

# SEQUEL PRIMER (2023)

Thomas J. Schur

This Sequel takes the original book and develops the Mag/Min framework significantly in several, important ways. First, it presents a conceptualization of Becker's idea of denial in more depth and specificity. Secondly, it lays out a deeper level of the operation of denial when the self is challenged, whether by a crisis, or by the need to explore the self in more depth as the self-improvement work proceeds. Third, it introduces the dynamic of transcendence, which is a part of Becker's work, but was not developed in the original Mag/Min book. As a result of these three expansions, and the presentation of them in specific examples, the Mag/Min theory becomes more robust, because the foundation is more clearly elucidated, and the overall framework has more integrity. Therefore, it can be trusted even more, both as a practical book, and as one with the theoretical foundation more understandable.

## **Mag/Min: Review of the Basic Framework**

The Magnifier/Minifier framework is based in the patterns of decision-making for a person over their lifetime. These patterns define the self; they make you who you are. There are two patterns, Magnification and Minification, which parallel the evolutionary dynamic of fight/flight.

When confronted with a situation of having to make a decision about taking action, one could say that a major factor is the consideration of the probability of a favorable outcome versus an unfavorable one. While there is always the possibility either could happen, in making this calculation people operating from Magnification minimize the possibility of failure. They focus primarily on the possibility of success. It is the opposite for

people operating from Minification. They focus primarily on the possibility of failure and diminish awareness of the possibility of success. For both, the calculation relies on a perception that favors the likelihood of one or the other. To the extent this pattern of Magnification or Minification overrides a balanced assessment of the evidence, both are distortions. The best decisions with the least distortions, are ones made with a more balanced consideration of what is possible and what is not possible.

## **Denial**

The original book was grounded in Becker's conceptualization of denial as an essential process for the human to handle the existential anxiety provoked by the existential paradox. Briefly, the existential paradox is the situation in which humans are aware of the fact that on the one hand, they can imagine the infinite. Language allows them to fantasize all kinds of possibilities, even that they will never die. At the same time they are aware of the fact that they have a mortal body that will eventually die. The paradox is that while both are true, they contradict each other, and the conflict is irreconcilable. Becker contends that this paradox generates existential anxiety because the conflict is about our existence, and it cannot be resolved. As a consequence, he says that in order to live a normal life, one needs denial.

In my Mag/Min framework, that denial takes the form of denying one side or the other of the paradox, either the mortal side (Magnifier) or the infinite side (Minifier). The Magnifier assumes things will generally work out and one does not need to be concerned about the risks of problematic outcomes. The Minifier assumes things often do not work out, and one does need to be concerned about the risks of problematic outcomes.

The Sequel extends the conceptualization of denial from the original book and breaks it down into an explicit structure of the denial mode, for either Mag or Min, which is comprised of two elements, the Directive and the

Rationale, both paired as a unit. As one is contemplating a decision, the Directive is the awareness of what to do, and the Rationale is the basis for why the person should take that action.

(To visualize the following explanations, it is helpful to consult the basic Chart for the Sequel that can be found on the Books/Sequel and Chart link on the website)

In addition, the Sequel further refines the concept of the Direction by scaling it from the extremes of either end of the continuum of Mag or Min to the Middle. The Home position is that point on the scale of the continuum that defines the point where the pattern of decision-making is stable over time. (Note that the point is on one side or the other and never crosses over, because the denial mode is either Mag or Min, not both.)

Home positions at the extreme ends of the continuum, either Mag or Min, reflect lower functioning, while positions toward the Middle reflect higher functioning. At the extremes, the articulation of what to do as one considers a decision, is defined as a Rule. In the Middle range of the continuum, this articulation is defined as a Principle. The difference between them is one of the internalization of the Rationale. When the basis for making a decision comes from operating from a Home position at the extreme of Mag or Min, the Direction comes from a determination that is external. The person is following what they have taken in from the outside world, and have accepted as valid. On the other hand, from a Home position in the Middle range, the Direction comes from a determination arrived at from internal exploration, validated by their experiences.

## **Level I and Level II**

Most of the time people are not aware of the operation of their denial mode, which of course is exactly how the denial is supposed to work. However, there are times when the self is challenged by a crisis, or even by the work the person is doing on self for example, in therapy. This prompts

reflection about the denial mode, which then emerges into the person's awareness. In the Sequel, I am defining this process as moving to a deeper level, defined as Level II. It is the level where the stability of the denial mode is disrupted and the person is working to recover it.

The original book proposed that the work of self-improvement involves experimenting with one's pattern of decision-making to move the Home position more toward the Middle. If a person is a Mag, the experiment is to modify the Direction by allowing the possibility of more limitations, taking risks more seriously. If the person is a Min, the experiment is to modify the Direction by allowing for more possibilities, with less focus on risks. In Level I this experimentation in decision-making is focused on specific situations, like one's relationship with one's spouse or children, one's job or one's health. In Level II, because the self is challenged and the denial mode is disrupted, the exploration extends to a broader range of one's experiences. The person questions their pattern of decision-making across more areas of their life than just in a specific area as in Level I.

The dynamic of moving to Level II is one of internalization. In regard to the Rationale, the person begins to reflect in a deeper way on why they make the decisions they make. What is the basis for the patterns of decision-making? Because the Rationale component of the denial mode is paired with the Direction, any modifications to the Direction from the experimentation in the work on self, modifies the Rationale as well. So if the Mag makes changes in the patterns of the Direction to now allow more limitations, the reason why they are doing that, changes the previous Rationale that supported the previous Direction. Similarly, if the Min changes the pattern to allow more possibilities, the reason why they are doing that, changes the previous Rationale. As this paired modification of the denial mode of Directive and Rationale together changes, in the work on self in Level II, the Home position can move toward higher functioning in the middle of the continuum.

It is also possible that the work of exploration in Level II, prompted by a challenge to the self, leads to a choice to not experiment with a change in the denial mode. In that case, the original denial mode is reinforced and the stability of the self returns to where it was before the disruption, and the Home position stays at the same point on the continuum.

## **Transcendence**

Becker talks about the need for a transcendent to support the essential need for denial. While I do not dispute the need for a transcendent, the Mag/Min theory proposes that the operation of a transcendent is different for a Magnifier and a Minifier. This difference becomes apparent in the Rationale component of the denial mode in its pairing with the Direction. The Rationale that supports the Direction for the Mag to act to restrict limitations, is different from the Rationale that supports the Direction for the Min. to act to restrict possibilities.

This inclusion of the dynamic of transcendence leads to the need to conceptualize two dimensions of transcendence. On the one hand, for both denial modes of Mag and Min, transcendence is a process, outside of awareness, not an idea. Magnification and Minification as denial modes provide transcendence of the Existential Paradox through protection from the simultaneous awareness of living and dying, by denying one or the other. This protection from the awareness is more complete at the extremes and less complete with more awareness and existential anxiety in the middle range, where it is still denial of the opposite, just less so. The less rigid transcendence in the middle of the continuum is what allows for more experimentation and change to a higher level of functioning.

As explained above, transcendence is the process of denial common to both Mag and Min, but carried out differently for each in the denial mode. This happens usually outside of one's everyday awareness in Level I as the denial protects. In this process dimension of transcendence, the Rationale

component justifies the actions taken as one makes decisions, but does not function as a transcendent idea because it is more limited to specific situations.

On the other hand, when the self is challenged in a way that disrupts the denial mode, and the person moves into Level II, the awareness of the denial process itself comes to the fore. This increases the awareness of the existential anxiety and so the Rationale becomes more of a focus. At this point, the other dimension of transcendence becomes apparent.

With this challenge to the self the person moves into Level II, where the exploration to recover the stability of the self, can lead to the questioning of the larger basis for the pattern of decision-making across multiple situations. In this case, the Rationale becomes more of a transcendent idea. This is the other dimension of transcendence in this Mag/Min framework, namely, transcendence as a Meaning narrative. This is the process where the Rationale, not only supports the Directive in specific areas of one's life, but extends to the larger perspective of making sense of the person's life overall, their worldview as they live their life everyday making decisions.

Consistent with the explanation above in regard to the Rationales generally, similarly here the differences between a Magnifier's worldview and a Minifier's will be different. These differences will be greater with Home positions at the extremes and less with positions toward the Middle.

## **Systems**

Just as the original Mag/Min book is thoroughly grounded in systems theory, the Sequel is as well. Actually, the expanded elements of the Sequel further reinforce this grounding in systems thinking because there are more components of the denial process that coordinate to stabilize the functioning of the individual person and the systems they live in. The format of the Sequel follows that of the original in that the dynamics of Mag/Min are first presented, as they are in this primer, from the

perspective of the individual person, and then transposed onto the template of systems, such as the family.

In the original, this shift to systems occurs by framing the dynamics of denial in terms of the operations of triangles. The Sequel similarly presents the expanded elements presented above in this primer, by describing specific examples of triangles in a family. So, these examples of triangles incorporate the three elements of: the Direction and Rationale components of the denial mode of Mags and of Mins; Level I and Level II; and transcendence.

## **Conclusion**

Like the Original, the Sequel presents a guide for practice, not as a set of self-help techniques, but more as a roadmap for pursuing the work on self in Level II over time. It offers a framework for experimenting with changing the Directive of the denial mode of Mag or Min, with the subsequent change in the Rationale, and then in the Meaning narrative that make sense of the person's world. This is the process of changing the self.

The appeal of the Sequel book is for the person who has reached a point where they know they need to make a significant change in how they live their life, and are willing to do that long-term work.