

The nature of addictions in a nutshell

Posted by skaybaltimore - 17 Jun 2012 15:36

---

All physical sensations and pleasures have a physical limit/ceiling. Once that limit/ceiling is reached, it's impossible to go beyond it. All addictions are an attempt to recreate the maximum enjoyable physical sensation/pleasure experienced in the past, and so a short circuit is created, since the inherent ceiling of the physical is impossible to transcend, so all our efforts to recreate and maintain that initial high result in us running around in circles.

On the other hand, spiritual pleasures are infinite; they have no inherent ceiling, and the circular path is actually an upward spiral. (We have to pay careful attention because the circular motion is more apparent than the subtle upward movement, differentiating a circle from a spiral. So it's not always obvious to us that we're achieving more when walking a spiritual path.)

So that's our most critical choice: do we seek to invest our life's energies in pursuit of limited, physical pleasures, or do we seek out infinite, spiritual pleasures? Love, compassion, truth – these are all spiritual pleasures. They have no limit.

The question then arises: So why do most of us choose the physical substitutes instead? Because they're "easier", at least at first. They're tangible. They're perceived as being, somehow, more "real".

Adding to the mix/confusion, is the fact that spiritual pleasures have built in steps; safeguards to allow for a measured progress, rather than an instantaneous flood of awareness/pleasure, that would actually destroy our uniqueness by wiping us out into the process. But when we get confused, these spiritual steps feel no different to us than the physical ceilings. They feel almost identical, so we figure what's the point in denying physical pleasures, when there's no bigger bang for the buck by opting for spiritual pleasures?

But we're missing a key point when we do that: a spiritual step has the distinct difference/advantage of being able to be transcended, to arrive at the next step, ad infinitum. (Whereas the physical ceiling cannot be transcended, ad nauseam.) Sometimes, when we get frustrated, it FEELS as if we've hit a spiritual ceiling, and we feel stuck, and a rebelliousness kicks in. We then conclude, falsely, that since there's no difference between a physical ceiling and a spiritual step, we'd be better off (or at least no worse off) by going backward/downward, and clinging to the world of physical pleasures.

But it's just a mistaken perception. If we persevere up the spiritual staircase (stairway to Heaven), we then see, feel, and experience the infinite nature of spiritual pleasures, and get stronger in that pursuit. The key/secret is to keep remembering that the apparent ceiling of each subsequent spiritual step is merely the floor of the next spiritual "ceiling".

=====  
=====

Re: The nature of addictions in a nutshell  
Posted by skaybaltimore - 19 Jun 2012 22:10

---

[Machshovo wrote on 19 Jun 2012 21:25:](#)

Kinder, Kinder, macht euch nicht narisch. When you'll reach my age (some of you sooner than others) you will see why I do not join such type of discussions. Firstly my brain is already too foggy to handle such high-class philosophic/academic/professional/etc type of debate. I stick to easy-going maggidus. Secondly, bottom line is - we need to each do what is good for our own selves - not to convince others - and perhaps not even necessarily to understand other people's approaches.

I realize my words do not sound as sophisticated as others on this thread, but take it from an old timer and calm down - especially when you seem to be spinning your wheels and getting nowhere.

(So where was I up to...?)

MT

I'm 57, so I'm no young-un.

Discussion, even debate, especially when it comes to something as important as addiction, is a 2,000 year old process in Judaism.

It's all good.

From my experience, there are two basic ways to approach life -- a linear approach, which is specific, point a to point b, and a non-linear approach, which is more "random". Related to that is the difference between an intellectual approach, and an intuitive approach.

Similarly, one can approach life from a fearful point of view, or a loving point of view. Fear is the main form associated with the physical level, and love is the main form associated with the spiritual level. Likewise, fear is constrictive, while love is expansive. When constricted people interact with expanded people, there is an inevitable clash, but that's to be expected.

I've stated repeatedly that my approach is just that -- MY approach. And if it helps anyone else, that's fine; if not, that's fine too.

=====  
=====

Re: The nature of addictions in a nutshell  
Posted by Dov - 19 Jun 2012 23:55

---

Nu. Now you are telling me that you are *this* type of person, while I am *that* type of person, and that I am afraid of something. If you think I would benefit from help to overcome some sort of fear, please be more specific and help me out.

But please note that I offer to openly talk about it on the phone with you, I use my real name, and I do not tell you about *you*. Are these things fearful? I ask about your *ideas* and share my opinions about them - not about *you*, but about your *ideas*. I am not telling you what you are nor am I suggesting that you are afraid, constricted, or unloving...these things show fear? Nu. But enough about you and me.

Consider once again taking the time to steer clear of the personal, and move on to responding to issues I brought up.

Thanks for the blessing of peace. I, for one, can certainly use it!

- Dov

=====  
=====

Re: The nature of addicitons in a nutshell  
Posted by skaybaltimore - 20 Jun 2012 01:08

---

@Dov

I think I'll just steer clear. Period.

=====  
=====

Re: The nature of addicitons in a nutshell  
Posted by Dov - 20 Jun 2012 11:08

---

OK. Whatever floats your boat. Maybe we will meet someday...who knows? We might actually have more in common than we have differences. Don't be surprised if you find me quite expansive (not in girth)...

=====  
=====

Re: The nature of addicitons in a nutshell  
Posted by obormottel - 25 Jun 2012 21:53

---

[skaybaltimore wrote on 19 Jun 2012 21:10:](#)

@Dov

You keep referring to the people you know. Maybe you either know the wrong people, or not enough people.

I only know the impact this process has had on me. And I do know myself.

I think this thing cooled off enough for me to post something.

Firstly, kudos to skay for sticking around the forum despite the luke-warm welcome. Of course, locking a topic and avoiding direct questions can be misconstrued as running away from an honest exchange of ideas, but if it's done for the sake of peace, than it's a positive hanhogo. So is an honest report of progress and sobriety status.

As far as the quote above:

Anecdotal evidence is only worth anything when it is quantified. Which is why Dov keeps referring to "millions helped", or the many that he knows personally who met with success when following a certain path.

But when one person keeps refering to his own and only story for proof, it could be either:

1. An exception
2. An untruth
3. A misrepresantation of facts
4. A stroke of luck

but not much in a way of worthwhile advice for others.

So my money, again, is on porn and masturbation. And if skay wants to prove me wrong and stay sexually sober for the rest of his life "to show me", I won't mind, at all.

Have a sober day.

Mottel

=====

====

Re: The nature of addicitons in a nutshell

Posted by E-Tek - 26 Jun 2012 01:08

---

[obormottel wrote on 25 Jun 2012 21:53:](#)

And if skay wants to prove me wrong and stay sexually sober for the rest of his life "to show me", **I won't mind, at all.**

**Have a sober day.**

Mottel

This is what I love about GYE.

=====

=====