

# **The Option Method Institute**

Education based on the teachings of Bruce Di Marsico

[www.ChooseHappiness.net](http://www.ChooseHappiness.net)

## **Loving has nothing to do with happiness, Part II**

from

**December 12, 1992 Lecture**

**Bruce Di Marsico**

## **Loving has nothing to do with happiness, Part II**

Say I have a child. He's two years old, and he is going to get an inoculation. And he's going to hate me for three days after that. He doesn't have a short term memory like other two-year olds. He is going to resent me, and when we get home he'll look for pins to stick me with. That's my child. And I'm going to give him an inoculation--I'm going to bring him to the doctor, and he's going to get a shot.

Am I loving him? Am I not loving him? Don't bother me with that shit! You can make this nice suggestion that you are "loving" your child because you are protecting him from disease, and you give him an inoculation, even though he doesn't appreciate it. And he'll know later when he's twenty years old that you were really loving him when you gave him this injection. But, on the other hand, right now, I'm going to be giving him, an armful of pain, something that he's afraid of, something he's scared of, something that hurts, something he doesn't want, and something that in no way he would consider love.

I've got this dilemma. I'm doing something that I consider loving, but my child doesn't consider loving. So am I really loving or being not loving? Shall I give the bum a drink, or shall I tell him I'm doing him a favor by not giving him a drink. "I'll take him to the restaurant and give him a cup of coffee, he'll really appreciate that, and if he doesn't, that's because he's sick."

Don't bother me with this! I'm doing what I want to do, because I feel like doing it. And my child's getting a shot, because I'm bigger. And I can help the child, and I can prevent the child from having a disease. And that's what I want to do. You might want to call that loving. I call that protecting. Then you might call protecting "loving". I've been "protected" . . . forget it! Haven't you? Don't give me "you did it for my own good"! Do you know how many things were done to me and to you because of that? You go into banks and they photograph you; you want to cash a check, and they fingerprint you; they are all doing it for your own protection. Yeah, right, that was Hitler's statement: "It's for your own good." No. Things don't have to be justified in terms love and unlove, that's my point.

When you have to start calling everything love, then you have to start twisting your mind into describing everything you do as love. Nobody accuses themselves of not loving. Then you get all this self-righteousness. All the evangelists are very "loving" when they are condemning everybody. The most venomous, hateful people appear on television, preaching some gospel, which I don't recognize, and they are calling it loving. Why does it have to be twisted like

that? Why can't it be that they are doing what they are doing?

The point is happiness is happiness, that's what counts. Love is no better a word, nor useful a word, than anything else you want. If love has a value to you, has a meaning to you, it's because it is something you want, however you define it. It's something you want for those who you love, it's something you want from others, but it's just a collection of a certain amount of things that you want. It's not divine. I hate that! God is "loving", that's why he blows up volcanoes, and smothers people, and drowns them. And then a hurricane goes through Homestead, and you get these little self-righteous people who say "God was with us"...well, what about your neighbor who just got smashed to pieces. God wasn't with them? "Our prayers were answered, God protected us". And he hated your friends?

Love, and "doing good" and getting what you want are really ways of saying the same thing . . . it's just another way of wanting what you want, getting what you want, getting what you consider good. You consider it good to get what you want.

Now, there are dilemmas. Once you start making love a thing to be sought in itself, you have the idea of "is this love or is this not love? Do I chain my wife to the bed so she won't eat anymore and get fatter and fatter and fatter?" So there is my idea of imposing my love on you, and you're not perceiving it as love at all.

The lecture, "Love is to be Happy" was to show that your not loving people by being unhappy with them, by sympathizing with them, by agreeing with them that they ought to be unhappy, by saving them from unhappiness--"Oh, your afraid of spiders? I'll rescue you from the spiders!" That's not love. Love is to help someone not to be afraid of spiders, not to go around killing every spider you find. Love is to show someone they don't have to be unhappy, not agree with them.

The comment I hear about love is that you sympathize with somebody who is unhappy; I was trying to make the lecture contradistinct to that. That to love is not to be unhappy along with them, to not agree with them, to not agree with their unhappiness, to not support their unhappiness, to not keep telling them they are right to be unhappy, and your going to fight that which makes them unhappy. This was the point of the lecture; that kind of love turns upon itself. And you wind up angry and unhappy at the people you love once you get into this idea that love is agreeing with people that they have to be unhappy. Now what happens when they are unhappy with you? And now you can't agree. The whole lecture was to show that we're not loving people by being unhappy.