

Wayne Dyer (Illustrated by After Skool): There Are No Justified Resentments

[Wayne Dyer \(Illustrated by After Skool\): There Are No Justified Resentments](#)



“He said, ‘If you become steadfast in your abstentions of thoughts of harm directed towards others, all living creatures will cease to feel enmity in your presence.’

[...]

“But at the higher level, when there are no justified resentments, what you are doing is you are at a place where you are sending love in response to hate.”



[There are NO Justified Resentments – Wayne Dyer](#)

by [After Skool](#)

October 17, 2023

Video available at [Odysee](#) or [YouTube](#)

Wayne Walter Dyer (May 10, 1940 – August 29, 2015) was an American self-help author and a motivational speaker. Dyer

completed a Ed.D. in guidance and counseling at Wayne State University in 1970. Early in his career, he worked as a high school guidance counselor, and went on to run a successful private therapy practice.

He became a popular professor of counselor education at St. John's University, where he was approached by a literary agent to put his ideas into book form. The result was his first book, *Your Erroneous Zones* (1976), one of the best-selling books of all time, with an estimated 100 million copies sold. This launched Dyer's career as a motivational speaker and self-help author, during which he published 20 more best-selling books and produced a number of popular specials for PBS. Influenced by thinkers such as Abraham Maslow and Albert Ellis, Dyer's early work focused on psychological themes such as motivation, self actualization and assertiveness.

[Connect with After Skool](#)

Transcript prepared by [Truth Comes to Light editor](#):

I was in a group one time of drug addicts and alcoholics. And I was one of the people that was a sponsor and leading this group. And the sign on the wall said "There are no justified resentments in this group".

And what I said to that group that night was, "No matter what anybody says to you here, no matter what kind of anger comes directed towards you, no matter how much hate you may encounter showing up in your life, there are no justified resentments."

Meaning that if you carry around resentment inside of you about anything or about anyone –

And I'm talking about the person that you lent money to and hasn't paid you back.

I'm talking about the person in your life that you feel was abusive.

I'm talking about the person who walked out on you and left you for somebody else.

I'm talking about all of the things that you have justified in your heart and in your life that you have the right to be resentful about.

And I'm suggesting to you that those resentments will always end up harming you and creating in you a sense of despair.

I've often said that no one ever dies from a snake bite. The snake bite will never kill you. You cannot be unbitten. Once you're bitten, you're bitten. But it's the venom that continues to pour through your system after the bite that will end up destroying you.

So now you have to take a look at all of the resentments that you may have in your life. And I'd like to suggest to you that I think there is a wonderful metaphor for this that I have created in my life for how to make this work.

There's a show called 'Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?'. And basically this show has two levels that you have to get to.

Now the first level is the thousand dollar level. And at the thousand dollar level you basically have to answer a question like, on your hand you have some digits. Those digits on your hand are called – your feet? – your nose? – your ears? – your fingers?. Uhhh. And everybody who ever goes on the show has this horrible dread that they're going to go out on one of those questions. Right?

So basically, in order to get to the thousand dollar level all you have to do is answer five pretty simple questions in order to get to the thousand dollar level. Now the thousand dollar level, for you in this metaphor, means that you will

leave with something if you get this. At least get this. This is the thousand dollar level.

You must send blame out of your life for any conditions of your life. Blame has to go.

Now blame means if you're sitting there with a disease you say, without guilt, "It's mine. I take responsibility for it."

This means that if you have been through any tough circumstances in your life, this means if you have a minimal amount of financial security in your life.

This means if your children don't get along with you.

This means that if your neighbors are taking up a petition to get you out of the neighborhood.

Whatever it might be that's going on in your life, you name it and everybody has a series of these things that you're willing to say, "I am here because of the choices that I have made. Right now. I'm willing to say that." Even though it's difficult, and we know it's really not your fault. We know really there's a lot of people out there who are really bad. All right? But you're willing to say, "No blame."

That's the first level. All right? That's where you understand "No justified resentment".

And then on the 'Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?' show, there is what is called the \$32,000 level. And the \$32,000 level is not only an opportunity for you to walk away with a sizable amount of goodies, but it also is the door opener to multi-wealth. But you got to get to this in order to have an opportunity to move into these transcendent levels. All right? Millionaire spiritual status. All right? You got to get through these next five questions.

And this \$32,000 question, or level rather, comes to this. It

came to me from a quotation that I used in the writing of 'A Spiritual Solution to Every Problem'. I read a book that was written a couple of thousand years ago by Patanjali, 'The Yoga Sutras', 'The Aphorisms of Patanjali'. And one of those sutras, one of those aphorisms, observations that this brilliant man made almost 2,000 years ago was this:

He said, "If you become steadfast in your abstentions of thoughts of harm directed towards others, all living creatures will cease to feel enmity in your presence."

Now this translates to: Blame, pretty basic. No more blame. I'm just not going to assign responsibility to other people for where I am. Because now I have an opportunity to get rid of it. If I think someone else caused it, then I've got to wait for somebody else to change in order for me to get rid of it. And you might wait forever for that. But if I take responsibility for it, I can do something, including move on, which might be the most important thing to do.

But at the higher level, when there are no justified resentments, what you are doing is you are at a place where you are sending love in response to hate. You are literally saying, "No matter what comes my way, I am going to be steadfast in my abstention of thoughts of harm directed toward others. I'm going to work hard at, no matter what comes my way, having it come out of me what I want to come out of me. And that is love. And that is a higher energy."

And if you can get to that level, Patanjali said, all living creatures will cease to feel enmity in your presence.

I have a little girl, a precious little girl. I have six precious girls and two precious sons, but I have a little girl who is almost 12. And she loves animals like no one I've ever met in my life. I mean, her whole life revolves around animals. And when we walk in the woods, butterflies avoid me, fly away from people around, and they come and they land

right on her arm, and it happens all the time. All living creatures. She couldn't have a thought of harm directed towards any living creature.

And Patanjali said to us, all living creatures will cease to feel fear or enmity or anger in the presence of those who can send love in response to hate. That's what I mean when I say there are no justified resentments.

What I'd like to do, I'd like to share a little story here with you. It's a very tender story. It was sent to me by someone who sends me beautiful things in the mail. And I call it *The Teddy Story*. And I'd like to read this to you, if I can do it without tearing up. And this story illustrates this as well as anything I've ever seen.

There's a story many years ago of an elementary school teacher. Her name was Mrs. Thompson. As she stood in front of her fifth grade class on the very first day of school, she told the children a lie. Like most teachers, she looked at her students and said that she loved them all the same. But that was impossible because there in the front row, slumped in his seat, was a little boy named Teddy Stoddard.

Mrs. Thompson had watched Teddy the year before and noticed that he didn't play well with the other children, that his clothes were messy and that he constantly needed a bath. Teddy could be unpleasant. It got to the point where Mrs. Thompson would actually take delight in marking his papers with a broad red pen and making bold Xs and then putting a big F at the top of his paper.

At the school where Mrs. Thompson taught, she was required to review each child's past records. And she put Teddy's off until last. However, when she reviewed his file, she was in for a surprise.

Teddy's first grade teacher wrote, "Teddy is a bright child with a ready laugh. He does his work neatly and he has good

manners. He's a joy to be around."

His second grade teacher wrote, "Teddy is an excellent student, well liked by his classmates. But he's troubled because his mother has a terminal illness and life at home must be a struggle."

His third grade teacher wrote, "His mother's death has been hard on him. He tries to do his best, but his father doesn't show much interest and his home life will soon affect him if steps aren't taken."

Teddy's fourth grade teacher wrote, "Teddy's withdrawn and doesn't show much interest in school. He doesn't have many friends and sometimes he even sleeps in class."

By now Mrs. Thompson realized the problem and she was ashamed of herself. She felt even worse when her students brought her Christmas presents wrapped in beautiful ribbons and bright paper, except for Teddy's. His present was clumsily wrapped in heavy brown paper that he got from the grocery bag.

Mrs. Thompson took pains to open it in the middle of the other presents. Some of the children started to laugh when she found a rhinestone bracelet with some of the stones missing and a bottle that was one quarter full of perfume. But she stifled her children's laughter when she exclaimed how pretty the bracelet was, putting it on and dabbing some of the perfume on her wrist.

Teddy Stoddard stayed after school that day just long enough to say, "Mrs. Thompson, today you smelled just like my mom used to."

After the children laughed, she cried for at least an hour. On that very day, she quit teaching, reading, writing and arithmetic and instead she began to teach children.

Mrs. Thompson paid particular attention to Teddy. As she

worked with him and his mind seemed to come alive, the more she encouraged him the faster he responded. By the end of the year, Teddy had become one of the smartest children in the class and, despite her lie, became one of her teacher's pets.

A year later, she found a note under the door from Teddy telling her that she was still the best teacher he ever had in his whole life.

Six years went by before she got another note from Teddy. He then wrote that he had finished high school third in his class and she was still the best teacher he ever had in his whole life.

Four years after that, she got another letter saying that while things had been tough at times, he stayed in school and stuck with it. And would soon graduate from college with the highest of honors. He assured Mrs. Thompson that she was still the very best and favorite teacher he ever had in his whole life.

Then four more years passed and yet another letter came. This time he explained that after he got his bachelor's degree, he decided to go a little further. The letter explained that she was still the best and favorite teacher he ever had but now his name was a little longer. The letter was signed Theodore F. Stoddard, MD.

But the story doesn't end there. You see, there was yet another letter that spring. Teddy said he'd met this girl and was going to be married. He explained that his father had died a couple of years ago and he was wondering if Mrs. Thompson might agree to sit in the place at the wedding that was usually reserved for the mother of the groom.

Of course Mrs. Thompson did. And guess what? She wore that bracelet, the one with several rhinestones missing. And she made sure she was wearing the perfume that Teddy remembered his mother wearing on their last Christmas together.

They hugged each other and Dr. Stoddard whispered in Mrs. Thompson's ear, "Thank you so much for making me feel important and showing me that I could make a difference."

Mrs. Thompson came, with tears in her eyes, and whispered back, "Teddy you have it all wrong. You were the one who taught me that I could make a difference. I didn't know how to teach until I met you."

Isn't that a beautiful story? That symbolizes there are no justified resentments. Work at reaching that \$32,000 level. The place where the only thing you have to send is love because that's what's inside.

And that's the message of our greatest spiritual teachers. That's all they ever had to give away.

Cover image credit: [CDD20](#)

"The Science Delusion": A Banned TED Talk by Rupert Sheldrake

["The Science Delusion": A Banned TED Talk by Rupert Sheldrake](#)

by [News Voice](#)

January 28, 2023

“Ten years ago, in January 2013, I gave my TEDx talk on The Science Delusion, which was later ‘banned’ by TED and has subsequently had more than seven million views on other websites. Last week this talk was re-released in a new, brilliantly illustrated version by an organization called After Skool.”

~ Rupert Sheldrake

[Video available at AfterSkool [odysee](#) and [youtube](#) channels.]

Transcription by AI@[NewsVoice](#)

Science delusion is the belief that science already understands the nature of reality in principle, leaving any of the details to be filled in. This is a very widespread belief in our society.

It's the kind of belief system of people who say, I don't believe in God, I believe in science. It's a belief system that has now been spread to the entire world. But there's a conflict in the heart of science between science as a method of inquiry based on reason, evidence, hypothesis, and collective investigation, and science as a belief system or a worldview.

And unfortunately, the worldview aspect of science has come to inhibit and constrict the free inquiry, which is the very lifeblood of the scientific endeavor. Since the late 19th century, science has been conducted under the aspect of a belief system or worldview, which is essentially that of materialism, philosophical materialism.

And these sciences are now wholly owned subsidiaries of the materialist worldview. I think that as we break out of it, the sciences will be regenerated. What I do in my book, The

Science Delusion, which is called Science Set Free in the United States, is take the ten dogmas or assumptions of science and turn them into questions, seeing how well they stand up.

If you look at them scientifically, none of them stand up very well. What I'm going to do is first run through what these ten dogmas are and then I'll only have time to discuss one or two of them in a bit more detail.

But essentially the ten dogmas which are the default worldview of most educated people all over the world are first, that nature is mechanical or machine-like. The universe is like a machine. Animals and plants are like machines.

We're like machines. In fact, we are machines. We are lumbering robots in Richard Dawkin's vivid phrase with brains that are genetically programmed computers. Second, matter is unconscious. The whole universe is made up of unconscious matter.

There's no consciousness in stars, in galaxies, in planets, in animals, in plants and there ought not to be any in us either if this theory is true. So a lot of the philosophy of mind over the last hundred years is being trying to prove that we're not really conscious at all.

So the matter is unconscious. Then the laws of nature are fixed. This is dogma three. The laws of nature are the same now as they were at the time of the Big Bang and they'll be the same forever. Not just the laws, but the constants of nature are fixed which is why they are called constants.

Dogma four the total amount of matter and energy is always the same. It never changes in total quantity except at the moment of the Big Bang when it all sprang into existence from nowhere in a single instant.

The fifth dogma is that nature is purposeless. There are no

purposes in all nature and the evolutionary purpose, and the evolutionary process has no purpose or direction. Dogma six the biological heredity is material.

Everything you inherit is in your genes or in epigenetic modifications of the genes or in cytoplasmic inheritance. It's material. Dogma seven memories are stored inside your brain as material traces.

Somehow everything you remember is in your brain in modified nerve endings, phosphorylated proteins. No one knows how it works, but nevertheless, almost everyone in the scientific world believes it must be in the brain.

Dogma eight your mind is inside your head. All your consciousness is the activity of your brain and nothing more. Dogma nine, which follows from dogma eight. Psychic phenomena like telepathy are impressive possible.

Your thoughts and intentions cannot have any effect at a distance because your mind is inside your head. Therefore, all the apparent evidence for telepathy and other psychic phenomena is illusory. People believe these things happen, but it's just because they don't know enough about statistics or they're just they're deceived by coincidences, or wishful thinking.

And dogma ten mechanistic medicine is the only kind that really works. That's why governments only fund research into mechanistic medicine and ignore complementary and alternative therapies. Those can't possibly really work because they're not mechanistic.

They may appear to work because people would have got better anyway or because of the placebo effect. But the only kind that really works is mechanistic medicine. Well, this is the default worldview that is held by almost all educated people all over the world.

It's the basis of the educational system. The National Health Service, and the Medical Research Council governments. And it's just the default worldview of educated people. But I think every one of these dogmas is very, very questionable.

And when you look at it, they're, they fall apart. I'm going to take first the idea that the laws of nature are fixed. This is a hangover from an older worldview. Before the 1960s, when the Big Bang theory came in, people thought that the whole universe was eternally governed by eternal mathematical laws.

When the big bang came in. Then that assumption continued, even though the Big Bang revealed a universe that's radically evolutionary, about 14 billion years old, growing and developing and evolving for 14 billion years, growing and cooling, and more structures and patterns appear within it.

But the idea is, all the laws of nature were completely fixed at the moment of the Big Bang, like a cosmic Napoleonic code. As my friend Terence McKenna used to say, modern science is based on the principle give us one free miracle and we'll explain the rest.

And the one free miracle is the appearance of all the matter and energy in the universe and all the laws that govern it from nothing in a single instant. Well, in an evolutionary universe, why shouldn't the laws themselves evolve?

After all, human laws do. And the idea of laws of nature is based on a metaphor for human laws. It's a very anthropocentric metaphor. Only humans have laws. In fact, only civilized societies have laws.

As CS. Lewis once said, to say that a stone falls to Earth because it's obeying the law and makes it a man and even a citizen. It's a metaphor that we got so used to that we forget it's a metaphor. In an evolving universe, I think a much better idea is the idea of habits.

I think the habits of nature evolve. The regularities of nature are essentially habitual. This was an idea put forward at the beginning of the 20th century by the American philosopher C. S. Purse. And it's an idea that various other philosophers have entertained.

And it's one which I myself have developed into a scientific hypothesis, the hypothesis of morphic resonance, which is the basis of these evolving habits. According to this hypothesis, everything in nature has a kind of collective memory.

Resonance occurs on the basis of similarity. As a young giraffe embryo grows in its mother's womb, it tunes in. To the amorphic resonance of previous giraffes. It draws on that collective memory. It grows like a giraffe, and it behaves like a giraffe.

Because it's drawing on this collective memory. It has to have the right genes to make the right proteins. But genes, in my view, are grossly overrated. They only account for the proteins that the organism can make, not the shape or the form, or the behavior.

Every species has a kind of collective memory. Even crystals do. This theory predicts that if you make a new kind of crystal for the first time, the very first time you make it, it won't have an existing habit.

But once it crystallizes, then the next time you make it, there'll be an inference from the first crystals to the second ones all over the world. By morphic resonance, it'll crystallize a bit easier the third time.

There'll be an inference from the first and second crystals. There is, in fact, good evidence that new compounds get easier to crystallize all around the world, just as this theory would predict. It also predicts that if you train animals to learn a new trick, for example, rats learn a new trick in London, then all around the world, rats of the same breed should learn the

same trick quicker just because the rats have learned it here.

And surprisingly, there's already evidence that this actually happens anyway. That's my own hypothesis. In a nutshell in morphic resonance, everything depends on evolving habits, not on fixed laws. But I want to spend a few moments on the constants of nature, too, because these are again assumed to be constant.

Things like the gravitational constant, and the speed of light, are called fundamental constants. Are they really constant? Well, when I got interested in the question, I tried to find out. They're given in.

Physics handbooks, handbooks of physics list the existing fundamental constants, and tell you their value. But I wanted to see if they changed, so I got it. The old volumes of Physical handbooks. I went to the Patent Office library here in London and they're the only place I could find that kept the old volumes.

Normally, people throw them away when new values come out, they throw away the old ones. When I did this, I found that the speed of light dropped between 1928 and 1945 by about 20 kilometers per second.

It's a huge drop because they're given arrows of any fractions of a set. Ah, practical points of error. And yet all over the world, it dropped. And they were all getting values very similar to each other with tiny errors.

And then in 145 it went up at 48, it went up again, and then people started getting very similar values again. I was very intrigued by this and I couldn't make sense of it. So I went to see the head of Metrology at the National Physical Laboratory in Teddington.

Metrology is the science in which people measure constants. And I asked him about this, I said, what do you make of this

drop in the speed of light between 1928 and 1945? And he said, oh, dear. He said You've uncovered the most embarrassing episode in the history of our science.

So I said, well, could the speed of light have actually dropped? And that would have amazing implications if so. He said, no, no, of course, it couldn't have actually dropped, it's a constant. So oh, well, then how do you explain the fact everyone was finding it going much slower during that period?

Is it because they were fudging their results to get what they thought other people should be getting? And the whole thing was just produced by in the minds of physicists? We don't like to use the word fudge.

I said, well, what do you prefer? He said, well, we prefer to call it intellectual phase locking. So I said, well, if it was going on, then how can we be so sure it's not going on today? And that the present values are produced by intellectual phase locking.

And he said, oh, we know that's not the case. And I said, how do we know? He said, well, he said, we've solved the problem. And I said, well, how? He said, well, we fixed the speed of light by definition in 1972.

So I said, but it might still change. He said, yes, but we'd never know it because we've defined the meter in terms of the speed of light. So the units changed with it. So he looked very pleased about that.

They'd fixed that problem. But I said, well then, what about big June E, the gravitational constant known in the trade as big G. It's written with a capital G, newton's universal gravitational constant that's varied by more than 1.3% in recent years.

And it seems to vary from place to place and from time to time. And he said, oh, well, those are just arrows, and

unfortunately there are quite big errors with big G . So I said, well, what if it's really changing?

I mean, perhaps it is really changing. And then I looked at how they do it. What happens is they measure it in different labs, they get different values on different days, and then they average them.

And then other labs around the world do the same and they come out, usually with a rather different average. And then the international committee on Metrology meets every ten years or so and averages the ones from labs around the world to come up with the value of big G .

But what if g were actually fluctuating? What if it changed? There's already evidence actually, that it changes throughout the day and throughout the year. What if the Earth, as it moves through the galactic environment, went through patches of dark matter or other environmental factors that could alter it?

Maybe they all change together. What if these errors are going up together and down together? For more than ten years, I've been trying to persuade metrologists to look at the raw data. In fact, I'm now trying to persuade them to put it online on the internet with the dates and the actual measurements, and see if they're correlated, to see if they're all up at one time, all down at another.

If so, they might be fluctuating together, and that would tell us something very, very interesting. But no one has done this. They haven't done it because g 's are constant. There's no point looking for changes.

You see here's a very simple example of where a dogmatic assumption actually inhibits inquiry. I myself think that the constants may vary quite considerably well within narrow limits, but they may all be varying.

And I think the day will come when scientific journals like Nature have a weekly report on the constants like stock market reports and newspapers. You know, this week big G was slightly up. The speed of the charge on the electron was and the speed of light held steady and so on.

That's just one area where I think thinking less dogmatically could open things up. One of the biggest areas is the nature of the mind. This is the most unsolved problem that sounds simply can't deal with the fact we're conscious and it can't deal with the fact that our thoughts don't seem to be inside our brains.

Our experiences don't all seem to be inside our brains. Your image of me now doesn't seem to be inside your brain. Yet the official view is there's a little Rupert somewhere inside your head and everything else in this room is inside your head.

Your experience is inside your brain. I'm suggesting actually that vision involves an outward projection of images. What you're seeing is in your mind but not inside your head. Our minds are extended beyond our brains in the simplest act of perception.

I think that we project out the images we're seeing and these images touch what we're looking at. If I look at you from behind, you don't know I'm there. Could I affect you? Could you feel my gaze? There's a great deal of evidence that people can.

The sense of being stared at is an extremely common experience and recent experimental research suggests it's real. Animals seem to have it too. I think it probably evolved in the context of predator-prey relationships.

Prey animals that could feel the gaze of a predator would survive better than those that couldn't. This would lead to a whole new way of thinking about ecological relationships between predators and prey, and also about the extent of our

minds.

If we look at distant stars, I think our minds reach out, in a sense, to touch those stars and literally extend out over astronomical different distances. They're not just inside our heads. Now, it may seem astonishing that this is a topic of debate.

In the 21st century, we know so little about our own minds that where our images are is a hot topic of debate within consciousness studies. Right now, I don't have time to deal with any more of these dogmas, but every single one of them is questionable.

If one questions it, new forms of research, and new possibilities open up. And I think as we question these dogmas that have held back science for so long, science will undergo a reflowering, a renaissance. I'm a total believer in the importance of science.

I've spent my whole life as a research scientist, my whole career. But I think by moving beyond these dogmas, it can be regenerated once again and become interesting and I hope, life-affirming.

Thank you.

[Connect with Rupert Sheldrake](#)

[Connect with After Skool](#)

[Connect with News Voice](#)

Alan Watts: Life Is Not Complicated

[Alan Watts: Life Is Not Complicated](#)

by [After Skool](#)

April 26, 2022

Speech extract from “Do You Do It or Does It Do You?: How to Let the Universe Meditate You” by Alan Watts, courtesy of <https://alanwatts.org>

[Connect with After Skool](#)

Alan Watts: The False Idea of Who You Are

[Alan Watts: The False Idea of Who You Are](#)


by [After Skool](#)

June 8, 2021

Video available at After Skool [Odysee](#) and [YouTube](#) channels.

Speech extract from "What is Life About?" by Alan Watts, courtesy of <https://alanwatts.org>

Alan Wilson Watts (6 January 1915 – 16 November 1973) was a well-known British philosopher, writer and speaker, best known for his interpretation of Eastern philosophy for Western audiences. He left behind more than 25 books and an audio library of nearly 400 talks, which are still in great demand.



[Connect with After Skool](#)