.a. the Blame Frame, we found that justification was one of them.<sup>7</sup>

"Importance is a great way to justify being mean . . . or doing anything else . . ."  
(Bandler)

I was watching an old film, Demetrius and the Gladiators, starring Victor Mature and Susan Hayward. The most self-important person in the Roman Empire at the time was Caligula. You can understand how it was that Caligula by his fiat nominate Incitatus, his favorite horse, to the Imperial Roman Senate! And the whole Roman Empire from Britannia to Persia assented to it. I thought, how utterly unpleasant and exquisitely insane. Of course the entire Empire was quite unaware of this insanity. Every Roman citizen knew that in relationship to all other human beings, Caligula was more important than any of them. To compound the insane situation, he was also God! And amazingly they were the ones who deified him<sup>8</sup>.

In this same film, our heroine declares to her school of gladiators her expectation that they are to die well so that they honor her house. If you were transposed to Caligula=s time to be a gladiator, would you not conclude that your lot would be singularly insane and unpleasant? Do you get the idea how diseased this thinking out of self-importance can become?

The manifestation of syphilis is not the same as tuberculosis. Like other diseases that we cited above, self-importance presents itself in varied and unique ways. How self-importance will manifest itself is choreographed by a person=s HOPs<sup>9</sup> (Hierarchy of Paradigms). As a semantic emotion, self-importance is a state of being. As such it can vary in thresholds of intensity. Even at its minimum:

"As soon as one thing is 'important' then other things aren't."

So it logically follows:

As soon as a person is important, then others aren't.

When a person becomes consumed by his self-importance, he begins to believe that he is transcendently above and better than others. You will never be able to convince him otherwise. This transcendence is across all domains. This means that all others are less than he and their existence have far less value, worth or merit than his. In the extreme, others live to serve him.<sup>11</sup> A whole community or race can think that way. When they do, they will then have neither concern nor to enslave others.

This makes slavery a semantic child of self-importance.

"The third disease is importance, and self-importance is the worst of all. As soon as one thing is important then other things aren't. Importance is a great way to justify being mean and destructive, or doing anything else that's unpleasant enough to need justification." (p. 97).

Given the perception of our first professions (medicine and nursing respectively), we read this quote as putting self-importance in the same basket as other diseases as syphilis, tuberculosis, cholera, leprosy, malaria, gonorrhea, plague, etc. Yet in the realm of mind, self-importance is worst of all.

When we realize the significance of what Richard Bandler wrote, we begin to understand that many people suffer from this disease. And that creates a bit of a mess in the world. We then just might see that things are surely quite insane (Korzybski) in the world. We may then wonder if anyone has a cure for this disease. We may even suspect that we may never be free of it entirely.

We believe that history supports the truth of these tragic and terrible suspicions. If everyone, across all known time, suffered from syphilis, no one would think of it as being anything else but a perfectly normal event in their lives. If anyone were to become aware of it as a disease, the awareness would be blunted because he is immersed in the environment of the disease.

Bandler's insight about self-importance is a neuro-semantic discernment of an astounding order of high brilliance and virtuosity. We have cited in an endnote that we think there is only one other discovery comparable to this.

The Judeo-Christian heritage says pride is a sin<sup>1</sup>. The Catholic Church teaches this as the first cardinal sin<sup>2</sup>. The spiritual solution to this is humility<sup>3</sup>.

How then is self-importance the worst of all the diseases?

Earlier we wrote about Alfred Korzybski<sup>4</sup> and Cause and Effect<sup>5</sup> to present our viewpoint on that. In our thinking, self-importance is the ultimate neuro-semantic command line of Causality. It is co-fostered by its companion neuro-semantic power line, the little question, why.

Korzybski attempted to show that the Aristotelian system is the mother of human insanity. It seems to us that this was his incredible discovery which he delineated in Science and Sanity. We discovered that within the A system are 12 logical levels.<sup>6</sup> Each logical level is a command neuro-semantic operator in its own right. All these logical levels, as operators, co-anchor each other. Self-importance is one logical level and it happens to be the ultimate operator of the entire Aristotelian system and therefore a massive co-contributor of human semantic ill-formedness<sup>7</sup> and hence of disease.

In the Bandler quote, he cites that one logical corollary of self-importance is justification:

**3) Give them a strong dose of reality and reality testing.** "Self-importance," in the negative sense, has a hard time existing in the face of reality, the light of imperfection. So when we gently put the harsh consequences of ideas, speech, and behaviors gone wrong back in the face of the person, this helps him or her to recognize and own up to his or her fallibility. "So I guess all your boasting about knowing how to play the market just didn't pan out for you the way you had hoped." And yes, it might very well first elicit dis-illusionment. Good. We need some of our illusions popped so that we can create a better adjustment to what's real.

Of course, we can expect to hear excuses as the person will try to put off responsibility elsewhere, the old "blame frame" that the Chongs write about. Just let that be... and keep bringing the person back to his or her abilities to respond.

## Summary

Asserting what we do know and can do enables us to experience the resourceful states of self-confidence and self-efficacy. But when we arrogate to ourselves knowledge, traits, skills, and qualities that we really do not have, but only want and long for, we only make ourselves foolish, cut ourselves off from feedback, and eventually find ourselves locked in a self-made prison. To develop true excellence and skill, we need to develop a good relationship to the feedback of our ignorance, mistakes, and errors. These are not things that undermine us. They actually provide the necessary instructions for how to grow and develop.

What frames do you need to set around feedback of your ignorance, mistakes and errors? A long time ago, I decided to accept my own, learn to appreciate the value and lessons that I can learn, and to esteem myself as having worth and value while being totally fallible. Meta-stating myself in that way has helped with adjusting to the constraints of reality.

Oh, by the way, I do work at making at least three good mistakes a day just so that I know that I'm still fallible and stretching beyond my current comfort zone. How about you? Let's toast, "Here's one to good ole human fallibility!"

## Part II Dennis K. Chong, and Jennifer K. Smith Chong<sup>ã</sup>

In this paper, the male pronoun will apply to either gender. The plural pronoun will apply to both authors. The nominal pronoun will apply to the first author.
---

We dedicate this paper to Richard Bandler.
--

In 1985, Richard Bandler wrote:

the human condition as it is given. The person who falls into arrogating and acting pompous has a poor relationship to human fallibility—that we always and only think in fallible ways, that we speak and act in ways liable to error.

That we all make many mistakes and errors every day is just a fact of life. We can do none other. Imagining, pretending, or hallucinating infallibility may make us feel important, but it is quite delusional. How do you think about these fallible expressions of your humanity? How do you handle errors and mistakes as a "concept?" Do you accept them? Are you open to recognizing them and learning from them? Do you appreciate yourself as a fallible human being?

These questions explore your Meta-States about the primary experience of making mistakes, mis-understanding, mis-speaking, mis-behaving, etc. What frames of reference have you set about such?

When we think that the way to cope and navigate life is by feigning perfectionism, by being better than others and superior to others, that someone our concerns are more important than others, than we exalt ourselves into this negative meta-state of "self-importance."

### **The solution?**

We have numerous choices about how to respond to "self-Importance," whether our own or someone else's.

**1) Lighten up with a touch of humor.** Use humor to tease people out of it. This was the approach that Dennis took with the man who wailed about the infidelity of his wife. He essentially asked the man to produce the piece of paper from God that excluded him from the human experience. "Where is that paper that exempts you from the fallibilities of everyday life?" Bandler used the same approach as recorded by Andreas in *Using Your Brain For a Change*. Actually, this is an easy one to do since we never look more foolish and silly than when we go pompously acting as a big shot! Jesus of Nazareth caused the self-righteous and self-important Pharisees of his day to bristle under the humor of his jibs.

**2) Bring Acceptance, Kindness, and Sympathy to bear upon the self-importance.** Remember, beneath all of the work of arrogation is insecurity and low self-esteeming. Pity the person who has to be the center of the universe to feel okay about him or herself! Often, we can simply give the person what they have not received—acceptance and esteem for being a human being. I've found that giving this unconditionally tends to blow them away. They have no map for that. And it seems humbling. "Yep, sorry about it ole chap, but you're just a regular ole marvelous piece of wonder and majesty, full of dignity and value, just like the rest of us! Yep, nothing very special about you except you've got a spark of divinity in you, made in the image of God, and all of that kind of stuff."

importance (*Using Your Brain For a Change*, 1985, pp. 94-98). Being serious blinds us to searching for things as does the need to be right or treating ourselves as high and mighty.

"These three diseases are the way most people get stuck. You may decide something is important, but you can't get really serious about it until you're certain that it's important. At that point you stop thinking altogether." (p. 97)

### **What then is the problem with "self-importance?"**

Should we not value and esteem and even consider ourselves important? Of course we should. Bringing thoughts of value and esteem to bear upon our concepts of our "Self" enables us to build a healthy and vigorous "sense of self" so that we can have sufficient "ego strength" and "ego boundaries" to get on with learning, growing, developing, relating, and contributing to the world.

The development stages (Piaget, Erickson) describe the pathway of development each of us must transverse in order to have a sufficiently developed sense of ourselves. Then, with that level of self-esteeming we can get on to develop the necessary skills to fulfill our talents and dreams. When we do that, we build up a sense of competence, self-confidence, and self-efficacy. Good things for a feeling of empowerment.

"Self-importance." in the negative sense of the term, generally refers to the lack of a healthy foundation of self-esteem. The pompous person who wants the world to revolve around his or her ego generally operates from low self-valuation. Such persons cannot forget themselves, take a learner's role to others, admit errors, cooperate (as noted in the Chong's article that follows). Instead, they are far too insecure with themselves and so become caught up with themselves. "Self-importance" becomes their way of coping with their sense of inferiority. Yet the way they cope with their inadequacies, and poor maps about their mental construct of self only makes matters worse.

They seek to esteem themselves by putting others down, by being the center of attention, by becoming "the most important one of all." In the following article, Dennis and Jennifer Chong have detailed some of the sickness of this state of mind. The insecure person opts for "self-importance" in order to arrogate to him or herself qualities, skills, and knowledge that he or she does not have. In this way these individuals attempt to make themselves "all important."

Of course, this leads to more and more insanity. Korzybski used this term to define someone who still gets along in the world, they have not broken with reality yet (psychosis), but they are not very healthy. They have poor adjustments in the way they relate to others, to learnings, to skill development, etc. They are "unsane."

Given this description, as well as the one given by the Chongs, the negative and exaggerated form of "self-importance" arises from a failure to truly accept and appreciate

