

Charny, Israel W. (2020). Channeling Anger and Hate for Protecting Human Life. Chapter in Sternberg, Robert (Ed.), *Perspectives on Hate: How It Originates, Develops, Manifests, and Spreads*. 1st Edition. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association Books, pp.109-135.

The following is a copy of the chapter from the book, presented in a larger font than the original, where the page numbers are for our manuscript and not the page numbers in the actual print edition.

Channeling Anger and Hate for Protecting Human Life

Israel W. Charny

This chapter is an attempt to connect us first of all to the primitive basic potential for anger and hate in our instinctual machinery and proposes a clinical technique for managing undue eruptions of emotional anger and hate in actual violence by individuals.¹ The basic thrust of this technique is to accept the naturalness of hatred as an emotion but at the same time to define the absolute wrongness of violent *action* to another human being (except in genuine self-defense).

“Hate” refers to that simple emotion that wells up in the heart and often enough in the mouth, say, of a 4-year-old who may tell a parent “I hate you” or variations that make the point no less clear such as wishing the parent to die. Some good people like to think that the 4-year-old doesn’t really mean it—and indeed we all say things we don’t mean as fully as they sound. Of course, in most cases the child has other kinder and loving feelings as well, and when the ire passes will move on to these, but it is my conviction that basically at the time of the experience of anger-hate the emotion is very real. In fact, in my own personal life experiences I had a dream when I was 4 of one of my parents dying, and while I “got over it” at the time, I retained a memory of the dream that enabled me to speak and work on it when I underwent psychoanalysis in my 20s. It was indeed a very real feeling of hate notwithstanding the fact that I was a “good” and definitely not hating or violent kid. Our 4-year-old remains inside of us all through the rest of our lives as we get to be big and grown up and earn doctorates in this or that.

In other words, from the outset there is a built-in capacity to feel rushes and bursts, and then also longer term policies of emotional attitudes, of intense displeasure, dislike, anger, wishes to hurt the other, and/or imagination of a grim fate befalling the object of our intensely negative feeling.

Any and all of these are not necessarily destructive or otherwise pathological. They are basic human emotions. Used properly, with mindful awareness and toward releasing anger only nonviolently and channeled constructively—both inside of us and in actual use in interpersonal relationships—they may well be valuable and helpful resources for good living. In fact, there is a good deal of clinical and research evidence that people who are seriously unable to experience and express anger are likely to be in psychological trouble and may also have a higher potential for destructive violent action than those who recognize and manage hate in their emotional lives.

I believe that the use of this model not only provides a treatment for emotional violence by a large group of individuals, but that it may contribute meaningfully to our theoretical understanding of the infrastructure of anger and hate in general and ultimately to our efforts to arrive at new approaches for reducing destructive hatred at other levels of human behavior.

ACCEPTING THE NATURALNESS OF HATE: A TOOL FOR NONVIOLENCE AND DECENCY

My original working title for this chapter was “In Praise of Hate—When Properly Experienced and Expressed,” and I began my text by assuming that a fair number of my colleague-readers would truly *hate* me for my very title, and that in doing so they would be providing us a good illustration of how feelings of hate spring up inside of us all perfectly naturally in response to a thousand and one stimuli. I added both in seriousness and in an effort at good humor that, as a psychotherapist and scholar who believes deeply in the naturalness of anger and hate and who believes in the importance of airing all viewpoints, I accepted any such feelings toward me and my topic.

As successive drafts of the chapter developed and I enjoyed the feedback of several notable colleagues (at least one of whom reminded me explicitly of the Christian concept of loving and not hating), I came to the conclusion that I wanted to soften the title and convey more clearly that what the model proposed, right or wrong as it may prove to be, was my participation in a quest for greater nonviolence in human life. So in a first revision I added quotation marks to the word “*hate*,” and in a second revision I added the further stipulation “to protect and not do harm to human life,” so that the title then read in full “In Praise of ‘Hate’—When Properly Experienced and Expressed to Protect and Not Do Harm to Human Life.” And, finally, I decided to drop “In Praise of Hate” as perhaps unnecessarily

provocative and go directly to a straightforward assertion: “Channeling Anger and Hate for Protecting Human Life.”

This chapter addresses the psychological infrastructure of anger-hate on the level of everyday human experiences. Insofar as the reader is expecting a discussion of hate, prejudice, discrimination, persecution, or genocide on the level of society, what is presented here will be a disappointing distraction. Yet it is my belief that in the long run we will have better results in solving the terrible social issues if we begin with understanding the psychology of hate on the most personal level of common experiences in intimate and everyday relationships. The thesis presented here is that these “bad feelings” ain’t at all so bad—on the contrary, they are part of our natural human equipment, and we have to master the proper use of them. At the same time, it is overwhelmingly clear that these feelings do set off countless incidents of terrible actual violence that we do not want to encourage in any way. After positing the naturalness of feelings of anger and hate, the chapter goes on to propose a method of healing outbursts of emotional violence and shows how the method provides us with a therapeutic/educational tool for helping some people not to fall into an outburst of violent behavior.

Of course, the method is not applicable in all situations, with all people; moreover, this method does not offer tools for the management of ideological and collective hate. We also need to know much more about other contraindications for its use. Thus, I have doubts—but no personal experience—in using the technique with people on drugs or otherwise in a physiological state where there is deeply warped or lacking receptivity to other people (although I have met one physician who told me he used the technique successfully with patients intoxicated on drugs).

There shouldn’t be the slightest doubt that my orientation overall is fiercely against destructive hate and evil. I am not only continuing my earlier attempt at humor when I say that I *hate destructive hate*, and that I hate violence that is not objectively for self-defense or otherwise saving and protecting human life. I am known as one of the key founders of the academic discipline of genocide studies, and my bibliography is replete with books and articles about the ultimate expressions of hatred of human beings in the many genocides of so many peoples (Charny, 1982a, 1999, 2016; Totten & Bartrop, 2008). I have also made my own small impotent efforts to come up with a few ideas to reduce societal destructive hate and violence such as a Genocide Early Warning System (GEWS; Charny, 1977/1982b), a proposal for licensing international leaders (Charny, 2012), and a world organization of all peoples who have endured genocide—R2L or Right to Life (Charny, 2012).

But in my very search to understand the horrors of our human destructiveness, both on the basis of philosophical and psychological studies and also on the basis of psychotherapeutic penetrations into our minds (for I continue all these years also to be an active practicing therapist), I have come to the conclusion that we are mistaken when we think of the problems of hatred and evil in a dualistic fashion—that hatred and evil are entirely bad and we want to replace them only with full goodness and decency.

Unlike the conception that man is inherently “good” and stands for life, and only under conditions of frustration and deprivation becomes hateful and destructive, my conviction is that, not unlike Freud’s eros and Thanatos, from the outset of life, there are two major titanic-instinctive energy streams pulsating in us: the one toward the protection, preservation, and enhancement of all that is living, and the second the capacity and pleasure of fighting off threats to our existence and of destroying other living creatures—at the least in an endless battle for survival of the fittest. One should note that this also means that often there really is a sense of reward and strength in doing aggressive acts to other human beings because it is natural—and sadly, we have seen many reports of such pleasures from people who have tortured and murdered others, for example, veteran soldiers, security people, or killers in genocides (Charny, 2016). In no way do I approve of such pleasure, but I do believe we need to know how it comes up for many people. In other words, I want to convey a basic principle that the ability to be aggressive, and yes, to harm some aspects of life, is built into our natures and is indeed necessary for living; then, obviously, if we want to contain destructive violence, the presence of two such vital streams of energies calls for the wisest and most constructive *choices* possible *when* and *how* one is to apply each energy.

Hate is a dirty word for many good people and social scientists of goodwill; *anger* somewhat less so, though it too earns quite strong “negative reviews” from many people, including a large and probably a majority of psychologists who want nicer people in this world. The way I define the relationship between the two—and any number of dictionaries do so as well—is that hate is a more intense and vicious anger. The two in effect are on a continuum, so they are related to one another at all times even when one does not feel the intensity of hate.

Clearly, hate is the infrastructure for a great number of the most heinous horrifying acts of destruction in human life. But hate is a natural emotion. Hate is a burst of emotional lightening. It is a storm of considerable energy. It is a powerful release of intense and pent-up anger and tension. It is a powerful comforting

instrument of security in the face of grave threats and danger. Strangely enough, it is many times also a cry of seeking to love and/or despair at not being loved. It is even built into genuinely loving relationships (Charny, 1972). You can't and should not rule it out from human experience.

Gideon Lev (2018) wrote about Sigmund Freud's essay "Thoughts for the Times on War and Death: The Disillusionment of the War" (written several months after World War I broke out):

The law of emotional ambivalence, which to this day controls our relationships with the people we love most, inserted a drop of contentment even regarding the death of a loved one. Love and hate always appear together, Freud wrote, for love is a response to the hostile impulses that we feel even towards someone close and dear to us, because even the closest person is still always a stranger.

All of us need to learn to recognize and harness anger-hate and use it constructively for self-defense and fighting for life and constructing a better life.

The intensity of the energy of hatred is also a constructive driving force that is characteristically necessary in building any number of new and desirable aspects and structures for life. Thus, it is a desirable psychobiological force in fighting against undue prospects of illness, death, and injury. Hating to lose or come in last in a competition can spur on achievement. Hating an obstacle to one's life can motivate invention and discovery of new means for achieving a goal. In other words, hate and anger are necessary arms of self-defense and effective living both externally and internally. If you don't want to be a sheep led to slaughter, hate and fight back. If you want to maintain your sense of self, dignity, and power under oppressive or trapping conditions such as in the book *1984*—meaning all sorts of types of dictatorship and denials of freedom—hate the oppression and oppressors and fight to think, be who you are, and express yourself in the best means possible.

In my judgments of how constructive and how destructive hate is, I differentiate between different intensities of hate such as inner *wishes* to hurt and kill versus unchecked drives to actual *acts* of violence and killing, and between different goals of one's hatred such as to win and build a better life (and not through destroying others as if for the purpose of a better life) versus annihilating and destroying other human beings.

To recap, my ground-rule definition on this issue is: *Hate* is very often viciously destructive, but hate intrinsically is a severe state of anger and aggressiveness that

expresses an intense press or intention to achieve a goal. One well-known literary critic of Shakespeare, P. K. Saval (2016), author of *Shakespeare in Hate: Emotions, Passions, Selfhood*, first recognized that in recent years hate, which was for a long time interpreted as “any intense dislike or hostility” (p. 1), has increasingly become restricted to negative beliefs and prejudices about groups of people. In the process, an “aesthetic pleasure in hating” (p. 2) has been overlooked: There is an aesthetic pleasure in hating, and part of the appeal of the greatest works of art is that they revitalize our *capacity* to hate. Vehement passions [are] a claim about the world and a mysterious access of energy; at its most sublime, anger is not a failure of deliberation but a supernatural power. The unruly and fighting emotions are not just psychologies to be stigmatized but forms of life to be celebrated. (p. 3)

In a popular professional blog that is substantially grounded in references to the formal experimental literature, British psychologist Jeremy Dean (2012) summarized six psychological benefits of getting mad:

1. Anger is a motivating force.
2. Angry people are more optimistic.
3. Anger can benefit relationships.
4. Anger provides self-insight.
5. Anger reduces violence.
6. Anger as a negotiation strategy.

From my point of view of hatred as an intense anger, I would rewrite each of these benefits to read “anger-hate.”

I say anger-hate *can* reduce violence, benefit relationships, promote optimism and be a useful motivating force, but it can just as easily be destructive. Used right, anger can be a handy tool. But use with caution, because people find anger the most difficult of all emotions to control.

TWO CONTRADICTORY VIEWS AND THE DIALECTIC: HOW ANGER IS BAD FOR YOU VERSUS ANGER IS GOOD FOR YOU

The contradiction between instructions to express and release your anger and counseling to reduce and overcome your anger is almost funny.

If you look at the enormous literature on aggression and violence that comes out of our profession, you will find a majority of papers that prove that violence is spurred on by the expression and unleashing of aggression, and I believe a majority of therapists see their task to be to reduce aggression as much as possible. Thus, see a summary of anger disorders by Howard Kassinove (2013). The prevailing and definitely politically correct stand in our psychotherapy literature is that, as much as possible, hate *should* be transformed into understanding, tolerance, compassion, forgiveness, dialogue, negotiation, and mediation (Brandt, 2014). An excellent and attractively presented summary of how to reduce anger is offered by Trudy Griffin (n.d.). However, you will also find a smaller number of pieces of advice from learned researchers and medical consultants that getting your anger expressed and released can be good for you. Thus, a recent review in the *Journal of Forensic Psychology* concluded: “Anger has often been viewed as a maladaptive response to distress, yet in actuality the emotion serves an adaptive function as its basic purpose is to prepare individuals to respond to real threats within the environment” (Moore, 2016, p. 1).

There have even been studies that show that one pattern is more nearly true of one culture and the second pattern is more nearly true of another culture. Several studies have shown that in the United States, expressions of anger led to increased physical agitation associated with the acting out of violence, while in Japan expressions of anger are reported to lead to reductions of physiological distress and violence (Kitayama et al., 2015). In other words, the cultural or meaning context in which an expression of anger is or is not encouraged or accepted makes a huge difference as to the impact and further consequences of that expression of anger. Japanese culture handles aggressive feelings quite differently than American culture. Japanese don’t show emotion. Japanese smile when angry. One description of media violence in Japan versus America was that although the amount of violence was roughly the same, in Japan the scenes “tend to last longer, are more realistic and place a much greater emphasis on physical suffering”; also in Japan, the perpetrators of violence were twice as often “performed by ‘bad guys’ with the hero suffering the consequences” the majority of the time (Center for Media Literacy, 1993).

Psychotherapy is also a cultural arena. The therapist is educating and conveying instructions to the patient. If, as is commonly the case, the therapist believes that anger must be suppressed, withdrawn, exchanged for self-assertiveness, emotional control, and/or compassion and communication, the results will be what they are; however, if the therapist teaches a proper use of anger that is clearly intended *only* for constructive purposes of releasing oneself and achieving the

greatest peace possible, the results will be different. We describe the latter kind of technique of psychotherapy later, but what I want to emphasize now is that a critical aspect of this technique is that the patient is carefully instructed, trained, and given exercises to do both in sessions and at home to help the patient become aware that the purpose of the expression of the anger is to *release* it to be more at peace and less angry. In other words, the culture for expressing violence that is established by the therapist is to work toward the most peaceful outcomes possible—not to build greater hate or spark actual violence, which is ethically wrong and as such is strictly ruled out.

It is my belief that studies that show expressing anger leads to greater hate and, worst of all, to acting out in actual violence are based on situations where people are encouraged/allowed to be enraged without instructions and without an expectation that they will channel their release of anger toward greater peace. Just as we described about U.S. and Japanese cultures of anger, what I shall call the “culture of expression of anger” makes a huge difference.

Anger-hate is a kind of “pick-and-choose situation” as to how you are going to use your anger. My opinion is that if you lock it up inside of you in an effort to limit anger and reduce the risk of violence, the likelihood of emotional damage including eruptions of violence is significant. On the other hand, if you release your anger indiscriminately, overintensely, and with a readiness to act out violently, the results clearly will also be destructive. However, if you release your anger for good reasons, with constructive intentions, with a proper pacing of the intensity and a genuine commitment to make it all work for greater peace for yourself and for others, you are maximizing the possibility of good, nonviolent results.

There are intriguing findings pertaining to the ability to fantasize and to imagine oneself being violent toward a hated object. Some clinician researchers have observed that the potential for dangerous acting out of killer violence is greater in people who cannot “own up” to angry feelings and fantasize their execution. Thus, psychologist George Bach and his colleagues reported a study of 74 spouse killers who had killed their mates and were in jail, which is where the researchers visited them. They found that, characteristically, these men and women were the “nice people” who either had not experienced or fantasized their murderous rage before committing their deadly act, or who “abhorred and therefore avoided open conflict and fighting” (Bach & Goldberg, 1974/2000, p. 59; Bach & Wyden, 1969). Similarly, Israeli psychiatrist Shlomo Kulcsar, who together with his psychologist wife, Shoshana, were delegated to examine arch killer Adolf Eichmann in jail

before his execution, also found on psychological testing that Eichmann was incapable of experiencing a natural range of angry feelings (Kulcsar, 1987).²

The “trick” is that one must learn and develop a good ability to harness anger-hate and use it constructively for life and not to destroy life. One might think of it as a psychological nuclear energy. Thus, in respect to everyday human relationships, we need to know how to process our angry feelings and to use them constructively to give us power *and* in efforts to work through conflicts and reach as constructive and peaceful outcomes as possible. Yes, it is difficult many times, even extraordinarily difficult, to master the above trick, and clearly millions of people do not have access either to counseling or to education programs or cultural influences that instruct and train them in life-promoting uses of their anger-hate. My purpose in this chapter is to contribute to some use of this point of view such as in psychotherapy and to offer a new theoretical perspective on which, hopefully, our civilization in the future can build new cultural forms and influences for promoting life (see, as an example of a proposal to stimulate wide cultural changes, my proposal for a “Worldwide Campaign for Life”; Charny, 2007). Sadly, we are far, far away at this time in our evolution.

Here is a summary of constructive anger by Meloy (2014):

Constructive anger is anger turned to healing and is characterized by hurt, anger, love, concern, sadness, compassion and a forgiving heart. It inspires closeness, intimacy, unity, affection and peace. Following an offense, the offended is able to affirm and protect themselves, affirm and be a corrective influence for the perpetrator, and be a constructive and healing influence for the relationship (pp. 38–39). . . . With destructive anger, you may have relationships that survive or end, but even if they do survive, we don’t judge that they are likely to be healthy; there will always be hierarchy and power imbalances. Simply giving free expression to any pathway of anger may not be healthy for the individuals or relationships. In therapy, clinicians must facilitate [patients] as they actively and consciously work to sustain productive expressions of constructive anger. (p. 46)

As we shall see in the discussion of experiences of hate in the course of psychotherapy, hate that is properly processed can be a highly effective contribution to *nonviolence* and to positive resolution of deeply negative and hostile conflicts. The patient in therapy who is experiencing hating feelings must first accept them as natural, but then, simultaneously, must direct the hate energy toward the explicit purpose of reducing and correcting first the potential for violence and second the intensity of the negativity in the relationship.

In fact, some psychotherapists, very much including this writer, propose in therapy that hatred that has not been experienced sufficiently be purposefully cultivated by the therapy and honored as a way of releasing anger that is building up deep inside the patient and also as a way of fighting back against sources of great harm to the patient. The techniques for cultivating such hate are the very opposite of the often-standard techniques for attempting to teach patients to suppress their violent feelings. Thus, one recent study by Tsvieli and Diamond (2018) in the journal *Psychotherapy* reported that the “use of interventions that direct the young adult to less personal content and a higher level of abstraction (e.g., psychoeducation) or attempts to comfort or help the young adult to downregulate (e.g., reassurance), did not lead to productive emotional processing” (p. 295) and that “therapists’ focus on clients’ rejecting anger preceded the discontinuation of such processing at rates significantly greater than chance” (p. 289). The same authors provided an excellent summary of emotion-focused therapy for “productive emotional processing” along seven dimensions: “attending, symbolization, congruence, regulation, agency, and differentiation” (p. 18). In other words, they too are not calling for wild and harmful anger but are calling for its responsible use.

The work of encouraging anger-hate in therapy does *not* mean encouraging the patient to go out into real life and blow up their rage at others. In my model the therapist should also be instructing the patient in a whole set of other rules for when and how to be self-assertive and when and how to express anger to people in one’s actual life—and we address these rules shortly as well. Our emphasis here is first of all on the *inner* experiencing of anger by a person, to aim purposefully at releasing pent-up angers that are stored within, often unconsciously, to help a person make an effective commitment to stopping or disowning any potential for actual violence, and then also to seek to reach as constructive a relationship as possible with the internal objects of one’s anger. The anger work is intended to help a person feel more safe and secure, not to be lost in greater hate and certainly not to be violent. Intriguingly such anger work is often also conducted in therapy toward objects who are no longer available in real life, such as a parent who has passed away, or when the object person is not accessible for direct relationship at the time. Thus, treating a young college girl in Tel Aviv who was decompensating rapidly toward a psychotic state, I used the empty-chair technique (a technique from Gestalt-method therapy where one imagines the object person, say a relative, sitting in a facing chair and speaks to them entirely authentically and far more openly than one ever can in real life) to release her intense anger at her parents who live in Europe. Within a few sessions the girl was able to reorganize herself, and the danger of psychotic deterioration had passed.

Of course, one should again note that there have been any number of research proofs that high anger expression can be bad for one's health and increased expression of anger can lead to an increase in violence. Thus, one popular but professionally grounded article in *Psychology Today* summarized the research thus: "Unfortunately scientific evidence shows that venting one's anger only makes things worse. Venting harms the self and others. Expressing anger is also linked to higher risk of heart disease (Boylan & Ryff, 2015) just like stuffing it inside. However expressing anger has another drawback. It increases aggression against others" (Bushman, 2013).

Clearly, these are very important findings, but as I wrote earlier, in my understanding they refer to the unguided eruptive and explosive expressions of anger by a person and not to the guided instructions we are describing for a therapy that teaches a person how to release their anger constructively and definitely nonviolently and very much for purposes of becoming quiet, constructive, and not angry in the relationship that is being addressed.

Like many a medicine, the "medicine of anger" should not be overdone, of course. When the patient is instructed on how to release quite intense imagery of harm and even fantasy images of murdering their hated ones, and to practice this technique at home, the instructions each time need to limit the amount of time that the patient will engage in such fantasy work and to remind them to be aware consciously that their purpose is to get their anger out so that they would be able to use it as capably as possible to improve their lives and to improve relationships. In no way are they to be actually harmful or destructive to other living people—even to those they hate. One might say playfully that they are being instructed, "Make emotional war in order to love."

It takes time and practice to learn how to exercise hate correctly without harming oneself and/or without building to dangerous intensities or to the encouragement of acting out of violence, but in my experience a vast majority of patients learn to do this quite well and with very good feelings of relief as a result. Of course, again note that this applies to professionally sound therapy where, like in medicine, the therapist keeps an eye open for allergic and anaphylactic reactions and guards against loss of control. We are very far from knowing how to teach constructive expression and control of anger to the larger population.

CHOOSING BETWEEN USING ONE'S ENERGIES TO PROTECT LIFE OR TO HARM OR DESTROY LIFE—BOTH OUR OWN AND OTHERS'

The processes of making choices between creating and destroying are critical to all of us.³ When should one choose to hate and when should one choose to love? On a more subtle level, when should one exercise power toward others, and when should one be yielding and allow and enjoy being guided and led by others? When should one be tough, and when should one be tender—a question to be nourished even in such joyous activity as making love? All of the above are natural forces of life. Psychotherapy should not be aimed at removing all hate, anger, and power, but at assisting patients to have sufficient power to fight *for life* together with an awareness and control that enables them to inhibit potential harm and destructiveness to others (Charny, 2017a); when one has failed to do so—as will be the case for all of us at certain times in our lives—we need to be able to acknowledge rather than deny the harm we have done others and to make some measures of restitution (Charny, 2016).

Let us think of loving and hating. Many an observer and many a poet have remarked on how love and hate are closely intertwined. Chinese poet, Luo Zhizhai (n.d.), wrote: “Love and hate in intersection, tears vertically and horizontally.”

If we listen to our minds, they reveal to us periodically that we harbor strong hate feelings even against those whom we truly love (Gibran, n.d.; Winnicott, 1949/1965).

An American love poem (Harder, n.d.) includes the lines: “I Hate Why You Can’t Be With Me . . . I Hate That I Love You.”

We certainly hate when we are unable to love someone we want to love. We also hate precisely because we do love someone very much and that means that we are all the more vulnerable to loss of that person and loss of that love. Often enough, we really very much love the same people whom we ostensibly hate—with young children, one can see more clearly moments where one lashes out against the other and the real dynamic is a desire for friendship and closeness. Moreover, there is much evidence that the ability to hate genuinely is also a precondition for the ability to love energetically and authentically. If the lover is continuously a yes-man or a yes-woman (e.g., ask for an opinion about how you are dressed and you are told every time that you look great), there is less of a ring of genuineness and truth to statements of love, which also may be “politically correct” efforts to appease and please.

Some measures of hatred, power striving, and even actual evil and destructiveness are, for better or worse, built into the inevitability of human experience and behavior. Furthermore, we are daring to observe and propose that some measures of all of these are necessary and ethically good for the purposes of fighting for life, as noted especially for genuine self-defense, or “fighting” against illness or say to recover from surgery, or “fighting” for a relationship, or also for the more simple fun of competing as many of us love to do in sports, business, or for that matter, in matters of love.

Improper as it is even in a nonexperimental professional article to go soft on theology and mythology, I will refer to a delicious rabbinic legend (*agadah*) that the Council of Learned Rabbis proposed to clean up this world for the good, and they petitioned the Lord to remove the “Evil Impulse” (the satanic figure who embodies all evil). The Lord hesitated to take such a final act and it was decided instead to imprison the Evil Impulse for 3 days. The Evil Impulse warned them, “It’s not worth it to you. If I am put out of commission, there will be no continuation of life in this world.” At the end of 3 days, the rabbis saw that no chicken had laid an egg. The consequent decision was clear to all that they must release the Evil Impulse to play out its share of life (*Babylonian Talmud*). Similarly, the iconic 18th-century Hassidic leader Baal Shem Tov wrote that plain common sense can “break” (overcome) the Evil Impulse, but true conquest of the Evil Impulse calls for one “to take full advantage of its power and fine attributes and use them for holy purposes” (Baal Shem Tov, n.d.). Amusingly, both the *Old Testament* and the *New Testament* give many instructions about how to moderate and replace one’s wrath with kindness, yet at the same time portray a God who frequently doesn’t hesitate to express his wrath and to warn of a “great day of wrath to come.”

Too many times genuinely good people are mistaken in their inability to spot and stand up to hatred, nastiness, and destructiveness in various areas of their lives such as in marriage; work relationships; with neighbors and their community; or in their ability to identify early on leaders and historical trends that are setting out on a course of incitement of hatred, destruction, and fascist control.

A PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC APPROACH TO CONSTRUCTIVE ANGER AND HATE

In a psychotherapy practice, we see that people often get furious at someone in their lives, and if that someone is defined as untouchably holy—say, the obligation so many experience to only honor their parents and not feel angry toward them—

and/or if the furious person does not accept in themselves the naturalness of the angry feelings, emotional crises and blockages develop. I frequently cite a superb article that was presented to a seminar of a Group for Study of the Psychology and Non-Violence in Philadelphia many years ago by a Quaker psychiatrist, Robert Clark, who was the head of the acute psychiatric in-patient service at Friends Hospital in Philadelphia. He taught us that the typical course of a psychotic breakdown in Quakers who presented as psychiatric emergencies in his hospital was that “unbeknownst to them”—which means unconsciously—they were angry as hell at someone and, as is natural in our human minds, entertained fantasies of pummeling and killing their hated object, but of course these dear committed decent Quaker people couldn’t possibly acknowledge to themselves such feelings. Dr. Clark continued that as the momentum of hatred and wishes to harm grew apace, an emotional crisis would develop, and the solution chosen by these people was to inflict on themselves a breakdown into craziness rather than to run the risk of living out their hateful wishes (Clark, 1965).

I was so impressed at the time by this understanding that I proceeded to do my own informal survey of a ward of acute psychotic patients at the VA Hospital in Coatesville, Pennsylvania. The question I searched for in the patients’ charts and with the social worker on the ward was whether the history of a patient conveyed that the patient had deeply hateful feelings for someone in their lives—generally their families—that had not been expressed or otherwise channeled constructively, and indeed there were many such cases.

So many times, people present for psychotherapy in a state of emotional turmoil, anxiety, depression, or as we saw, madness, and the key that opens the door to relief and constructive therapeutic work is the recognition and acceptance of the hatred that they feel toward—whomever.

In my clinical experience, there are so many cases in therapy where a major contribution is to free the patient to experience and express their anger, and even more so to encourage and train the patient to enact in a psycho-dramatic fashion their festering anger and hate.

Many, many patients will reach an acknowledgment that they are *angry* but will protest adamantly that they don’t *hate*. In one such recent case I saw how the patient’s body remained tense and rigid (as she was in much of her real intimate relationships) until we reached an understanding that her hate was a level of intensity of anger that marked a transformative zone on a continuum of anger-hate. Hate is a more explosive and encompassing anger, ostensibly different but like

many materials we know that undergo meaningful changes when the heat or other extreme implodes them. With the acknowledgment of the truth and of her hatred (in this case of her “doing mother,” but not “being mother”), a sweet warm glow began to appear on her face.

When I treat actual violence, say in a family, such as between spouses or between parents and children (in either direction), the immediate and insistent position that I take is as follows: “Obviously you are full of anger and hate at (object), and I will help you with your anger which needs to be heard, but you know that it is absolutely wrong to inflict actual physical damage on another human being” (Charny, 1967, p. 60). I have employed this technique many, many times, and as I have reported in the literature on several occasions, I have succeeded any number of times in receiving from people who were in the throes of a violent outburst their knives or in one case a gun, and in other cases where no actual weapon was involved but there were physical blows, a decisive end to the beatings (Charny, 2018a, 2018b). I will be describing this technique in greater detail shortly.

Note again the principle: Anger is a legitimate natural force, and that goes for the intensity of anger that we call hate too, but it is by no means to be unleashed without the deepest considerations of the appropriateness of the extent of damages one wants to inflict on another person. (One brief analogy to the collective level, say in the actual conduct of what we will call a “*just war* against fascism,” there is every reason for justifying going all the way to kill the perpetrators of evil, but there still remain considerations of conducting war as humanely as possible, as opposed to “crimes against humanity,” and also how one goes about treating captives and enemy wounded, and how one treats the vanquished enemy after concluding the war.) In everyday relationships in the family and in the business world, it will be the clear-cut consensus of most of us that doing actual violence is wrong as can be, but a discharge and clarification of the angers one has are very much called for.

HATE AND POWER ARE BLOOD BROTHERS

Power issues are everywhere. They manifest themselves endlessly in all the controlling people that we meet in our lives. It is easy to recognize almost immediately an intent to dominate. You can hear it in a teacher’s voice when addressing students peremptorily. You can hear it in a doctor’s voice speaking to a patient imperiously. You can hear it in a mother’s voice when she gives instructions in an aggravatingly bossy manner to her child. Sadly, the desire

and readiness to adopt overly powerful behaviors often manifest themselves even in people whom we have experienced earlier as nice and friendly, but once they enjoy a promotion to a higher position of authority they become entitled to make more decisions and assignments of others according to their wishes. It's bad enough to run into an insulting bossy person in whatever role, but there is extra disappointment and pain when the control and tyranny issue from people we have previously known to be fair and friendly who have become infected with what I like to call the *power sickness*.

As Lord Acton (John Dalberg-Acton, 1834–1902) concluded forever for all of us, “Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely” (Lord Acton, 2019).⁴ After studying literally millions of cases of genocidal fatalities, the political scientist who in my opinion has been the greatest scholar of genocide in the world to date, the late R. J. Rummel (1997) of the University of Hawaii, came to the decisive conclusion that the striving for power over others was the overwhelmingly key dynamic in the genesis of genocide:

The most fundamental explanation of democratic peace is that Freedom promotes non-violence and Power kills. . . . The less democracy the more nations make violence on each other, and the more their internal collective violence and democide. That is why nondemocracy is an engine of violence. This is because these societies . . . are ruled by coercion and force. And thus, Power kills. (p. 203)

The exercise of power is driven to a significant extent by hate. Along with ambition and a desire for superiority, hate seems to be an engine that drives much of the quest for power. It is striking that psychologist Gustave Gilbert (1950) concluded from his examination of the Nazis who were on trial at Nuremberg that they were driven by their overwhelming ambition and low ethical standards joined with their strong commitments to ideology, these obviously in addition to their overwhelming desire and exercise for power over other human beings. Moreover, when one aspires to power and experiences resistance to one's superiority, feelings of hate will naturally follow. The conclusion has to be that effective reduction of destructive hate in a person needs to be linked to a significant reduction in power strivings as well.

The issue of excessive power also has further implications for a person's mental health. See inspiring classical clinical works by psychoanalysts Karen Horney (1937; a psychiatrist) and Rollo May (1972; a psychologist) on the role of excessive power strivings in emotional disorders. See also my proposal of a formal diagnosis of a personality disorder of excessive power strivings (Charny, 1997).

Slowly but surely, I have come to my personal conclusion that the single most determining force of human problems is the mishandling of our power strivings. The evidence is overwhelming that every human being needs to achieve a state of satisfying power to stand up to the endless challenges and crises of life, but the evidence is also clear that an incredible number of us seek compulsively to establish our superior power over others in millions of ways, and that this motivation intrinsically eats away at what could be the beauty and decency of our styles of self-expression and relating. For example, take intellectual achievements and differentiate between genuine desires and pleasure in learning more about the incredible mysteries of life versus driving ambitions to be “first in the class” or to publish the most outstanding work or to gain the most prestigious prizes. Thus too, consider loving another person and experiencing real appreciation, respect, and attraction to them for their beauty and fineness, compared with a runaway desire (though in itself it is natural to an extent) to conquer and possess the other.

The quest for power is also tied deeply to an unconscious quest for immortality. We people are, understandably, terrified of dying, and terrified of really knowing that we are going to die—even though of course we know it. Philosopher Ernest Becker (1973) showed dramatically how the denial of death is a driving force toward violence. Psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton (1979, 1987) has described how a huge number of human activities are energized in particular by unconscious wishes to have these activities serve as “living memorials” to our existence. This includes intellectual-artistic creations, great engineering feats, scientific discovery, sports achievements, military prowess, outstanding artistic performance, and more. This is not to deny that the central goal and joy of creative experiences is the expression of one’s sensitivity and ingenuity, but the point is that on an unconscious level, a driving force toward undertaking and completing the hard creative work is the desire to leave a permanent record of one’s self. Even the intellectual-artistic creation that is not driven by competitiveness or a quest for immortal honor constitutes on an unconscious level a credit toward one’s “immortality,” so that the “taste” of immortality becomes attached even inadvertently to creativity over and above a genuine goal and joy of experiencing one’s sensitivity and ingenuity.

We return to the facts that power and hate are closely intertwined. The undue exercise of power often springs from hateful feelings. One easily brings to mind pictures of abuse and brutality that are expressions of and accompanied by emotions of despising and humiliating the victim. Hate, in turn, is characteristically engendered when a person suffers a feeling of lacking power and reacts angrily in hatred. Hate then becomes the driving force to enable securing more power. As noted earlier, hate serves as an engine that drives much of the quest for power.

WHAT OF EMPATHY, COMPASSION, AND GREATER DECENCY?

But is it morally right to hate so intensely? Certainly, nice people don't like the idea, and endless church sermons call on us to cleanse ourselves of such bad feelings and replace them with understanding, love, empathy, and forgiveness. And so do many a therapist—both classical and “new age”—and there are wonderful educational programs in schools to teach children how not to hate in bigotry or in domination bullying. Bless them all! These are needed efforts to curtail and reduce the destructive hatred that plagues our humanity at every corner. But then people also have to go out into life to face a really overpowering destructive spouse or a fiercely nasty boss, or to stand up and fight along with many others against killer terrorists and fascists who are out to destroy life en masse. They need their power to hate legitimately and for constructive goals. Tyrants don't disappear, nor are they generally influenced by good reason or olive branches to change their ways. They need instead to be fought powerfully and cleverly and brought down. A great American pacifist, A. J. Muste (1885–1967), wrote about the years of Hitlerian hell that if he had met Hitler, he would have embraced him as a step toward pacification and humanization; he is quoted as saying at a Quaker meeting in 1940 “If I can't love Hitler, I can't love at all”⁵ What do you think Muste's fate would have been? Leo Durocher, the famed baseball coach of the Brooklyn Dodgers (on whose team the first African American player, Jackie Robinson, entered the major leagues), said it about plain old sports, “Nice guys finish last.”

Again the “trick” is to choose and pick so much of each emotion—the constructive and destructive—and apply them in an integrative way. In marital relationships, there are certainly powerfully distressing situations that call for an aggrieved spouse to put their foot down very firmly or even more to resort to a decisively aggressive response, but there is a world of difference if these impassioned statements are conveyed as animalistic wishes to take vengeance and destroy or are conveyed as efforts to bring about new agreements and understanding that will be good for both spouses. See again the analogy to collective behaviors. Take a situation where we absolutely have to fight to the death against a deadly fascism. As remarked earlier, not only are there considerations of how we should make every effort to avoid war crimes of undue collateral damage to civilians and crimes against humanity, when the fight is won, we stand before choices of destroying the remaining enemy vengefully or extending a welcome into a shared life on our planet.

To me it seems like a bad joke: A majority of therapists will respond with understanding, acceptance, and encouragement to a patient reporting an angry

dream or describing a life situation where the patient was obviously appropriately angry at someone who hurt them. But if the patient reports holding on to the anger as their basic emotional “policy,” say, toward a given parent or work colleague, many therapists will attempt to suppress and redefine the patient’s angry policy. They will sincerely try to deflect and reroute the patient’s hate toward “good” nondestructive feelings. Of course, it is psychologically healthy and emotionally mature when one can give up hate, but when giving up one’s hate prematurely leaves one passive and vulnerable, it is certainly not psychologically healthy. I believe that anger should be treated as a natural and healthy emotion to be used intelligently and constructively and not only when it as if is foisted on us by a dream or a situation that captures us involuntarily.

HATRED AND MENTAL HEALTH AND THE TREATMENT OF ACUTE VIOLENCE

I am going to briefly look further at some relationships between hatred and mental health—a subject that is not only for practicing clinicians, but is also of relevance to a broad array of intellectuals. My understanding of considerable formal and clinical research over the years is that the same commonsense basic dialectic applies: *Too much* hate is bad for mental health, and *too little* hate is bad for mental health.

The “too much” is definitely common and evident in a great variety of psychiatric conditions, for example, the need to be crazy in order not to engage in actual violence that we saw earlier; or the explosive violence of a delusional paranoid; or the narcissistic hate-violence of a psychopath manipulating and exploiting others, say, to his Madoff-type economic crimes that destroy so many people’s lives and institutions; or many psychosomatic conditions and illnesses that are “secreting” unexpressed or unprocessed hate; or the tumultuous hate-violence of an uncontrollable agitated anxiety state—thus, I recall treating a powerful big man on the psychiatry ward of a general hospital where the key to his extreme agitated anxiety turned out to be that he wanted, altogether understandably, to kill his wife and her lover.

The other side of the coin is that too little hate also invites many and quite serious mental disturbances, such as withdrawals into passive psychotic states with overwhelming inadequacy to deal with the most common aspects of life; personality disorders of chronic helplessness, inadequacy, and phobic withdrawals from given activities even when they pertain to one’s basic health or to completing requirements of one’s job; or weakness, passivity, and attraction or surrender to a

victim role in key relationships. I heard recently of a tragic case in which a very bright and capable young man who seemed to be leading an all-around good life committed suicide and left a note that he had suffered deep depression for years but had never spoken to anyone about it. His family described him as a forever nice and unusually accommodating guy. No one, in a sense including him, had a clue about how enraged he was, and even after his death the battered family at least at first could not bear to think of their son's anger that had not been recognized. The weak who do not know how to get tough and angry, how to hate and fight back, will certainly not inherit the Earth because either they don't want to or don't know how to fight for their fair share of life's opportunities and rewards, including being loved and cared for and having ample opportunities to perform, achieve, and be recognized. See, for example, America's great contribution to a devastating new syndrome of mental illness that I call here the "Columbine/Sandy Hook Sickness" (Charny, 2018a). This sickness is a true and tragic killer, and it is for the most part at the hands of kids and people who have been living as excluded, mocked, isolated, and marginalized, who are frequently characterized from "shy" to "loner" to "weird," and in their murderous violence are out for their devastating insane revenge.

In sum, good mental health includes capacities for self-assertion, winning displays of oneself, a power to compete, an ability to enjoy success and in a sense to even enjoy failure as a necessary experience in life, and a capacity to be angry and hate and process it with control and constructively. *Hate often is not so much wishes to destroy but rather hating very much to lose out to a point where hot hatred erupts (which also creates new problems when it is too intense), and it can be a powerful thrust of one's power toward winning in all aspects of life.* Overly passive people (this refers also to many people who bluff strength with aggressive bravado but who are inwardly decisively dependent and passive), "losers," and the chronically inadequate also make up substantial numbers of the psychiatrically ill.

TREATING EXPLOSIVE RAGE, HATE, AND VIOLENCE IN THERAPY

As introduced earlier, the therapy that I propose is based on simultaneously recognizing and very much honoring the intense anger, hate, and destructive wishes a person is feeling toward a given object, but at the same time reminding the person clearly—even as he may be poised with a weapon to attack—that it is deeply wrong (referring to a universal ethic that is instinctive and I believe/hope lies deep in the hearts of all of us) to do actual physical harm to another living person (Charny, 2018b).

Certainly in those numerous scenes where the therapy is addressing an immediate outburst or potential breakout of violence, this is hardly a message that the therapist is to get across quietly and “professionally” in the sense of speaking in a tone of a mature wise counselor. It is hardly appropriate to attempt to speak with a quiet dignity. Something terrible has already begun to happen or is about to happen. The therapist speaks up in turn, often by literally yelling or speaking in a popular “street language” as intuitively as possible with whatever phrases are common to the patient’s culture. The therapist says unmistakably that he honors the patient’s hate and rage and is going to help the patient seek satisfaction for his or her anger, but he or she [the patient] certainly knows that it is absolutely wrong to do physical harm to another.

As noted earlier, this technique has indeed worked for me in a good dozen situations, including two cases in which the adolescent patient was brandishing a knife and headed toward his victim, and one in which an adult patient was carrying a pistol to use to shoot his unfaithful wife. In one situation a powerful hunk of a teenager, who was legitimately diagnosed with significant brain damage owing to a devastating accident when he was a little boy, was tearing through my office, overturning furniture, and yelling at me that he was going to “beat the s___ out of me”—which he was perfectly capable of doing. The latter incident is particularly touching in that after the treatment maneuver succeeded in quieting the young man, he returned the following week with a gift for me. It was a small pocket knife that he said I should enjoy using to cut up oranges in Israel, where he knew I would be traveling the following week.

Another case in my U.S. practice also ended poignantly and with an especially remarkable gift from a teenage patient. This case, which is striking in our disastrously violent times when mass murders are an all-too-familiar pathology, involved a high school boy who was considered “retarded” and “weird” by others at his school and who the staff also believed could barely read. The boy confessed to me his plans and preparation for a murder spree at a shopping center. He responded to the treatment emotionally and gratefully, gave up the plan, even as he warned me touchingly to be careful in the world because I was too nice. He then gave me as a parting gift a high-reading-level book on the Nazi SS—which he could read well enough to pick out for me.

There have also been at least two cases (one in the United States and one in Israel) where adult male patients have threatened to kill me precisely because I was enjoining them to stop beating their wives. No way were they going to give up their joyous way of life; notwithstanding my promise to help them process their

anger meaningfully, I was for them a disturbing punk or gadfly who should be wiped out. In both cases, when they ominously threatened me, I promptly moved my comfortable desk chair “right into their faces,” pushed my head forward toward theirs, and said adamantly, “You’re not going to lift a finger at me.” One of those instances involved an ex-sailor in his mid-thirties who had been psychiatrically hospitalized in the U.S. Navy because he attacked his social worker therapist and who now kept at home a “modest” collection of some 30 to 40 firearms, the scene ended truly touchingly with the man sobbing in my arms. (Unhappily, this session had been videoed, but the tape proved to be defective; I do have a tape of a session with this man and his wife 2 years later after he had shut down his violence, and in this session he is the one helping his wife to recognize her collusive prompting [virtually requesting] for him to be violent to her.)

Yes, the conduct of this treatment is tiring, upsetting, and very demanding throughout. But we expect no less from many a surgeon and from any number of helping professionals in those life situations where the chips are down.

As is necessarily true about any treatment technique, and even more fraught in a live situation of raging hate and imminent violence, no one can possibly know the outcome of treatment beforehand. In situations of treating actual violence, the real risks are of course perilously high. I always emphasize that this technique is entirely inappropriate in the face of ideological hatred and violence, such as with terrorists. The same applies to situations involving criminal violence, and also to any person who is judged clinically to be unable to achieve sufficient emotional control, say, because of drug addiction (although one physician told me he did use the technique successfully with some patients who were on drugs, but I myself have not had that experience).

The many incidents where the technique does work dramatically certainly fit the earlier theoretical theorem that there is a powerful instinctive stream of appreciation—desire to protect life—our own and that of others—flowing within us along with a no-less-instinctive stream that invites and celebrates our beating and killing others.

“HOMEWORK” OR “TAKING MEDICINE AT HOME”: INSTRUCTING PATIENTS IN REGULAR EXERCISES OF FANTASIES OF ATTACKING THEIR HATED OBJECTS

The previously described dramatic therapy interventions in situations of acute hate and violence are not unrelated to a far more quiet standard treatment technique that

I also used based on the same principles, namely, that I teach people—first in the office together with me and then via exercises they are to do as homework—how to hate, as intensely and colorfully as they want and are able to unleash in their fantasies, and how to picture and relish doing every bit of physical injury to their hated object, but all within a clear-cut framework that says decisively:

1. Feelings or fantasies are not at all equivalent to actions; when you fantasize hurting or destroying the other, you are doing no actual harm to the person you fantasize attacking.
2. Expressing feeling through fantasy is absolutely not intended as a rehearsal for actual behavior.
3. It is understood without any reservation that doing actual harm to another human being is wrong, but it is healthy, relieving, and releasing to experience in fantasy the feelings of such hatred that are inside of us. In their secreted unconscious positions inside of us, they are more dangerous either or both toward us, for example, in psychosomatic illnesses, or toward the hated objects.
4. Furthermore, the patient is instructed to remember at all times—and instructed to restate to themselves periodically—that their goal is to release the anger and thereby reduce it, and definitely not to propel the anger into runaway modes of acting out.
5. Finally, in time, patients are told as an accompanying narrative that there are cases in which the release of the anger has led people to feel infinitely more comfortable in the presence of and relationship with their very hated object, and that what naturally gets freed is an unexpected new dimension of appreciation and possibly warm affection or even love for the hated one for their more decent and attractive qualities, which up until now have been overshadowed by their nastiness.

INSTRUCTIONS TO PATIENTS FOR INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION WITH PEOPLE THEY HATE

In my philosophy and clinical experience, a majority of situations fraught with hate in our lives yield best to the previous treatment approach of releasing the heated feelings in one's own mind and fantasies (I often call our own minds "our greatest democracies"). This technique is obviously also a godsend for the millions of situations where we dare not, or best choose not, to air our grievances in a real way with people. Thus, ask yourselves and check out in any group whether people can imagine inviting their parents to genuine conversations such as would be the case

in an authentic family therapy where true feelings are disclosed. And then there are the many situations in which you would lose your job, get kicked out of school, be sued, or whatnot if you dare to speak up to people in authority who don't have the slightest inclination to entertain your anger respectfully.

However, in those situations where genuine communication can be established and where there is reason to hope that such genuine communication may lead to real changes and improvements in a relationship, actual communication of anger is possible, but here too there also need to be guidelines on how to speak about our intense feelings. Most of us human beings simply aren't cut out to be able to tolerate/entertain/respect intensely critical and hating feelings toward us. We get hurt and defensive. We move into denial of the faults that are identified in us. And yet the goal of more genuine communication can be within reach for a great many of us if the dosages that are delivered to us are tolerable.

In preparation for actual dialogue about tensions and hate, patients can be instructed and given practice in the therapy sessions in a number of ways:

1. Introduce the conversation to the other person in a frame of wanting to arrive at a better relationship and outcome. Convey that you do not want to hurt or insult, but that you do hope that together you can achieve a meaningful degree of honesty about what each of you are feeling and what you would like to change.
2. Do not yell, scream, curse, and thrust vulgarities (even the tough words some of us love) into the conversation. At all times, speak respectfully and in a way that draws on your stated commitment to seek a better relationship.
3. As much as possible, speak in a first person and avoid charges of "You . . . are a so and so . . . did so and so . . ." Use phrases like "I feel," "My feeling is," "what happens to me is . . ."
4. Keep your statements significantly brief—one short paragraph at a time. Leave room for the other to absorb and to speak in response, and listen to them, respecting their right to think and feel differently than you even when do not agree with them.
5. Tell the other what you are feeling and about what, and how it is making you upset or angry, and insofar as possible phrase your anger in a context that also suggests how things could be made better. For example, a woman in individual therapy tells her husband, "I had a powerful dream about you in which it became very clear to me that I feel dominated by you and pushed around by your ordering me about and your discontent with me. I'm going to try to stand up for

myself more effectively and you'll know how I feel earlier and more clearly.” (Just imagine how the same ideas could have been conveyed in brilliantly colorful assaultive language and what estrangement would ensue.)

6. Do *not* expect the other to surrender, yield, or agree with your anger. Trust that saying what you feel is like a medicine that works by working away inside the other for the better, and the results will be seen at a later date.

In an interview by Van Nuys (n.d.), psychotherapist Leslie Greenberg, author of many works on emotion-based psychotherapy, said,

The distinction between adaptive and maladaptive emotions [is that] anger can be empowering anger, which is constructive and healthy, or anger can be maladaptive and destructive. So it's almost like anger stated in the language, like “I am angry at you,” is very different to anger stated in “you language,” which is “you are a . . . xyz,” right? You can insult or denigrate the other. So there's empowering anger and there's destructive anger.

A COMMENT ABOUT A POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP OF THIS MODEL TO LARGER EVENTS BETWEEN COLLECTIVE GROUPS

I am, of course, entirely aware that the overall, very important intention of this book is to address the larger phenomena of hate in human affairs in deadly prejudice, wars, crimes against humanity, and genocide—all of which I oppose with every fiber of my being, certainly in their actuality but also in preparatory and planning thinking and statements in favor of mass destruction. Rightly or wrongly, I have chosen in my essay to focus on aspects of the infrastructure of hate as it is experienced by individual people *in their personal lives*. Obviously, this is an important subject in its own right and a valuable one for many a practitioner of treatment of psychological disturbances. But I would like to make one brief comment suggesting one line of possible connection also to the grim subject of collective hate.

I believe that it may be a useful direction for us to explore possibilities of recognizing—without agreeing—existing prejudicial and hating feelings between different ethnic, religious, and national groups, acknowledging that the attitudes are real and that the issues they raise need to be processed, *but* also to remind the haters and bigots that they themselves know only too well that it is absolutely wrong to do physical damage to other people because of these feelings. Needless to say, all efforts of leadership, programs of education, and other societal efforts to shape more wholesome cultures that overcome distaste, prejudice, and

discrimination are very much to be applauded and encouraged (see Charny, 2007, for my proposal for a “worldwide campaign for life”). The strange suggestion I am raising here is that it may be possible to reach the even more critical part of the hearts of some bigots with regard to their readiness to commit actual violence if the insistence on the wrongness of the violence follows some measure of recognition of the humanness of their bad feelings toward whatever object people. This might be possible by using the principle that we saw was effective in treatment of individual violent people of first acknowledging their feelings of dislike and worse, but then simultaneously trying to evoke in them an experience of the universal ethic that we believe originally was instinctual for them as well—not to harm another living human being.

I also believe that there will often be opportunities to appeal to powerful early images that have been influential in the minds of millions of people as children in many religions and cultures of “Thou Shalt Not Kill” and “Do Unto Others as You Will Have Them Do Unto You,” and that appealing to these images can be especially powerful. Of course, there is also the truth that most religions have been responsible for an enormous amount of mass murder, but still the prevailing predominant images of many religious beliefs is that they command us not to kill (Jacobs, 2009).

CONCLUSION

Anger is hardly a neglected topic in the psychotherapy literature, but evaluations of the ethical imports of people’s behaviors is often excluded as not relevant to treatment. At the same time, there has always been a small solid group of psychotherapists, many of whom are very distinguished such as psychiatrists Silvano Arieti (1974), Ivan Nagy (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 2013), and psychologist William Doherty (2001), who have called for psychotherapy that very much includes addressing the life values and ethical aims of patients; however, the majority and the politically predominant point of view in the field is that values and therapy are to be kept separate. This chapter does call for differentiations between the good and bad of emotions and behaviors on the basis of a guiding criterion of the impact on one’s life and on the lives of others. Is human life being protected and enhanced, or is human life being harmed and destroyed?

In a nutshell, this chapter is advancing a metaphoric picture of hatred as a “nuclear energy.” Hate is truly powerful stuff. It is horribly destructive. It is dangerously vulnerable to mismanagement and loss of control. But it is also anchored in the truths of nature and a source of vital energies. We human beings

hate naturally and frequently. We can't help it. It's part of the equipment with which we have been endowed for conducting and protecting our lives from all sorts of threats and dangers.

Hatred is one of many emotions that I like to think of as available to us on a kind of palette of emotions. I believe that each emotion is a skill-tool that is endowed with positive evolutionary functions to help us to live better, and that each can be used constructively or destructively. Hate gives us self-defense; power; and relief from fear, humiliation, or danger. Further, hate even facilitates and is intimately linked with the creation and launching of new developments and new structures that protect and enhance life. It is also a vital force in enabling us to experience positive feelings and to love. The issue at all times is the proper management of this nuclear energy.

Obviously, there is a major dialectical conundrum at play—too much hate and you're destroyed, too little hate and you're destroyed, but if you achieve an integrative balance between an ability to hate and an ability to construct and protect life, you have a winning script for living well. I refer once again to the work of psychotherapist Leslie Greenberg (2002), author of *Emotion-Focused Therapy*, who wrote that “anger has often been viewed as a maladaptive response to distress yet in actuality the emotion serves an adaptive function, as its basic purpose is to prepare individuals to respond to real threats within the environment” (p. 184).

Mahatma Gandhi did not have at hand the metaphor of nuclear energy, so he wrote about electricity. This great man of peace—and of overthrow of an oppressive colonial ruler—spoke of “the gift of anger” and compared its proper use to the management of electrical power (A. Gandhi, 2017):

When we channel electricity intelligently, we can use it to improve our life, but if we abuse it, we could die. So as with electricity, we must learn to use anger wisely for the good of humanity (p. 20). . . . Letting anger motivate us to correct wrong has great value, but only when our real goal is to seek a solution and not just prove that we are right. (pp. 33–34)

Hate for me is a basic nuclear-type energy for advancing life and getting things done. Terrible “nuclear accidents” and disasters result from its incorrect, negligent, or intentionally evil use. Magnificent achievements of healthier, safer, and enriched human lives result from its wise and correct use for the explicit purposes of making life better for oneself and others.

As the author of a chapter that encourages certain anger and hate, I once again attest, unambiguously, that I am totally and unreservedly against the many dangerous forms of anger and hate that are cruel, sadistic, disproportionately venomous, and aimed at destroying the lives or the life opportunities of ourselves or other people promiscuously; I am similarly adamantly against bigoted hate, incitement of violence or celebration of it, hate that supports fascist and totalitarian goals, and hate that in any way contributes to mass destruction and genocide. All of these are, for me, immoral and disgusting, and I believe should be defined by our justice systems as illegal, and at the same time defined by our psychological/psychiatric codes as unhealthy/sick/disturbed/pathological.

The title of this chapter, in its final form but also in its original provocative form, is an effort at understanding more the normal role of emotions of anger and hate in our evolutionary toolbox and a call for strength, toughness, resilience, and the capacity to cope and overcome—as much as possible—pain, illness, disability, harm, and injustice. It is a call for power to compete and to pursue constructive goals to create, protect, and enrich life and love life.

Ultimately, we need a comprehensive theory/model of hate that extends across individual experience to collective experience, in both cases a model that differentiates between constructive and healthy toughness and destructive hate.

REFERENCES

1. Arieti, S. (Ed.). (1974). *American handbook of psychiatry* (Vols. 1–2). New York, NY: Basic Books.
2. Baal Shem Tov. (n.d.). Conquering the evil impulse itself [*Shuvas (Tshuvot)*, 26; translated from Hebrew]. In Babylonian Talmud, Yoma, 69b. Retrieved from <https://www.fxp.co.il/showthread.php?t=5473216>
3. Bach, G. R., & Goldberg, H. (2000). *Creative aggression: The art of assertive living*. Gretna, LA: Wellness Institute. (Original work published 1974)
4. Bach, G. R., & Wyden, P. (1969). *The intimate enemy: How to fight fair in love and marriage*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
5. Becker, E. (1973). *The denial of death*. New York, NY: Free Press.
6. Bettina, S. (2015). *Eichmann before Jerusalem: The unexamined life of a mass murderer*. New York, NY: Viking.
7. Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., & Spark, G. M. (2013). *Invisible loyalties*. New York, NY: Routledge.
8. Boylan, J. M., & Ryff, C. D. (2015). High anger expression exacerbates the relationship between age and metabolic syndrome. *Journals of Gerontology*:

- Series B. Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 70(1), 77–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbt092>
9. Brandt, A. (2014). *Mindful anger: A pathway to emotional freedom*. New York, NY: Norton.
 10. Bushman, B. (2013, September 25). Anger management: What works and what doesn't. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/get-psyched/201309/anger-management-what-works-and-what-doesnt>
 11. Center for Media Literacy. (1993). *Media violence: Japan vs. America*. Retrieved from <https://www.medialit.org/reading-room/media-violence-japan-vs-america>
 12. Charny, I. W. (1967). The psychotherapist as teacher of an ethic of nonviolence. *Voices: The Art and Science of Psychotherapy*, 13(4), 57–66.
 13. Charny, I. W. (1972). *Marital love and hate: The need for a revised marriage contract. How you can love and hate, honor and dishonor, obey and disobey!* New York, NY: Macmillan.
 14. Charny, I. W. (1982a). *How can we commit the unthinkable? Genocide: The human cancer* [In collaboration with Chanan Rapaport. Introduction by Elie Wiesel.]. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
 15. Charny, I. W. (1982b). Toward a genocide early warning system [In collaboration with Chanan Rapaport]. In *How can we commit the unthinkable* (pp. 283–334). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. (Original work published 1977)
 16. Charny, I. W. (1986). Genocide and mass destruction: Doing harm to others as a missing dimension in psychopathology. *Psychiatry*, 49(2), 144–157.
 17. Charny, I. W. (1997). A personality disorder of excessive power strivings. *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 34(1), 3–15.
 18. Charny, I. W. (Ed.). (1999). *Encyclopedia of genocide* [Two Volumes; Associate Editors: R. Paul Adalian, Steven Jacobs, Eric Markusen, and Samuel Totten; Bibliographic Editor: >Marc I. Sherman. Forewords by Archbishop Desmond M. Tutu and Simon Wiesenthal]. Santa Barbara, CA and Denver, CO: ABC-CLIO.
 19. Charny, I. W. (2007). *Fighting suicide bombing: A worldwide campaign for life*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.
 20. Charny, I. W. (2012). Requiem for the prevention of genocide in our time: Working towards an improbable possibility but not giving up. *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, 7, 108–122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/gsp.7.1.108>
 21. Charny, I. W. (2016). *The genocide contagion: How we commit and confront Holocaust and genocide*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

22. Charny, I. W. (2017a). *A democratic mind: Psychology and psychiatry with fewer meds and more soul*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
23. Charny, I. W. (2017b). *Psychotherapy for a democratic mind: Treatment of intimacy, tragedy, violence and evil*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
24. Charny, I. W. (2018a). *Psychotherapy for a democratic mind: Treating intimacy, tragedy, violence and evil*. Foreword by Douglas Sprenkle. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
25. Charny, I. W. (2018b). Treating emotional violence and evil. In *Psychotherapy for a democratic mind: Treating intimacy, tragedy, violence, and evil* (pp. 253–338). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
26. Clark, R. A. (1965). *Friends and aggression* [Mimeographed paper]. Philadelphia, PA: American Friends Service Committee.
27. Dean, J. (2012, March 6). The upside of anger: 6 psychological benefits of getting mad [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://www.spring.org.uk/2012/03/the-upside-of-anger-6-psychological-benefits-of-getting-mad.php>
28. Doherty, W. J. (2001). Value sensitive therapy. In J. Carlson & D. Kjos (Eds.), *Theories and strategies of family therapy* (pp. 98–122). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
29. Gandhi, A. (2017). *The gift of anger: And other lessons from my grandfather Mahatma Gandhi*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
30. Gibran, K. (n.d.). *The sleep-walkers*. Chicago, IL: Poetry Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/58695/the-sleep-walkers>
31. Gilbert, G. M. (1950). *The psychology of dictatorship: Based on an examination of the leaders of Nazi Germany*. New York, NY: Ronald Press.
32. Greenberg, L. S. (2002). *Emotion-focused therapy: Coaching clients to work through their feelings*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10447-000>
33. Griffin, T. (n.d.). How to release anger. In *wikiHow*. <https://www.wikihow.com/Release-Anger>
34. Harder, K. (n.d.). *I hate that I love you*. Retrieved from <https://poets.media/i-hate-that-i-love-you>
35. Horney, K. (1937). *The neurotic personality of our time*. New York, NY: Norton.
36. Jacobs, S. L. (2009). *Confronting genocide: Judaism, Christianity, Islam*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
37. Kassonove, H. (2013). *Anger disorders: Definition, diagnosis, and treatment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
38. Kitayama, S., Park, J., Boylan, J. M., Miyamoto, Y., Levine, C. S., Markus, H. R., . . . Ryff, C. D. (2015). Expression of anger and ill health in two cultures:

- An examination of inflammation and cardiovascular risk. *Psychological Science*, 26, 211–220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797614561268>
39. Kulcsar, S. I. (1987). De Sade and Eichmann. In I. W. Charny (Ed.), *Strategies against violence* (pp. 32–47). Boulder, CO: Westview.
 40. Lev, G. (2018, November 9). How Freud made clear we're 'nothing but a band of murderers.' *Haaretz English Edition*. Retrieved from <https://www.haaretz.com/science-and-health/.premium-how-freud-made-clear-we-re-all-a-band-of-murderers-1.6636735>
 41. Lifton, R. J. (1979). *The broken connection: On death and the continuity of life*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
 42. Lifton, R. J. (1987). *The future of immortality and other essays for a nuclear age*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
 43. Lord Acton. (2019). *Lord Acton quote archive: Power and authority*. Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute. Retrieved from <https://acton.org/research/lord-acton-quote-archive>
 44. May, R. (1972). *Power and innocence: A search for the sources of violence*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
 45. Meloy, K. C. (2014). *Constructive vs. destructive anger: A model and three pathways for the expression of anger* (Unpublished master's thesis). Brigham Young University, Provo, UT. Retrieved from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4075>
 46. Moore, Z. E. (2016). Current status of the anger avoidance model: Recent empirical findings and treatment considerations. *Journal of Forensic Psychology*, 1(2), 1000107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2475-319X.1000107>
 47. Rummel, R. J. (1997). *Power kills: Democracy as a method of non-violence*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
 48. Saval, P. K. (2016). *Shakespeare in hate: Emotions, passions, selfhood*. New York, NY: Routledge.
 49. Totten, S., & Bartrop, P. R. (Eds.). (2008). *Dictionary of genocide* (Vols. 1–2). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
 50. Tsvieli, N., & Diamond, G. M. (2018). Therapist interventions and emotional processing in attachment-based family therapy for unresolved anger. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, & Practice*, 55, 289–297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pst0000158>
 51. Van Nuys, D. (n.d.). *An interview with Leslie Greenberg, PhD, on emotion-focused therapy*. Northern Wyoming Mental Health Center. Retrieved from http://www.wyomentalhealth.org/poc/view_doc.php?type=doc&id=36618&cn=91
 52. Winnicott, D. W. (1965). Hate in the countertransference. *Voices: The Art and Science of Psychotherapy*, 1(2), 102–109. (Original work published 1949).

53. Zhizhai, L. (n.d.). *Love and hate in intersection*. Retrieved from <https://www.poemhunter.com/poem/love-and-hate-in-intersection-tears-vertically-and-horizontally/comments/>

¹This chapter is a nonexperimental statement, but it is based on clinical research and reports of tangible and understandable expressions of emotions in the course of psychotherapy, as well as some references to more experimental literature. In addition, this chapter is intended to be written as much as possible in language that conveys recognizable human experiences and emotions. For a further description of the method proposed for therapists treating violence, see Charny (2017b).

²I am not unaware of recent controversial opinions that Eichmann was a consummate liar who played the part he believed would be most beneficial (see Bettina, 2015). The interpretation reported by me here is based on the belief that accurate psychological and psychiatric examinations of Eichmann were achieved by the Kulcsars.

³An early publication of the concept that psychological and psychiatric diagnosis of doing harm to oneself must always be accompanied by diagnosis of whether one is doing harm to others was in Charny (1986).

⁴Text in a letter to an Anglican Bishop.

⁵Quoted in *The New York Times*, 12 February 1967. <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191826719.001.000/q-oro-ed4-00007746>