

01-THURSDAY NIGHT PART 1

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Part 1

Track: 01-Thursday Night Part 1

TRT: 19:56

Marc: So we're going to do a lot of laughing this weekend, because laughter is an unbelievably important thing to do. Laughter lets you say the things that you're really not able to say any other way. So there's a dude named Jack Canfield who sent me this joke. And Jack wrote a series of books called *Chicken Soup for the Soul*. So Jack is working with us in this project, this outrageous love project, which is very, very exciting. And we met at the Success 3.0 Summit that a couple of people – who were like the four or five people here were at it? Who was here? Sam, right, a few people were at it. Wasn't that awesome? Isn't that awesome? It's so awesome.

So Jack started sending me jokes afterwards. So he's responsible for the following one. Okay, so his name is Eisenstein. So Eisenstein – Eisenstein's this Jewish dude. And as you could figure out from his name, right? His wife's named Sadie, because the Jewish dudes often have wives named Sadie. That's just how it goes. I'm not sure why. And there's a son named Matza, and Passover's coming up. So it's a good time. And he has a nail company, and they make nails. You pound the nails into the wall, it makes nails, and it's a good business. You make nails, from the old country, it's very good. He's been doing it for 25 years. He's very, very happy. It's going very, very well, and he's finally made enough money, Rosemary, that he can take a vacation.

And he's trained his son, Matza, in the business. He really knows marketing and he knows how to make nails, and how to pound them into walls. And it's good. So he goes to Miami Beach and take a vacation. He says to Matza, "Matza, you're in charge. You do it." He's like, "Dad, no problem. Tata." It means "dad." "No problem. Got it covered." He's down there, "Hey, Marlene." He's down there in Miami Beach, and he opens up the *Miami Herald Tribune*. He almost chokes on his cigar. And there's a picture of Jesus on the cross and it says, "They used Eisenstein's nails." That was the advertising.

He says, "Oh my god! I can't even believe it. My son, what did my son do? That's terrible." So he calls up his son, he says, "You're a crazy guy! You used Eisenstein's nails like in a cross? You can't do that, the goyem, they're going to kill us." So he says, "Dad, I'm so sorry. I just didn't understand. I'm totally, totally

sorry. I'll never do it again." Two days later, he opens it up, Eisenstein, the *Miami Herald Tribune*, sees a picture of Jesus at the bottom of the cross, crumpled up, and at the top it says, "They should have used Eisenstein's nails."

[Laughter]

That is so bad. So bad, right? You're like, "Oh my god! Oh my God. Did he just tell that joke?" It's so painful, right, but it's just so great. Okay, so humor allows you to say things you're just never allowed to say. You just can't – and Jack sent me that joke. So I'm not responsible for it. He's my joke supplier.

So laughter's a big deal. Whenever you do a wedding, there's a holy, mystical tradition that, at a wedding, you don't actually need a priest or a rabbi. The sacraments are actually created by the people themselves. But you always need a *bajrun*, you always need a jester. Why do you need a jester? Because to bring the masculine and feminine together requires laughter.

If you're going to try and bring the masculine and feminine together, you better have a comedian in the house. Or you're in a lot of trouble. And that doesn't matter whether it's the masculine or the feminine in a gay relationship or in a straight relationship, the polarity is always there. It's always at play. It's not a heteronormative issue, as I like to say. It's a core structure of reality. Those two poles of reality, when they come together, something explodes.

Something which is gorgeous and stunning, and beautiful and filled with friction, and filled with complexity, and filled with pain, and filled with angst. And a vision of what reality looks like in this great dance between these two poles of reality, which have historically been called masculine and feminine, as they live in us, as they live in each of us, as they live between us, as they live in phases of history. What is the masculine and feminine? What's the dance? How do we laugh it through? What is sex? What's gender? How does it work? It's the biggest question in the world.

Who am I? Am I a man? Am I a woman? Am I transgender? Am I genderqueer? Am I a man with some woman, or a woman with some man? Why does it matter? Who cares? But actually, it's the biggest question in the world. Because the biggest question in the world is always, "Who am I?" And know thyself. And from that place of knowing myself, and actually having the deepest, most profound, powerful understanding of who I am. And who I am has little to do with my sexual preference. Gay/straight, it doesn't matter. Gay, straight or goats, whichever one, we're good.

But the deeper issue is, who am I in my core identity? And does it even make sense to talk about masculine and feminine anymore? Maybe those terms are completely outdated. Maybe they're not. And we're going to suggest a radical approach to this whole world. And we're going to push through and we're going to

enact it. We're going to dance it. We're going to laugh it. We're going to embody it. And like what we did when we first started talking about the pleasure dharma – how many people were with us for the pleasure dharma? The Unique Self dharma. How many people were with us for Unique Self dharma? Seven kinds of sexing dharma. How many people were with us for that? The shadow dharma. How many people for that? As we push through each one of those pieces, what we tried to do was get to what we call "source code clarity." Meaning we don't want to just say something cute or clever. We want to actually enter into the source code of reality itself and actually find, what's the deepest understanding?

At this moment of time, of this issue, to actually change, to evolve, the very source code of reality itself as we live it. To actually enact in this room an actual evolution of the dharmic source code of reality. That's what we're trying to do.

So the goal of the Wisdom School is different, in some sense, than an average retreat. An average retreat, you're sitting around saying, "How am I being served?" And in the average spiritual New Age world, is an expression of an enormous amount of good and an enormous amount of narcissism. And it's, I go, I get served. Am I taken care of? Am I being addressed? Am I being entertained? Am I being right? Fuck all that! This is not about entertainment. It's not what it's about. If you're not feeling entertained, who cares? You may be uncomfortable. Great. Awesome. The norm is, "I'm a little uncomfortable." Fantastic. Awesome.

The job of good dharma is to comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable. So if there's no time that you start feeling uncomfortable in the week and, "I feel uncomfortable. I don't think I should be here." that's the first time to begin showing up. If you just feel cuddled and petted, and all your basic beliefs reaffirmed, then basically nothing happened. You wasted your time, you wasted your money. If you feel challenged, if you feel upset, if you feel occasionally angry, if you want to throw something at me, now we're having a great Wisdom School.

[Laughter]

That is awesome. Try and miss. Oops, duck. So what we're going to do is we're going to go into the very source code of who we are as human beings. And we're going to do this not just for ourselves. We're going to do it in order to evolve love itself. That's what Wisdom School is about. Wisdom School is about the evolution of love. It's about evolving the source code of love itself, because love is not eternal and static. Love is changing, love is moving, love is transforming. And to actually wake up and play a larger game, and to actually participate in the evolution of love, it is to participate in evolving the core source code structures of reality.

Now, the paradoxically wonderful truth is that all of reality lives in each of us. That's actually what to awaken to enlightenment means. It's all in me. Everything. That's the fractal theory in mathematics. Every piece of reality is, in some sense,

playing and dancing in me. So actually, you can find it all in yourself. You can actually check it all in your first person in the deepest way. But you've got to get to the deepest first person. You've got to get beyond the egoic contraction, beyond the story, beyond the false self, beyond being lost in oneness, and to actually find the deepest, truest voice that's you – which is actually your true first person – and check in there. That's actually a harder thing to do. You've got to check into the deepest sense of self, the deepest place where I'm coming from. And from that place, you'll always recognize the dharma, because the dharma is you, and you are the dharma. There's no split between the dharma and you. A true dharma, you actually find it and locate it in yourself. And if it's a true dharma, and you're not locating it in yourself, check yourself.

Now, challenge of the dharma, always, but don't challenge it from – anyone who has a challenge to anything we say is totally welcome. We're in a kind of karate dojo. The nature of a karate dojo is, there's absolutely no obligation for the person teaching to be right. So if anyone has a significant challenge to anything we say, bring it on. But we're not going to go for just general questions that have got nothing because they haven't really thought it through. I'm just kind of raising my hand, whatever, from some issue I had in my life, boring. Not interesting. No, not all questions are welcome.

[Laughter]

No, that's dumb. No, actually go to a therapist, work it out privately. But if you're actually coming from your deep place with your wisdom and your Unique Self, I'm on my knees in devotion before you. Because everyone in this room is a teacher. And everyone in this room has stunning wisdom. But I'm actually inviting you to take responsibility to speak from that voice of your largeness. To speak from that voice of your greatness. And speak from the voice of your wisdom. And actually, we all know how to make that discernment. So by us taking that responsibility, we're doing something audacious. And pretty much everything I've said over the last four minutes, we're not allowed to say anything in this seminar. But of course you can, because we're in Wisdom School. And it's by coming together and forming a community that's actually self-regulating. You get what I'm saying?

And everyone's actually taking responsibility for their own arousal. We always want somebody else to arouse us. If they arouse us, it's great. But actually, we've got to take responsibility for our own arousal, our own emotional arousal, our own intellectual arousal, also our own physical arousal. It's always somebody who hasn't aroused us. And if they would arouse us, it would be okay. But to take responsibility for my own arousal is what it means to begin to wake up. I'm going to take responsibility for regulating my emotions. I'm going to take responsibility for showing up fully. I'm going to take responsibility as I begin to drift off to find center. I'm going to take responsibility to go all the way inside to that deepest,

gorgeous, resplendent, shining, stunning, luminous, jewel lotus that is me, and speak from that voice.

And when we begin to do that, then what happens is a collective intelligence begins to emerge from the room. We've moved from being a group of eyes that are all coming together with some sort of contract that we're all going to get something, into a "we." We move into a sangha.

When we say the next Buddha is a sangha, we don't mean it in a New Age way, people get together. There's no longer a teaching, we're just hanging out together and it's the collective that reigns. No, we mean when every person in the sangha is in their Buddha. And those Buddhas come together. Every person in the sangha is in their Unique Self, which is a unique puzzle piece, which is distinct and unlike any other. And it took the love intelligence of reality 13.7 billion years to manifest that irreducible love intelligence and love beauty – that is the Buddha that is you. And when that comes together, and those puzzle pieces begin to coalesce in a large role, then what emerges is a kaleidoscope of stunning beauty which is sangha unlike any other that's ever seen and never will be seen again. Because this sangha's never going to happen again.

This collective intelligence of this weekend, and those of us who have showed up and dared the ominous weather that didn't show up, thank god, and made it here and went through, "Should I come? Is it dangerous? Will I be killed? Do I have insurance? Have I had sex this way before I die? Maybe I won't come."

[Laughter]

There's lots of issues in coming out, right? But we went through lots of shit to get up here, so here we are. And now, we're going to wake up. We're going to grow up. We're going to show up. We're going to play a larger game. We're going to participate in the evolution of love. And it's never going to come again. This weekend's never happening again. It's never happening again. We're in an utterly unique space in quality and time. It's never going to be again. Doors can open this weekend that will never open again. And if we really hold to our intention, not to do it for ourselves. And that's the big intention that we always begin Wisdom School with. We're going to ask everyone to do a very, very, like literally five second – so we're going to do the whole thing in nine minutes to five second drop it, because if everyone starts talking for three minutes, it's going to be a very long night. Okay?

But what we always do at the beginning of Wisdom School is to reset our intention. Which means my intention's not... And usually, we go around the room. And then we challenge the intention. But this time, I'm going to kind of encapsulate it for us. Usually, when we go around the room, everyone offers the most beautiful intention. "I'm here to fix this, I'm here to work on this issue, I'm here – my mother did this and I'm here to open up this way. I'm here to be free

and I'm here to flow." And those are all beautiful. But if you can let those intentions go and actually try in a new one, "I'm here to participate in the evolution of love." Wow. "I'm here to play a larger game. I'm here to actually change the source code of what it means to be a woman and a man in the world." We don't know what it means to be a man anymore in America. It's the end of men. What does it mean to be a man? "Be a man." What does that mean? "Be a woman." What does that mean?

And we're completely confused. It's one of the core anchors of our identity. Has been for the last several thousand years – has been gender. And we no longer know what it means. It's so utterly confusing. Can we cut through the confusion and actually articulate a dharma that takes everything into account and walks us the next step. Wow. And then offer it into the world. And I need your help and you need my help, and we need each other's help, and to love each other is to need each other. If I love you, it means I need you. So my first "I need you." I need every single person in this room. And you, every one of us, need every other single person in this room. We need each other.

We're putting out a book next year called *Beyond Venus and Mars*. I'm writing the book with a dude named John Gray, who wrote a book called *Venus and Mars*, which is one of the core books that actually, from some people's perspective, froze gender. You're either from Venus, or you're from Mars. Warren Farrell is doing the book with us. And I'm now writing the core draft of the book. And the book's going to go directly into culture. It's going to be an enormous opportunity to actually evolve the source code of culture. And what we do this weekend is going to have enormous impact on what goes into that book.

So we're actually creating together. It's this wild invitation to really create something together. To create a vision that's wildly transformative. That's inviting, that introduces the evolutionary masculine and the evolutionary feminine – whatever they might look like – into reality almost for the first time. A new man and a new woman is waiting to be born. And we can birth it here together this weekend, in the sangha, in this Wisdom School. What an invitation.

So often, we feel like we're not at the table. The real cultural conversation's over there, and we're doing our thing. So we're at the table. And this partnership between Shalom Mountain – and Shalom Mountain is so awesome, and I'm in such deep devotion to this sanctuary, to this holiness that's here. And the partnership between Shalom Mountain and the Center for Integral Wisdom is what's created the energy of the Wisdom School.

And so we bring together all of the holiness and all of the history, and all of the lineage of Shalom – starting with Jerry, who initiated and found and consecrated the ground with blood, sweat and tears, and delight and ecstasy and holiness. And then to his students, and then to this generation. To Joy and Lawrence, and

everything that they did here, and everything that they held. And now, to this new generation that's holding it, and Nance is holding the center here with a group of incredible teachers.

So all that lineage is in the room. And all the lineage of the Center for Integral Wisdom is in the room, which means the best of all the great traditions of knowledge, in their original texts. The best of all the traditions of modernity, science, all the sciences and all of the schools of psychology. All the schools of physics, ethnomethodology, cultural studies, gender studies. The best of pre-modern, modern and post-modern, which formed the core of the Renaissance Project that's the center. These two meet. And we come together to articulate and actual evolution in the source code.

Now, here's the crazy paradox, my friends. By participating at that level, I absolutely guarantee you that every single, sacred personal issue that you brought will be addressed 20 times better. That's the paradox. When you give yourself up, you then find yourself on the other side in a way that's unimaginable. So I just want to be clear, I'm not in any way denigrating the personal. I'm saying the personal, though, before you move beyond it, is a contraction. It's a trap. It's limited. It's grasping. You'll never get there. You're never going to work it out.

Let go of the personal. Let go of separate self/small self. Step into true self and the complete part of all that is. And from there, arise to Unique Self. Reclaim the personal at that higher level of consciousness. And when you're actually serving the evolution of love, and then things begin to clarify. Things begin to open up. Can you feel that? Does that make sense a little bit? Yeah? You're ready for an awesome weekend?

Speaker: Yeah.

Marc: Like awesome, awesome, awesome?

Speaker: Yeah.

Marc: Awesome. Okay, so let's chant a little bit.

02-THURSDAY NIGHT PART 2

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Part 2

Track: 02-Thursday Night Part 2

TRT: 15:52

Marc: Now, watch your mind for a second. Watch your mind. So what part of your mind steps in? What part of your mind looks back and says, "Is this what my life came to?"

[Laughter]

So that part of your mind, let go. That part of your mind that's always outside trying to figure it out – let it go. Let it go. That's the invitation. The invitation is to step in. And I promise you, there'll be moments that are uncomfortable the whole weekend. But as a whole, it's going to be the journey of a lifetime. And every moment, you have a choice. It's the one choice that every person has every single moment of every single day: you either open to the moment, or you close to it. That's the choice. You're either open or you're closed.

If you're open, you can live with any pain. Whatever pain's coming your way, if you open your heart to it and you let your heart break open, and you break open, then you don't break down. If you close your heart to a moment, then you break down. So the practice is just to open our hearts, again and again. And if you think I'm doing something that's wrong, just assume that you're right. Don't even have the arguments. Take it as a given. You're right, I'm wrong. Who cares? I give up the weekend. Everything you think I've done wrong, you're right about.

[Laughter]

Done. You save so much time and energy. Let's just, all of us, give up being right this weekend. You know what happens when we give up being right? Our hearts open. Our hearts open. And if neuroscientists taught us anything in the last 20 years – as the real neuroscience investigations began in the early '90s – so when you open your heart, your entire brain is rewired. Literally. Of course, we always knew that was true in the great spiritual traditions. Now, we're actually able to see the rewiring happen. And when you stay outside **of them and** closed, then you shut your brain down. The synapses are rewired in a different way.

And the decision we make, moment after moment in life, "Am I going to open my heart again?" How many people in this room have been hurt? Of course. How many people in this room have been betrayed? And who can betray us? The only person who can betray us is someone who could never betray us. That's the whole teaching of Christ. The whole teaching of Christ is, what do you do with betrayal? That's the whole thing. Christ was betrayed. What do you do with betrayal? You birth new love. You open your heart again. And the greater the intimacy, the greater the betrayal.

We've all been betrayed, every single one of us. Brutally. Sometimes again and again. And the decision I make is, am I going to open my heart? And when we do a chant, it's exactly that kind of moment. A chance, it's in your face. You can't

avoid it. And the question is, how do I enter it? And there's three ways to enter. One is, I enter it with a full, open heart. And as I enter it, I'm completely there. But I'm really outside, even though I seem to be there. And the third is, I'm just really – I don't even seem to be there.

So the invitation isn't actually to clap and to sing. Let's totally clap and sing, because when you move your body, and when you clap and sing, that's actually the **whole neuro** game begins to dance. It's how the whole spirit game begins to dance. It's the action that actually does it. But something else happens – you let go. You let go of the contraction and you step into a larger field. And that larger field is a larger field of love intelligence. A larger field of love intelligence is chance. That's what it does, it vibrates.

And so when you chant, you're actually accessing that field, literally. You're literally accessing that field. You're spiritually accessing it. You're neuro-scientifically accessing it. You're entering into the field. And when you enter into the field, you've got to keep opening your heart, again and again. So as you're chanting, you'll notice, just like in classical dzogchen meditation, your mind will wander. Like you're in the middle of chanting and you're thinking about, "Wow, my credit card bill, did I pay it?" And like, "Oh my god, everyone else must be totally in the chant, and here I am thinking about my credit card bill." So the answer is, your mind always wanders, no matter what you're doing. You're in the middle of the best sex of your life, your mind is someplace else. You bring it back.

Meditation is always to non-judgmentally bring your mind back to center and drop back in. So I just want to invite everyone, when we chant, just step in, whether it's your practice or not, and just be there all the way, and open your heart. Again, the one decision we make is, are we open or closed? That's the only decision we actually get to make in this world. Pretty much everything else is a fixed game. But that's not. You get to decide whether you're open or closed. So that's one.

And just the second, just pointing out instruction as we enter into our sangha. Which is, you know the words "I love you?" Aren't those great words? "I love you?" "I love you," those are such great words. I was just thinking about "I love you" because it can really hold us in the weekend. Because the entire weekend is a great shout-out about love. It's about the evolution of love. And we've said many times in this room that when the World Trade Center was in flame and people had a few seconds left, and they got on their cellphones and they called home, no one recited the sacred creed. With all due respect to Christianity. No Jews called home and said the Shema, the beautiful Shema prayer, which I love so much. Buddhists didn't call and recite the Four Noble Truths. People called home and said, "I love you." That's what people said. So "I love you" is like "ah." Right? "Ah." But there's actually something beyond "I love you." And beyond "I love you" is "You love me."

There's a new practice we're doing in our sangha which is, we're just beginning to sign letters, not "I love you," but "You love me." See, "I love you" is I'm loving you, I love you. I love you, Sam, I totally love you. That's beautiful. That's a huge step. But actually, if we just take that step, it's not enough. We've been working in our community on really unpacking this teaching of "outrageous love" and what "I love you" means. I'm not going to enter into that door now. It's a whole gorgeous, stunning door. But some of us have a sense of what we mean by that.

But if you just stop at "I love you," it's not enough, because what do we all actually want? We want someone to say to us, "I love you." We're waiting for someone to choose us and say to us, "You're the one. I love you." So what we really want to know is, not just "I love you," we want to know "You love me." And to hold the steady realization that you love me is actually harder than to hold the realization that I love you. Like, wow. If we just did that this weekend, if we stopped here, we could spend the entire weekend just in that dharma. "I love you." That's a big thing.

We've been working on our sangha for a few years and really holding "I love you" with "outrageous love." And now, we're taking the second step. "You love me." Because that's what we're always questioning. "Does she love me?" "Does he love me?" But if I take responsibility for my own arousal, I begin to realize that it's my responsibility to know that you love me. Wow. Everything changes in that understanding. We just changed everything. That's a source code change. Like, you love me. You love me. I'm responsible to know that you love me. "Ah."

And I'm so excited about just saying that now. I don't want to go to sleep tonight. I'm going to spend like until tomorrow morning – like forget the weekend, forget the schedule, forget Venus and Mars, let's just talk about this the next 14 hours. It's unbelievable. And actually, in every moment, the universe is whispering every moment, "I love you." That's what uniqueness means. Imagine if I made a present for Kai. Okay? I made a present for him and I took off like four months and I went into my garage, and I got my power tools out – and I'm Jewish, so I don't have any of that shit – but people like Sean do. Right? You know, Mennonites, right?

So I go and I've got my tools, I'm making some there. You know what I mean? I don't know how people do that shit, but you kind of saw – I don't know what you do there – nails, something. But something goes on there, right? Whatever it is. It's very confusing. So I make this really beautiful thing, this awesome, gorgeous thing, and it's tailor-made for Kai's taste. And it takes me four months. And everybody knows, "God, he's in the garage doing something. He's doing something in the garage." And then, we send it to Kai and she gets it. Oh my god, I made this totally unique, beautiful thing for Kai and she says, "He loves me." Right?

Now imagine, who am I now in this moment? Who am I? Who am I? I am 75 trillion vibrating unique cells with an elegance beyond imagination, with a synchronicity and a particularity not replicated any place that ever was, is or will be. And in this very moment, there are millions of miles of nerve cables in me that are unique. There's immune structures and lymph structures and cellular structures that have been manifested, utterly, irreducibly, uniquely to express and incarnate as me, in reality. And reality produced that. So I've just received, not something like Gafni made in his garage for four months. I've just received the most elegant affirmation of "You love me." What Unique Self is, is an affirmation of the whisper and caress of reality, which is in every moment saying, "You love me." That's shocking.

And that actually knowing lives in me. And not to know that is not to realize the irreducible gorgeousness and elegance and stunning symphonic, cacophonous beauty of the symphony that's uniquely me. So what Unique Self says is, step beyond where we were, Steve, a year and a half ago. His Unique Self is saying, "You love me." That's what Unique Self is. It's reality saying, "You love me." That's what reality is saying. Reality sent a gift to me in the form of my irreducible gorgeousness, so in every moment, reality is whispering, "I love you. I love you. I love you."

And now the responsibility of spiritual practice is the responsibility to get aroused. To get aroused to the realization that the universe loves me. So I've got responsibility to say, to know, "You love me." The universe loves me. I'm a good child of the universe. Can you feel that in your body? I'm a good child of the universe. The universe is yessing your desire. The universe is yessing your goodness. And to actually realize that in every moment I'm being yessed by reality. "Ah."

And that's what we have to do for each other. What we have to do for each other is to love each other madly, but to give the other person access so they realize they get glimmers of it. And then, the other person's got to take responsibility to know you love me. Wow. I expect my brother Sam to wake up in the morning, and after he's done everything he's done – he's in the middle of his day – to remember, "Mark, Mark, Mark loves me. He totally loves me, madly." And I've got to know Sam loves me. "You love me. Even in hard moments, you love me."

And whenever we're upset, my friends, we don't believe it. We've lost access to "You love me." The core of all pain and all breakdown, the core of all utter heartbreak, and ultimately, the core of all disease. So when I lose connection to the truth of "You love me." It's to evolve love, we need to move beyond "I love you." Outrageous love says, "You love me." Ordinary love on a good day says, "I love you." And it's a small "I love you." Outrageous says, "I love you with all of the force of reality." But says even more, it says, "You love me."

So I just want to invite myself this weekend, and invite everyone in the room, that we all know you love me. And whenever we lose it, take responsibility to arouse it again. You love me. And the practice that we're going to invite for the weekend is that, in between sessions, find at least five people in between every single session – so we're actually weaving together a field of outrageous love and intelligence – find five people that you know, or a new person you've met, because – I'm not going into a dharma of love now, but love is not just an egocentric security blanket. Love is "I see you." And I can see you in a second. And I can be utterly devoted to you, and I can fall in love with you.

So fall in love with people all through the weekend. Fall in love with people. But the practice is going to be, find five people and just say to them, stop for a second, and say, "You love me." You could do one tonight, two or three tomorrow morning. But in between each dharma session, five people. And if you miss every single thing we say in the dharma, and you do that in between each session, it would be the best weekend of your life.

[Laughter]

And I mean that with all my heart and soul. It's a complete Copernican shift. Instead of waiting for someone to say, "I love you." And figuring out all the reasons why they didn't say it and why they're wrong. Just take responsibility. "You love me." Yeah, say, "You love me." Amen. Have a gorgeous night. Deep bow. We're bowing to the God, the Goddess, in the center of the circle. Amen.

03-FRIDAY MORNING PART 1

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Part 1

Track: 03-Friday Morning Part 1

TRT: 21:53

Marc: So I want to do a very simple – with your permission – ceremony, just in the next five or so minutes. Now, I want to ask us to do it, and we're going to actually do two ceremonies this morning. This is the first one. And the second one, Vyana, Christian and I stayed up until 4:00 or 5:00 in the morning preparing this second ceremony. And I just want to also just say what an utter delight it is – we haven't done it in a while – to be leading with Vyana and Christian. Let's give them a huge hand. Thank you very, very much.

[Applause]

Amen. Thank you. And of course, the last time we did the first version of this Lines and Circles, Christian left, and he walked out Sunday morning. Who knows what he'll do this time? We'll see.

[Laughter]

So there's many levels of that that three of us understand. But we'll leave it there for now. Okay. This will slowly become clear as the week unfolds. Okay. So the ceremony that I'd like to do is a ceremony of names. And we're just going to put our names in the room. And we're going to start over here without saying the name, because I don't want to say it. But I want to ask everyone if we can really just receive everyone's name. Usually we do a circle of intention, but just because of the size, we didn't last night. But it's just really, really important just to presence ourselves. And so let's just go slowly and allow space between the names, instead of like "Tuh. Tuh. Tuh. Tuh." Just kind of let it find its cadence, its resonance, its rhythm. Let's just try and really receive everyone who's here. Let's really just receive all the names.

And we'll start and we'll just follow it, and there's a kind of music into it. There's a kind of music to it. And let's just listen both to the names and to the space between the names. Because in the space in between, in that liminal space, the space between the cherubs, raiders of the lost ark, two cherubs above the ark in Jerusalem, in the space between the cherubs, the divine voice speaks. *[Foreign language]* "I will speak to you from the space between the cherubs."

So we're always looking for that liminal space between sessions. When we say, "You love me," the space between is where the voice speaks. So we're always finding that space. That space in the original mystical Hebrew is called "Binah." And Binah means "wisdom." It also means "the higher goddess," Shekinah Eliana. And Binah also means "bein", the space in between. So the name for the goddess in Kabbalah is literally "higher wisdom." But if you know the Hebrew, the name for the goddess is "the space in between." So the goddesses in the between the lines. And we'll come back to what that might mean.

But the goddess lives in the space in between. That's her place. Which of course means the nature of her power is different. She has power that often doesn't have formal authority. And the distinction between power and authority is very strong. What's power? What's authority? They're different. And so we're going to return to this time and again. And of course, in the higher vision, both the god and goddess would both have power and authority. But the goddess always has power. And her power isn't the space in between.

There's a beautiful essay about the place of the black housekeeper, as it was called then – it was before the word "Afro-American" came into being. So the black housekeeper in the Southern plantation had an enormous amount of power. No authority. A devastating social situation, which is a violation of all human dignity,

yet she had power. She was a powerful figure. And her power derived from the space in between.

So to find that place in between – so as we say the names, we think that the saying of the name is where it happens. And the saying of the name is half of where it happens. We can't skip the name. But in the space between the names, the goddess lives. The god is the name, the goddess is the space in between. And for those of you that that's kind of way too mystical to start the morning with, just press delete. And for those of you who are tracking it, don't try and track it with your mind. That wasn't a cognitive transmission. It wasn't a mind transmission. Just feel into the space. And so we begin.

So we'll just shut our eyes for a moment. And some things – as the holy masters say, and we say every time together – some things we can see with our eyes open, and other things we can only see with our eyes closed. And in the epistemology of it – meaning in the deep theory of knowing, in the deep gnosis, what you know – we know things in three ways. We know things through the eye of the mind. It gives us logical structures, mathematics. We know things through the eye of the senses. It give us empirical information which can be validated and tested. And we know things through the eye of the spirit, or the eye of the heart, which reveals the interior face of the cosmos. And each one of those forms of knowing is equally valid.

And of course, in culture, culture has chosen, always, one of the three eyes and said, "That's the true eye." And dismissed the other eyes. In the last 200 years, the eye of the mind and the eye of the sense have reigned. And the eye of the spirit, the eye of the heart, has been labelled as merely subjective. And it's why neuroscience has had such an explosion. And part of it's positive, and part of it's exceedingly negative. Because what it's saying is, "Oh, now that we can verify it, now we can show there's something happening in the eye of the senses. The new microscope of modernity is the MRI, magnetic resonance imaging, which allows us to, for example, scan the brain in real time while actual activities are being performed – an unheard of empirical accomplishment in history. That's real."

That's precisely wrong. In the entire movement, the Buddhist Neuroscience Movement, is actually misguided in some fundamental, essential way, because the essential claim is, "Oh, the eye of the senses see it. That's real." Precisely misses the point. No, it's the eye of the heart and the eye of the spirit that gives you no less information. It's no less valid than the eye of the senses. And paradoxically, the Buddhist emptiness gravitates towards neuroscience because it finds hard actually relying on the integrity in the contemporary culture of the eye of the spirit, the eye of the heart.

But actually everything we hold dear – loyalty, love, relationship, values, meaning – all of that is discernable almost exclusively through the eye of the heart, the eye of the spirit. And it's not merely subjective. The phrase "merely

subjective" is the cultural dismissal of the three eyes. And to actually reclaim spirituality in a genuine way, we need actually all three. We need science and spirit to be merged into a larger whole to actually articulate a new vision as we merge into the future. To evolve the source code of love, we need to both track how love affects the body, and all of the serotonin releases and the neurochemical cocktails which express the physical expression of love in the body. And yet, we can never make the common cultural mistake of reducing love to dopamine, reducing love to serotonin.

The fact that there's a physical expression of an interior experience doesn't make the experience merely physical. It means that the experience shows up in the interior and the exterior. And every event in reality has an interior and an exterior. Now, that sounds like a simple sense, but if you actually get that sense, your entire life view and world view changes. And we're going to be concerned, this morning particularly – in some sense, this is going to be the hardest morning. And we're going to do some deep work in actually enacting a world view.

And most of us live without a world view. And world views aren't merely subjective. Not all world views are the same. That notion of pluralism, "Well, everyone just says different things, no way of resolving the information, it's all merely subjective, it's all relative," is utter nonsense. Actually, some world views are better than others. It's a shocking thing to say, right? Some world views are better than others. Meaning, the information yielded – and try and listen, holy sisters and brothers, with your eyes closed – the information yielded by the eye of the spirit and the eye of the senses – the eye of the senses is empirical. Eye of the mind, mathematical, logical, deductive. And the eye of the heart, the eye of the spirit, interior eye. The information yielded by all three of those eyes supports one world view more than it supports another world view. Not all world views are the same.

That means there's a hierarchy. Some things are better than other things. That's a shocking thing to say. When I first started teaching, I was 19-20 years old. A little older – this particular story happened a year or two later – and I had started a network of culture clubs in the New York City public and private schools called "gypsy clubs." And they were about meaning, and particularly, meaning in a particular spiritual context. And I went to elite private school after elite private school – Dalton, Horace Mann – then to the major leading public school – Stuyvesant in New York, Bronx High School of Science. And I posed the following question: Can you make an objective statement that Mother Teresa's world view is better than Hitler's world view? And the resounding, overwhelming response by the smartest high school students in New York was no.

I just came back from a trip to Exeter – Phillips Exeter Academy—and our dear sister, Kathy Ariel Brownback, actually wasn't able to be with us this time, and is working with her family some holy health issues. And we send her massive blessing. So I was up at Exeter where Kathy was, for many years, the Dean of

Students and she's a leading faculty member there. And I asked some version of this question to the students a year ago – same answer. It's pretty shocking. These are the leaders of tomorrow. And what did they say? They said, "Those are decisions that come from your interior. And your interior's merely subjective." Meaning, they had inherited that cultural world view which disqualifies interiors with no good reason. And claims that only that which is measurable by exterior forms, which are empirically available – like microscopes – only that information is true. Shocking.

Actually, we do have the ability to derive world views, and interiors and exteriors are both real. And actually, we all know it. We'd stake our lives and our loves and our loyalties. We actually can articulate values. We're afraid. We have a cultural patrimony of fear, because for so long, people outside of us articulated values and imposed them on us. We have a several thousand year history of values being imposed on us. On having some actually paradoxical exterior institution – church, government, monarchy – decide what our correct interior thinking was.

So what we did is we actually rejected interiors altogether and we said, "Only that which is measurable by third person – classical scientific inquiry – only that is true knowledge." Huge mistake. And to reconstruct a new world view, we have to reclaim interiors in the eye of the spirit, in the eye of the heart, as a valid source of knowledge, of gnosis.

Introduction. One more sentence, then we'll chant. It's an introduction to the chant. All gnosis is available only through transformation. The most important sense in the world. Gnosis means knowledge. No true knowledge is available without doing a transformative practice. So for example, sex by itself yields no true knowledge, unless sex becomes a transformative practice. That's called "tantra." The transformative practice of sexuality and meditation and chant and study. And actually, 99 percent of tantra has nothing to do with sexuality. 99 percent of tantric **texts** are about how you study, how you meditate, how you chant, how you attain right knowing through the eye of the heart and the eye of the spirit.

So chant is a transformative practice. And we do it to open up the eye of the heart and the eye of the spirit. Now, like any practice, like lifting weights, you don't do it once. You engage the practice in a sustained way over time steadily, and you do three sets with ten reps each, and you do them every other day. And slowly, you begin to see transformation. As the hermetics taught us, "As above, so is below. As in the body, so in the heart." And now we're just accessing the fragrance of the practice.

But practice creates transformation. Now, it happens to be for the first time in history, we can see the exterior expression of practice through neuroscience. But that's not what practice is. Practice is to create a transformation in interior space, and to open up the eye of the spirit and the eye of the heart. That's what practice

is. And now, as consciousness is evolving, we're for the first time in history able to see the resonance of practice physically incarnate through actually tracking what happens, for example, when we chat, or when we study, or when we meditate. But the transformation is interior.

And all knowledge happens through transformation. The tragedy of the western university is there's gnosis without transformative practice. It's the great tragedy of the western university. It wasn't the original intention of Plato, as the father of the western university. So we need to actually reclaim knowledge. And we reclaim knowledge, we reclaim gnosis, through engaging in transformative practice, which then opens us up to enter the world of gnosis.

As your mind wanders, bring it back to center, eyes closed. And set your intention for the day. Intention is the most powerful spiritual technology. Utter clarity of intention, burns through, transforms everything. Without clarity of intention, transformation can't happen. Utterly, radically clear. My intention is to be a greater human being by the end of this weekend. My intention is to play a larger game. My intention is to offer up my process of growth transformation, healing, radical opening, insight, for the sake of the evolution of love.

The more audaciously you set your intention, the more powerfully it appears. So just with eyes shut, we'll just popcorn. It doesn't matter if voices emerging to each other. Just around the room. Maybe Christian will start us. Just speak your intention, just in a couple of seconds. And we'll just speak some intentions into the room. So hold it there. And we're deepening our well. We're creating the sacred space again together, and we create it anew every time. And feel the power of the sangha, feel the power of the intention. And Margaret Mead was absolutely right when she said, "If you think there's not the power of a small group that meets regularly to change the world – only a small group with clear intention that meets regularly has ever changed the world."

We're in the source code. We're at the leading edge. We're having this conversation not only for our only transformation, but for the sake of the larger evolution of love. And as Jeff said, "And as that happens, we embody it internally. And we transform and we shift and we move." So we're just getting to the last piece of the practice, and the key to this practice is to not speak any extra word. That's the meditative key. So we're going to do, for the next three minutes, "You love me."

You'll find that you can stand or turn to the person next to you, but find – you'll probably have to stand at least once – find the three people. Person with the shorter hair goes first. "You love me." If you don't know each other's names, just exchange the name. Person with the long hair responds, "You love me." The key to the practice is no extra movement. No extra words, no chat. Meaning we're inside. We'll begin that in three, and we'll rest into silence of presence. And I would say we enter the dharma, but we're of course right in the middle of it right

now. So on three, three minutes we start. And the practice goes for three minutes, and three minutes we start. One, two, three.

04-FRIDAY MORNING PART 2

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Part 2

Track: 04-Friday Morning Part 2

TRT: 38.10

Marc: What we're going to do, please Goddess, in the next period of time, is in some sense set the stage for where we want to go. And from an what they would call, wisdom-tainment perspective. A wisdom-tainment perspective. I know there's a perspective called wisdom-tainment. I should skip this. Because it's profound and deep and important, but you've got to do some work. So if I was focused on brand and filling Wisdom School, we would skip this. Because a lot's going to happen in the next hour and a half. But our contract, our covenant and Wisdom School is to radically respect the integrity of where we want to go, so we don't skip steps. So we're not going to skip steps here. We're going to go through about eight different structures of thought in the next four minutes. That's not true. But not that much longer. And these are absolutely critical to actually find our way.

So maybe the way to begin is to say that we've basically given up – I said a little earlier – having a worldview. Having a worldview is everything. Your worldview, it's the lens through which you see the world. And the more accurate your worldview – the more accurate your map – and the more you access your map, and the more your map becomes internalized, the more you're able to act. Not having a worldview, or a confused worldview, shapes everything. And there's no person in the world that doesn't live in a framework. It doesn't exist. Somebody says, "I don't have a framework." Well, that's a framework. That's a pretty powerful framework, don't you think? That's a powerful framework. "There is no grand narrative." That's a grand narrative. You get that? Postmodernity said, "There are no grand narratives." Which is the greatest grand narrative in the world. It's a claim that there are no grand narratives. That's a huge claim. To make a claim that there are no grand narratives – that there are no patterns that connect, that everything's merely subjective – that's a huge grand narrative. You get that? That's a huge claim.

And at some point Foucault, in his later writing, woke up to the contradiction. In his earlier writing, he didn't get it. When Foucault kind of woke up, Foucault

realized, "Oh my God. I've been articulating a grand narrative saying there are no grand narratives." That's, of course, postmodernity's weakness, and pretty much everyone in this room was shaped by postmodernity. Even if you never read any postmodern literature, you were shaped by it. It shaped every place. We breathed it in. There are no worldviews. Who has worldviews? Fundamentalists. I was just in Houston, Texas last week at Aunt Belle's hundredth birthday party down in Houston, Texas. With Lori, it's Lori's aunt. And we passed by Joel Osteen's church. Kind of stopped in for a little while. So Joel Osteen's got a grand narrative. Rick Warren, *Purpose Driven Life*, grand narrative. Fundamentalists. Fundamentalists have grand narratives. Liberals have options. You get that?

But actually, to have options, you need to have a grand narrative. Otherwise you're living in a grand narrative, which is, there are no grand narratives, which completely dominates your life and paralyzes your ability to actually act powerfully and awaken. And so when we begin to talk about masculine and feminine – is there, isn't there – and of course there is and there isn't – we need a grand narrative. And so what I'm going to engage in this morning is the hard, but delightful, play of articulating the beginning of a grand narrative around this topic.

Now even though I've thought about this – I started thinking about this 11, 12 years ago intensely. And it's this particular issue of masculine and feminine. And I did a series of television shows in Israel that was kind of my Oprah version of Israel, was this Gafni show I did in Israel. It was actually a funny show. Was called "Tahat Gafno". "Tahat Gafno" means "under the vine," which is a biblical verse. "Gafno" – Gafni's also my last name – also means "the vine". It's a verse from Isaiah. It's the vision of the future world. When everyone's sitting under their vine. But "tahat" also means "ass." So we called the show "Tahat Gafno" very, very straight-faced in Israeli culture, which could have meant one or two things. "Gafni's Ass," or "Sitting Under His Vine."

[Laughter]

And it was a huge debate in the Israeli newspapers, which we intended. And there were some people that suggested that I was completely subversive and I intended the second, and I looked at the reporter straight and said, "How can you even possibly say that? It hadn't even occurred to me until they said it." Well, maybe it did. But anyways. So on the show we did a series of programs critiquing John Gray's book, *Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus*. And kind of subjecting it to a fierce critique for three or four shows. And that was the first point I kind of read this literature intensively, and intended, at some point, to essentially publish a book critiquing John. Because I think John made a great contribution. Great contribution. Sold 40 million books making the contribution, which tells you not that he had good marketing. It tells that it resonated in culture.

You don't sell 40 million books because you have good marketing. It means it resonates, it speaks to something in culture. Pretty much every place you go in the world if you mentioned Mars or Venus, it one of the few – maybe the only – kind of transformational books that broke out of the transformational world and lives in culture. Everyone knows Venus and Mars. Even if it's a vague association, we know what it is.

Now the deeper issue - let's kind of look at the deeper issues that underlie it. Actually in the end, John – I met him, as I mentioned yesterday, through Warren Farrell, who's probably the greatest writer in the United States on the masculine. He's was president of NOW, the National Association of Women, for a number of years. One of the leading members. He then was very close with Gloria, Gloria Steinem, that world. And then he actually wound up being one of the key founders of the men's movement. And writes today actively on men's issues. He's highly controversial. He pretty much can't get a speaking gig in a university because Women's Studies departments essentially dominate the university and there's enormous fear – ask Lawrence Summers at Harvard if Women's Studies departments are powerful. They got him fired for suggesting that there was a gender distinction innate between men and women. In the way they learn mathematics. And he actually lost his job for making that claim about a decade ago. That serious, right? Gender studies departments are – between the '60s and the '90s in the United States – gender studies departments had a political orthodoxy that said that differences between men and women are completely heretical. The notion that there could actually be fundamental, essential differences was considered a heretical notion, was utterly dismissed.

There was actually a well-known story, which was cited – and I'll cite you a little bit from one of the pieces of literature – on this topic. It was a book by Leonard Sax on gender who's with me and Warren in something we're doing inside of our Center for Integral Wisdom, we're trying to militate to start a White House Council on boys and men. There is, of course, a White House Council on girls and women. There's no White House Council on boys and men. Which is part of the movement in today's culture, which actually demonizes the masculine, and views the masculine as privileged. And certainly, they don't need help. And so we have a whole movement. We're trying to, again, start a White House Council on boys and men, and what that might mean. So one of the key people involved in the commission that we're starting, that Warren started within a center, is this gentleman Leonard Sax. And he just writes – I'll just read you a little bit, just so you kind of get a sense of it.

He say, "I enrolled in the PhD program in Psychology 1980 University of Pennsylvania." Reagan is president. He was actually then challenging Jimmy Carter. Just kind of get a sense of what 1980 was. How many people remember 1980? Right? I mean, oh my God. Apple had just come on the market, Bill Gates

nowhere even vaguely – the Internet, what's that? Facebook, Mark Zuckerberg was in diapers. He had gotten near Harvard. He was in preschool, whatever he was doing. It was a different world. The World Wide Web was about 10 years in the future. In 1980. It's kind of shocking to go back for a second. And so he's quoting from a famous professor named Justin Aronfreed at UFP who's talking about gender differences. It's a graduate seminar in Developmental Psychology.

And Aronfreed says, "Why do girls and boys behave differently?" And he responds, "*Because we expect them to.* Imagine a world in which we raised girls to play with tanks and trucks, in which we encourage boys to play with dolls. Imagine a world in which we played roughhouse and tumble games with girls, while we cuddled and hugged the boys. In such a world, many of the differences we see in how girls and boys behave – probably all the differences – would vanish." That was, for 30 years, the reigning political dogma which shaped, and still reigns, in gender studies departments. Particularly Women's Studies departments. This is still a very, very strong position. It's called the social constructionist position. Meaning all of gender – that is to say, masculine and feminine – is socially constructed. And therefore, if you change the social construction of reality, so then that difference would disappear.

One of the most famous proponents of it – and we're going to go through so much – this is just one small piece that we're going to do in this next session, but I want to start here. I want to start with this stuff. Because you can't enact a spirituality based on good meditation alone. Just like you can't enact a science without good meditation. In order to actually enact a spirituality that's genuinely integral, that integrates all of reality – what is spirit but a vision of reality? And if you actually skip pieces of reality, and you only engage in what we narrowly call spirituality, spirituality essentially becomes irrelevant. It doesn't impact the mainstream at all. So we need to enact a spirituality which is integral, which engages all pieces of reality, all domains of science, all domains of literature, all domains of sociology's hard sciences, soft sciences. So I'm starting here in a little bit of the sciences.

So we're talking about in mid-'60s to '90s, there was a very famous professor who actually – Lori, my partner, her husband for the last... They were married for 25 years, and they still work together every day. Mark Schwartz. He was one of the iconic, really best people in America on trauma therapy. There's like four or five people, great trauma therapists in America. Peter Levine, Lori Galperin, Mark Schwartz, Bessel van der Kolk – who just put out an important book – Dan Brown. Those are really the great trauma therapists. And Mark's professor was John Money. Who was at Johns Hopkins, who was – does anyone know that name? Anyone know the field? John Money was the iconic professor. Anyone know John Money's work?

Audience: Yes!

Marc: Nice. Nice. Nice. That's good. Don't get too honest. God, that would be terrible. Always lie a little bit.

[Laughter]

So John Money. This was a famous story. And I remember reading of this when it happened. There was a story about a guy named David Reimer. And David Reimer actually had a botched circumcision, which they went to Money to ask him what to do, and he recommended essentially raising her as a girl. And so they did. With the whole kind of dolls, Barbie, like the whole story. Dresses, etc. And Money actually reported on this as evidence, the great success of this experiment. Of course, David Reimer committed suicide when he was 39 years old. And a couple years before wrote of his devastating experience. And Money was dead wrong. Dead wrong. All the way across. There's actually no question today that gender differences are real and they exist, and we'll get to that in a few minutes. What that means is a whole other conversation.

So let's just bracket what that means, because there's a fact, and there's the way you interpret the fact. So let's let that go for a second. Let's kind of start from the beginning, which is in the middle. So why is there a movement against differences? Where did this movement come from? Between 1965 and 1995, which still dominates most of liberal conversation. Why is this movement – there's a movement to what I might call the leveling of differences. That's a movement. If you want to have a worldview, you can't look at something in isolation. What's happening in the masculine/feminine conversation? It's actually part of a larger conversation. The larger conversation, the conversation to level differences. And this is something that, again, you rarely hear. You can go to every department in Brown University, but they won't give you an overarching meta-view of what's happening in the larger culture. There's a movement to level differences, which has been a key movement in culture, particularly in liberal progressive culture. Now why? Why is there a movement to level differences? Cerridwen?

Cerridwen: Well, there's this whole ethic around equality, and equality of opportunity. It's just in the bones.

Marc: Yeah. Right. For a really good reason, says Cerridwen. The movement to level differences wasn't based on liberal pathology, she says, company correctly. You are a billion percent correct. It wasn't a pathology. It wasn't some bad, confused liberals deciding to level differences. That's not what happened. As the conservative movement demonizes the liberal world. No. The movement to level differences was because differences were used as a source of oppression. It was a really good reason. So let's start right – that's really critical to realize. That

actually the movement to level differences, before we critique it and its limitations, let's have a worldview. Let's think broad for a second. And let's let go of everything – I know, we're going to have so many transformational experiences in our own stories this weekend, but for now, let that go. Let's just kind of be in the larger Dharma, and then the Dharma will become us as we move through the weekend.

So the difference between the peasant and the aristocrat, the difference between the Jew and the non-Jew, the difference between the Christian and the non-Christian, the difference between a Mongolian and the non-Mongolian, the difference between the Islamist and the infidel. All of those were differences. And those differences were the source of oppression. And today, we've rejected the notion of differences. And in one of the few places you still have the idea of royalty, there's a couple of places on the continent – England, for example – but why did they retain the idea of royalty? To mock it. It's the reason royalty's retained. It's not because anyone in England believes in royalty. What do you do? You have royals, and then the entire paparazzi – I mean, Princess Di was killed because she was being chased in a high-speed chase by the paparazzi when she was in the middle of having an affair and they wanted to expose it because they wanted to expose that Royals are just like everybody else. She died in that. She was actually one of the last incarnations in the public sphere of the confused and gorgeous goddess. She held that goddess energy. I cried when she died. And it was that – I didn't know her. We had a thing once, but you know.

[Laughter]

But it was that she was the goddess. She incarnated that energy. But the reason you have Royals in Britain today, it isn't because anyone actually believes in royalty, it's because they're actually using it as a caricature to mock differences. And the entire British press attacks Prince Charles and follows them and attacked them, loves/hates them. And it's this kind of strange phenomenon in which there's this sense that there should be distinction, and they're looking for it in a weird place – royalty. And so they mock it because, of course, it seems absurd because, why would it be there? And of course, it's not there. Otherwise that cultural phenomenon of royalty in Britain – one of the most fascinating cultural phenomenon today. But it comes from this ambivalence in regard to this notion of distinction. So differences were always used. Black and white. The word discrimination means what? To discern between. That's what discrimination means. Discrimination is to discriminate between. It's a power of discernment. Differences. So since differences were used as the fundamental source of oppression, the progressive world correctly said, "Let's level differences."

Now was that an evolutionary thrust forward? Of course. You get it? Already we're speaking integrally. We recognize, in the beginning of our conversation,

differences exist. We say, "Okay, but why are we trying to level differences?" We're trying to level differences because they're the source of oppression. And what happens is, we begin to equate – as Cerridwen pointed towards – sameness with the quality. In order to be equal, you need to be the same. And difference means hierarchy. And stay with me. And hierarchy means dominator hierarchy. Not organic hierarchy. You get that distinction? Stay with me for a second. Hierarchies always exist in the world. Anyone who's against hierarchy is an idiot. There's no two ways to say it. I'm going to say it really clearly, in case you missed my point. If you're against hierarchy, you're an idiot. You're not right, you're not wrong, you're just an idiot.

[Laughter]

If you want to be an idiot, you can. But hierarchies exist in the world. Of course they do. Of course they exist. Hierarchy means there's more and more depth. So an atom has one level of depth. Atoms come together, there's a molecule, which has many atoms. They have a higher level of depth. Molecules form a complex molecule, they have more depth. That's a hierarchy. That's what a hierarchy is. It means there's more and more depth, more and more complexity, more and more layers. And ultimately, more and more quality. Here's a statement. Mother Theresa was a better human being than Hitler. That's a hierarchy. Now if you want to say that's not true, you're an idiot. You get it? I've just got to say it clearly. Now Raine Eisler, who's a close friend of mine, who lives not far for me in Pacific Grove, and hopefully will be with us again this year for the Passover Seder, Raine wrote a book called *The Chalice and the Blade*. How many people caught that book? Okay, now you never known who's being honest now, right?

And in that book, she makes a distinction which is absolutely correct between a pathological hierarchy and a dominator hierarchy. A pathological and a dominator hierarchy are one form of hierarchy, and a holistic hierarchy is a legitimate hierarchy. So a dominant hierarchy is, very simply, when you use difference for oppression. That's it. That's a dominator hierarchy. You use the fact of distinction, and you turn it into a tool for oppression. That's a dominator hierarchy. But what happened is, when we went to reject that, we rejected differences. And we said, "All rankings are bad." I can show you 5000 articles – Elif, you've read all of them – which talk about how bad rankings are. No, rankings aren't bad. Using ranking indiscriminately – paradoxical use of the words – and using them as tools for oppression, that's bad news.

So let's just look at the movement to level differences for a second. Where did it take place? Let's have some fun. So what are the differences we moved to level? So difference one: the difference between man and God. Go to any good New Age seminar and you'll be told very quickly that you're God. It's like the fastest way to become God is to go to a New Age seminar. You used to be a human

being. Now you're a God. Okay. Maybe? Now let's follow it for a second. Let's follow it. So what's actually happening? So what the New Age seminar is saying is we're going to kill the mythological God – what we call the "God you don't believe in that doesn't exist" – because the God you don't believe in doesn't exist – but we'll kill the mythological God, and actually, that God-force lives in you. That's a great idea. That's a great idea. Actually, that creative impulse of reality, that infinite value and dignity, lives in you. And in that sense, you are God. Absolutely. But when you efface completely the distinction between the human being and God, what do you lose? Stay with me. What do you lose? You lose all of Rumi's poetry. Because all of the Rumi's poetry is about falling into the arms of the beloved. And if you are the beloved, there's no arms to catch you.

We lose what we've called in this room and talked about in great length – which I'm going to now – you lose the second face of God. You lose the face of the divine that knows your name, that cares for you, that loves you, that says, "I love you," that holds you, that tracks you, that's larger than you, even as he and she lives in you. But when you can't hold that key word, that paradox, and you make God you because you're leveling differences – is a level differences move – then you actually lose the experience of knowing that every time you fall, you fall into the arms of the beloved. Because you have co-opted the beloved through your own narcissism. You track that? Which is why Kant said that the modern human being is most embarrassed if he's caught praying. Because praying, like you don't pray. That's crazy. But actually, we've lost prayer. Meditation's in, prayer's out. Why is prayer out? Because prayer is about a distinction. And we're leveling differences.

Now is there a legitimate critique of prayer? Of course there is. And if you're praying to a mythological god that's castrated you and demanding obedience, as Spinoza reads the mythological god in Tacitus five, well then you should stop praying. So there is a legitimate and powerful critique of prayer. But you don't lose prayer with its false version, with its pseudo-version. You've got to reclaim prayer. And actually realized that I'm actually held by the personal face of essence. You get that? Now we could talk about this for the next two hours, just this, and we wouldn't even get started. But what does that mean? I'll just say one word sentence on this just so we get it, and then we'll go on forward. So let's say that Sean and I have a personal relationship. And this is not going to be my general set of Sean jokes are not coming. They'll be coming later, all through the weekend.

[Laughter]

We're not going to lose them. So Sean and I have a personal relationship. Now I love Sean. There's a personal quality to our relationship. So let's say Sean and I have a quick phone call and Sean gets off the phone and says to Victoria, I don't

know. He just felt impersonal. It just felt impersonal, that conversation." So he's not saying to Victoria, "Isn't that I great? He felt impersonal." He's saying, "I couldn't find some quality of essence between us." You get that? So that quality of the personal is not held only between Sean and I. That's not a quality that exists just between separate selves. That quality of the personal that Sean's pointing to when he says it was lacking in the conversation, when he says, "Hey Victoria, it was impersonal," that's a quality of essence. Stay with me another second, okay?

Let's say I lift weights. Let's say I'm bench pressing 150 pounds. So I'm strong, right? I'm strong. 150 pounds. Wow. But that quality of strength doesn't live in me. I'm participating in a larger quality, which is power. Which is in the universe. And I'm expressing a dimension of strength. But strength isn't in my separate self. I'm expressing a quality of the _____ called strength. And for example, a supernova is stronger than me. So far so good? You with me?

So the quality of the personal doesn't exist between Sean and I. It's not a separate self-fragmented grasping quality. It's a quality essence. So if Steve and I exchange an email and we kind of find our personal connection, we're tapping into the God force. We're tapping into the larger field of love intelligence. So the quality of the personal doesn't exist just between desperate, separate selves, as Heidegger tried to argue. The quality of the personal is a quality of cosmos. So the infinite cosmos, which seems impersonal in process, is impersonal in process, but has a personal face. So the personal face of the cosmos hears me talk. And in the same way the personal in Sean hears me talk. That's how you hear. You don't just hear through ears. Ears are the physical structure through which you hear. But it's your personal intelligence that hears and receives. And that's prayer. Prayer means you're held by the personal face of essence.

Now when you go to level differences and you say, "Man and God are exactly the same," what have you done? You've lost all of Rumi. Lost the whole thing. Now why did you level differences? For a good reason. Because you were leveling differences because differences were used for oppression. God was so different and other that you couldn't challenge God, so therefore God had all sorts of rules and told you who to sleep with when, and how, and who was chosen and who was not chosen, and who should be rich and who should be poor. So God, the difference between the human being and God, was used as a tool for oppression. So as the movement of culture, we went to level differences. So now what we need to do is we need to actually reclaim the difference without its pathology. Everyone track that?

So that works all the way across the board. And literally, we could spend the entire weekend looking at the 10 differences that were leveled, why they were leveled and why we need to reclaim them. You get it? I'll just give you a couple of other examples and then we'll move forward. So here's the second distinction.

The second distinction is between animals and human beings. This is going against a lot of things you like to believe in your body, right? Animals and human beings. I'm sitting on a plane, eating my kosher food, my special lunch, a woman sitting next to me – it's about a decade ago – she's eating her vegetarian meal and she says, "Why do you eat kosher?" I give her the kosher deal. Now I happen to also be vegetarian, but I didn't want to share that, at that point. I was then kind of a loose vegetarian. And she gives me her vegetarian deal, which I think was fantastic. But I say, "But why?" And she says, "Because the whole distinction between human beings and animals is absurd." I said, "Really?" And she goes on. She's a well-trained university lecturer. And she gave me an entire lecture on speciesism, which is the basic claim that we actually discriminate in favor of the human species.

Now, let's just stay with it for a second. Let's stay with it for a second. Let's stay with that. Is that a legitimate claim? Yes. We do discriminate in favor of the human species. Now stay with me. Did difference cause oppression? For sure. For sure. The oppression of animals is actually significant and real. It's why I actually became a vegetarian. Because I actually just researched how beef is prepared for market and I literally couldn't participate in it. It's a complete violation of the sanctity of life. So if you eat a hamburger, which is not at least freely grazed and raised, you're participating directly in that oppression. For sure. And you're asleep to it. So we actually use that difference as a source of oppression. 1000 percent. Animals were, and are today, treated in a way that defies imagination. It just defies imagination. So difference was used as a source of oppression. Now stay with me.

Does that mean that there's no difference, though? Do you get it? No. That's not what it means, right? So if you had a choice – I'll just give you a simple example. You're walking by, your neighbor is drowning. And a dog. And the dog's a fantastic, beautiful, wonderful dog. And you love this dog. And your neighbor's annoying. Pesky. Pesty. Yuk. You don't like your neighbor at all. And you have only time to save your neighbor or the dog. Who do you save?

Speaker: The dog.

[Laughter]

Marc: So I asked this question on Israeli TV, on one of the television shows I described earlier, and I was talking to Gil Ron Shama, Gily, who's a great guy who was the head of a band in Israel that was called "Sheva" at the time. He was a fantastic musician. And Gil said, "For sure, you save the dog." And we had a huge fight right on TV. And the editor of Israel's, one of its two major papers, *Maariv* was there, and actually Gil and her had a huge fight over this issue. Who do you save? If there's no distinction, if you like the dog better, you save the dog. But I'm going

to make a statement which is going to annoy about half of the people in the room. And I'm going to make it unequivocally. You save the neighbor. 1000 percent. 1000 percent. Save the neighbor. And the reason you save the neighbor is because there is a distinction between the human being and a dog.

For example, a dog has never built a hospital. I'm madly in love with dogs, just to be clear. I'm madly in love with dogs. And Lori has a cat named Moe who sleeps with us in bed every night. Not my idea. But Moe's hanging out with us. There's many joke I can make now. I'm not going to make any of them.

[Laughter]

But Moe's kind of just doing his thing, and Lori's madly in love with Moe and tolerates me reasonably. But the answer is that nonetheless – and I'm actually madly love with Moe, as well. I work at home, we kind of hang out together, we've spent many, many hours together. We kind of glance at each other and we flirt sometimes. We've got a whole thing going on. Nonetheless, I won't save Moe first. And by the way, I don't like my neighbor. But you see the point? The point is, there's a distinction. There is a distinction. What it means is, I've got to treat Moe with unbelievable kindness, we've got to remove cruelty against animals in totality – and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is wildly important. I was driving with Lori a couple weeks ago and we were – it was one of the rare moments we had like two hours and she wanted to catch a movie. This is for me just to kind of be good in relationship thing because she always wants to see action movies with lots of people killed because that's what relaxes her most. And so I kind of go along and hide my face. I'm like, "Oh my God, oh my God." I like the stylized ones where you don't actually experience the death, but she likes the ones where they go slow.

But anyways, so we're on the way going to the movie. And we pass by a bird that we saw being chased by a cat, and the bird was hurt. So we stopped the car, Lori picks up the bird and we drove the bird right to the Society for the Prevention – the bird actually died in her arms. It took us like 45 minutes to find the place to get there. We take care of animals one billion percent with huge dignity and huge devotion. And there's a distinction. And when you level that distinction, you lose something essential. But what it means to be a human being, a human being of builds hospitals. Dogs have never built hospitals. That means something. What it means is that there's a different structure of consciousness available. And it doesn't mean that dogs are beautiful, and it doesn't mean that dogs don't have actually depths of emotion. They do. And we need to take them seriously. I'm not going to sidetrack on this topic now. But just to kind of catch the distinction. Just last one.

God and nature. God and nature. I'm picking the ones of that are particularly, in this kind of room, provocative. God and nature. Is there a distinction between God and nature? So there was an old distinction between God and nature which was used as a tool of oppression. And the oldest distinction was, God's God and nature's just nature. So therefore, you exploit nature and you abuse nature and you take down the Amazon forests. And you actually create a situation in which Rachel Carson in 1960 writes *Silent Spring* and you realized that you've actually viewed nature as an externality. And you've commoditized nature in service of a narcissistic human being. Because by making that distinction between nature and you, you externalize nature. And by externalizing nature, nature became a commodity. And then you begin to destroy nature, and that kind of human rapacious narcissism actually created a world in which the world might not actually survive. That distinction between man and nature, between a tool of oppression. Are you seeing it?

Audience: It's man and nature, not God and nature?

Marc: No, it's God and nature. Thank you. That became a tool of oppression. But that doesn't mean that we lose the distinction. It means that we actually stop it from being a tool of oppression. We actually realize that God is in trees. 1000 percent. And that actually there's an eminent living divinity all through nature. And there's a distinction between God and nature. Because the God force is the force of choice that allows you to choose beyond my nature.

For example, I'll just do a little check here for a second. And Maurice, we're going to start with you. How many people here are toilet trained? I'm just checking. One? Just only one? Only Paul? Just a show of hands. Show of hands. Come on everyone, show of hands. How many people are – okay, Edie. I know Jeannie's not, but Edie is. Right? Okay, good. We're all toilet trained. Now you've noticed the fact that toilet training is not natural. Right? No one is toilet trained naturally. As a matter of fact, Freud spent an enormous amount of time talking about the pain inflicted by toilet training because it violates our nature. And if you're actually toilet trained in a way that was actually problematic, it might add to all the other traumas that you experience. And you can work it out in a “*mat trip*”. But until we're there, toilet training's not natural. 1000 percent not. And yet, we're all toilet trained.

Now is there anyone here who would prefer not to be toilet trained? I'm just saying. I'm just doing a little check here. No, really. It's okay. This is a moment to kind of own everything. It's like a vulnerable moment together in Sangha. Right? So the answer is, we actually think there's an advantage to toilet training. Now forget about why for a second and let's kind of skip that cultural excursus. But actually, the notion that nature rules is a false notion. The fact that something's natural, whether in male or female nature, by the way – a little foreshadowing of

where we're going to go –the fact that something's natural doesn't make it sacred. There's first nature, and there's second nature. And that's called, in mysticism, Teva Rishon, first nature and Teva Shenee, second nature.

First nature is your default nature. Second nature is the ability to access something deeper in you through accessing the ecstatic God impulse that lives in you that allows you to transform. The possibility of transformation is the possibility of possibility. God is the possibility of possibility. A transformation's possible. Meaning God is in trees, but God's also not in trees. But that means that you can actually direct your nature. And that ability that every single person in this room shares, and we believe in, because we're all part of a transformational movement. And the entire point of transformation is you can transform your nature. You get it? Powerful.

So on the one hand, the old distinction between God and nature was used as a tool of oppression. So we want to move beyond the old difference, but then claim the difference at a higher level. And you've got a sense of it, right? Everyone's got a sense if it? I mean, I can go through 10 more examples, but it's actually a powerful dharmic insight were you kind of get how this works. So now let's begin to play.

05-FRIDAY MORNING PART 3

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Part 3

Track: 05-Friday Morning Part 3

TRT: 47.58

Marc: So let's move forward. So masculine and feminine. Man and woman. Let's just start with man and woman. The idea that differences between men and women are a source of oppression is a very, very, very powerful idea. And it has a very, very, very unholy history. So just for one example, about 100 years ago a German physician Paul Julius Mobius wrote a best seller called *Regarding the Physiological Weak-Mindedness of Women*. Had major influence in culture. And he basically compared the cranial capacity of men and women of the same height. And he showed that if you examined the skull of a 5'9" tall woman and compared it to the skull of a man of the same height – and this was not a popular weird book; this was accepted as a given in the world 100 years ago – you'd find, on average, that the volume capacity of her skull, and therefore the size of her brain, was about 8 to 10 percent smaller than the man's. And it was very, very powerful.

He was actually partially right. Women do have slightly smaller brains than men on average, even after controlling in the experiment for body size. So that's actually true. But what he did is he used difference – he interpreted the difference. And that interpretation verified a 2000 year old tradition that assumed that the masculine qualities were, in some sense, superior to the feminine qualities. Now what also happens to be true is – we'll just add a couple things – that women have higher brain blood flow per gram of tissue than men have, which he didn't realize. And in some critical areas of the brain, women have larger brain cells that receive more inputs than from corresponding areas in men's brains. And for many key areas, women use the cerebral cortex, which is the part of the brain that's most advanced for doing certain processes, while men use the amygdala, which is the emotional brain. So actually, there's in a more enormous amount of distinction between the male and female brain. And he only caught one of them.

But the point being, at this moment, is that this was the last step just 100 years ago in a long tradition that assumed that differences between men and women – which we actually doubt need brain surveys to analyze. You can actually notice that there's lots of differences between men and women, which begin with anatomical differences. And those differences also reflect the way men learn, the way men and women see things, the way they hear things, the way they interact, the way they experience emotions, the way they experienced sexuality. There's a real difference that exists.

Now what did was – and an entire history did – is interpret difference as a tool for oppression. So what happened? There was a movement to level differences. And in this leveling of differences, the differences between men and women got leveled. Now if you think that we've got to now establish this topic we've just begun – so I want you to really just relax for a second. Easy listening. And just hang out. But just follow me step-by-step.

So what happened? So what happened is, this dogma then entered. A new dogma. And the dogma was, we've leveled the differences. There are no differences between men and women. That's the John Money story that I started with. David Reimer should be raised as a girl because, ultimately, there are no differences and it will be healthy. Money was totally wrong. It turns out that in the last – since about 1991 or '92, we've done, I would say, 500-600 major scientific studies using the new microscope of modernity, the MRI – magnetic resonance imaging – which is able, actually, to tell differences in real time. So you can have a man and a woman – we used to basically dissect cadavers. That's basically the best we could do.

Now, in real time, when men and women are actually doing something – having sex, drawing, communicating, listening, seeing – we can actually monitor their brains and actually color-code the brain. And begin to see neural pathways, and to begin to see which part of the brains are being used, how big each part of the brain is, what each part of the brain is used for. And what we've basically come to

the conclusion – and we could spend a week on these studies. I'm going to summarize them in just a couple of minutes. But the conclusion we've come to one billion percent is that there are real, substantive, what they call in science, intrinsic differences between the male and female brain. Those intrinsic differences are chromosomal. It's not a level of hormones. It's chromosomal. There's different chromosomes that direct and define the male and female brain in some dimension of the brain.

There's actually a cellular substantive difference between male and female brains. Number one, men and women use different parts of their brains for different activities. Men and women see differently. They have a completely different sense of their visual field, and visual appreciation is completely different between men and women. Men have a much stronger visual sense than women. Women have a much stronger auditory, hearing sense than men. We have all sorts of studies of babies in the hospital that were exposed to music therapy, and the girls come out usually 9 ½ to 10 days earlier from the hospital after being exposed to music therapy because they actually hear the music in a completely different way than the boys do. And we're talking about studies that are not based on 10-year-olds who are watching too many James Bond movies. We're talking about day of birth studies. We're talking about day of birth studies. Meaning, we're not talking about cultural influence. And virtually all the major gender differences, which are absolutely real between men and women today, are found also in animals.

So you don't have a bunch of rats watching James Bond. That's not what's happening. It's really important to realize that. The core differences have now been validated based on day of birth studies, number one. Number two, the core differences are also found in the animal kingdom. Pretty much across the board. So the notion that there's no gender differences has been completely, utterly and correctly exploded. Not only, though, are there molecular, structural differences. There's hormonal differences. Men are bathed in testosterone. And women are bathed in oxytocin. Now women have testosterone and men have oxytocin. But the effect of oxytocin is basically mitigated by progesterone in a particular way in men. And mitigated by testosterone in a different way. Progesterone in a particular way in women. And testosterone in women is mitigated by oxytocin. So what happens is – let me tell you what that means.

What that means, really simply, is that the way testosterone works in a man is it creates, what we call, the classical masculine character. Whatever that is. It's created by testosterone. Now when you give testosterone to women, they actually develop much of the same characteristics. Oxytocin creates much of the classical feminine characteristics. When you give oxytocin to men – and again, there's so many studies on each one of these – then actually men develop many of those feminine characteristics. Those are a new set of facts that we have to deal with.

Now that's just the beginning of the story, though. That doesn't mean actually, by itself, anything. That's the surprising information. So although all sorts of

essentialists are claiming this information as evidence for their position, it's not. Because there's another fact at play that's actually developed at the exact same time in neuroscience. How many people are completely lost? We're okay?

So the new fact is, neuroplasticity. It's a big deal. So what's happened over the last 25 years is there's two arenas of science that developed in parallel to each other which, in effect, cancel each other out. On the one hand, there's this enormous emergence of documenting gender differences based on the kinds of studies I just cited. On the other hand, we have this entirely opposite realization. And the entirely opposite realization is the realization of neuroplasticity. What does neuroplasticity mean? What it means is, is action, emotion, environment, practice actually rewires both the neural circuits and actually some of the structure of the brain.

Now throughout almost the entire 20th century, the assumption was that this wasn't true. The assumption was, there was a critical period in childhood in which the brain was malleable, and then after that, the brain is basically a given. We now have as many studies that talk about gender differences – we have twice as many that talk about neuroplasticity. Which means that, although there are gender differences that are real, it also means that gender's the beginning of the conversation, not the end of the conversation. Because what we now know is, on the one hand, there's real distinctions between genders, but we also know that you can develop in a different way. You can actually make a decision to practice in a way where you develop – let's say you're a man – you develop your feminine – whatever that is. I don't want to talk about what that is at all now. I'm avoiding that like the plague. But whatever that is, whatever it is, you can develop it through practice.

So actually, what neuroplasticity tells us is something very interesting. It tells us two facts. Number one, the brains that we have now are a function of the last 5000 years of neuroplasticity. The brain given that we have now actually, we don't actually know how it developed. It's actually a function of neuroplasticity of the last 5000 years. And the brain that we have now may be completely different – when I say "completely different", I don't mean completely; it may be in-part different – than the brain that we have in the future.

So what do we know? We're going to stop the science here. We know, number one, that gender differences are real. They're not imagined. And we know that biology actually is part of our destiny. And we know that you will never move entirely beyond gender differences, nor would you want to. Women have breasts and lactate. And are bathed in oxytocin. And men have testosterone. And don't have breasts and don't breast-feed. Women actually conceived life in their body. Men conceive life outside of their body. There's just objective differences. Now, of course, you can play with those differences, but actually, we now know, based on the studies, that the hormonal and structural differences between men and women are so profound that not to recognize them damages children. That the

amount of damage done to children by not recognizing hormonal differences in enormous.

So for example, based on what are called the M cells and the P cells – men have M cells, women have P cells – in the retina, which converts light in the brain, boys are attracted, when they color, to draw with few colors, moving objects that are usually moving very fast and making a lot of ruckus. That's what boys naturally draw. Girls naturally draw figures that are in front of you. They use about 10 colors, they use warm colors, and their paintings almost always involve human play in contact. So Mrs. Kanefsky – let's make up a name – is a teacher in school, and she has a drawing class, art class. And she's been taught in educational training that you should try and get the children to draw affiliative, loving, interactive, bright, flowers, people interacting.

So she's in her class and she's got Tim, and she's got Janice. She goes by Janice's drawing and Janice's drawing is just this beautiful picture of a flower and a mother and smiling, and the mother's holding a little stick baby and it's filled with these gorgeous colors. And Mrs. Kanefsky says to Janice, "It's beautiful. That's so beautiful." And Janice is bathed in oxytocin and feels affirmed and dignified. And then she goes over to Tim, and Tim has drawn in gray and black a rocket ship pounding into the Earth. Or an alien planet, all gray and black, exploding. And she kind of looks and she does her best, she says, "Very nice Tim." And if there's one thing that four and five-year-olds know, they know when they're being approved and when they're not. So Tim gets a cold shudder in his body. And he knows he's done something wrong. Essential. And over the next year or two, he tries to change. Because he's met with the fundamental disapproval of the system, incarnate in his teacher, and he can't change. So he feels that there's something wrong with him.

And then he comes to a conclusion. Art's for girls. Now watch what just happened. Not knowing gender distinction actually just reinforced a gender stereotype. See what happened? You just cut the boy off from our art by actually not understanding gender distinctions. Kind of wild. So actually, we've reinforced a negative gender stereotype by not understanding that, actually, he's drawing. And he's drawing exactly what the M cells – the nature of the M cells in the retina are such that they actually don't make distinction between colors, they're attracted to motion. The P cells are all about palettes of colors, and they like this deep sense of stillness. And he's actually reflecting his M cells and you're actually denying his essential nature. You've actually destroyed something essential in that child. I could go through 30 examples like this. Actually not knowing gender differences is a disaster, educationally. Not knowing the difference between male sexuality and female sexuality. Are there differences between male and female sexuality? Of course there are.

Know where we're going to go, we haven't gotten any place where we're going to go. But not knowing that distinction is one of the great sources of male shame.

And one of the great sources of male same in cultures around sexuality. We haven't actually articulated a sexual narrative that actually encompasses male sexuality, in a significant way. There was a great movie – I don't remember the name of it, but it was about the early gay movement, and one of the activists – *The Normal Heart*. It was a great movie. It was a great movie.

And it's about the early gay movement and the attempt to have activism against AIDS. And how the government essentially ignored it. The government completely ignored – there was like four or five years where people were dying all over the place, and the government refused to recognize something that was happening. There's a moment of an early gallery of the first national hotline on AIDS that was formed, and they're talking to each other, "Can we tell the gay community to have less sex" And one of the funny and tragic lines, and beautiful lines, in the movie, one guy says, "Are you kidding? The entire political platform of the gay movement is fucking. How can we play with that?"

[Laughter]

It was great. Right? There's movies that have really captured that beauty in the early gay movement. The movie *Milk* is one of the movies that actually captured some of the beauty. And what it meant was this is a new – and although it wasn't an articulated sexual narrative, it was a movement towards a sexual narrative that actually affirmed something about male sexuality that culture, to that point, had completely demonized and placed outside of culture. So men had to deal with their sexuality, some way or another, outside of the mainstream of culture and live a double life. Which created enormous shame in the masculine.

So just imagine for a second the person, by the way, who got this in a deep way, but he didn't have the right solution for it was – this is a wild sentence coming at you – was Joseph Smith. Joseph was the founder of Mormonism. Imagine for a second, when were all the great traditions formed? All the great spiritual traditions. When were they formed? The last couple hundred years? I don't think so. Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Daoism, Confucius. All the great traditions are ancient. How the fuck in upstate New York did they managed to establish a new great tradition called Mormonism? It's actually one of the most shocking expressions of human culture that actually defies reason. What were they doing? How'd they do it?

And that's questions always fascinating me. It's just so historically anomalous. They've actually created a great tradition. Mormonism is now one of the world's great traditions, hands down. How'd they do it? Upstate New York. What did he know? And I got to Salt Lake City about nine years ago and I lived there for three years, and I became close friends with some of the core leaders of the church. And I started studying Joseph Smith. Just because, you're in Salt Lake City, do as the Romans do. And what Joseph Smith got was male shame around sexuality. He just got it. And he basically writes, in a couple of his key passages, he says,

"America has produced a nation –" and he says "a nation of shamed adulterers." But what he meant was men who are lost in shame. And what he said was so beautiful, he said, "What is that do to the social fabric of the country? When half of the population feels fundamental internalized shame and has no idea what to do with it." It's a very powerful insight. It's a shockingly powerful insight.

Of course, his solution was, he had 83 wives. So I'm not dealing with his solution. In other words, his solution was polygamy. Which, of course, ignored the feminine. In a thousand different ways. So _____ is actually part of patriarchy, but he was sensing something. Not sensing the distinction between the masculine and the feminine, in terms of sexuality, is destructive beyond imagination, to the very fabric of society. And since all of us love both men and women, we should all care about it. It's about our boys, it's about our brothers, it's about our fathers. It's something that needs to be taken into account in a profound way.

So all of this is to say that a) gender differences exist and they're real. They are strong tendencies. That apply to a great majority. Although far from all, but 80 percent of men and about 80 percent of women. And gender differences are natural, and nature's only the beginning of the story. And that's key. Nature's the beginning of the story. That's why we're all toilet trained. Meaning there's a possibility of evolution and transformation. And that possibility of evolution and transformation producing a new man and a new woman and a new vision is actually, for the first time in history, documented in the last 25 years, in neuroplasticity. What a world. Do you began to see something of a picture emerging here? So let's now go to the next step.

So this is, again, I could skip this, but if I skip this we'd actually be – everything we're going to do this weekend is going to be much more classical, Wisdom School retreat, but if I skip this conversation, we're idiots. Meaning, we're just not part of the conversation. And if you can't actually work this material, then everything we're saying is actually in a vacuum. And what we've actually established, which is pretty much unwritten anyplace, is that there's these two conflicting things happening. Gender differences are established, neuroplasticity's established. Now let's go to the next step.

So what's the move? So the move is an evolution of the genderqueer position. The genderqueer position. If you really sense what's happening here, we're making huge cultural moves here. And I want to ground them in a way that, to the best of my knowledge, they have not been grounded. At this moment in history. So what's the genderqueer position? The genderqueer position in the world today is something like as follows. "Don't define me by gender. I am something which is beyond gender." And they are absolutely right. They're ahead of culture, but they're right. The genderqueer movement is right on target. But what are they saying?

Now the movement itself is completely confused beyond imagination with so many internal contradictions that it's just dizzying. And so much confusion. "I'm genderqueer, so I'm going to have a sex change operation." That's not beyond gender. You're just changing gender. So the genderqueer movement began with this notion of being, "I'm going to change my gender." Then it said, "Well, I'm transgender. I'm beyond gender," but that was an androgyny position. That denied sex differences. Which is also a mistaken position. The transgender movement was a later expression of that '60s to '90s dogma in the academy of androgyny, androgyny's not true. So that's problematic. But the genderqueer movement, beyond its problematic, it's got a really profound intuition, which says as follows.

It says, who is Claire? Claire is Claire-ness. She's Claire-ness. That's who she is. She's Claire-ness. And who's Vyana? Vyana's Vyana-ness. That's who she is. And Lerid is Lerid-ness. That's who he is. That is so profound and so true and so powerful. I am not defined by either what's generally called the masculine or the feminine. It's just not true. Who am I? I am Maurice-ness. That's who I am. That's issue one. Again, we're putting a lot together here that's never been put together, so stay with me. Here's the next piece.

The great traditions and the gender researchers, who would give you lists of masculine and feminine, fucked it up big time. Including Hinduism, including Daoism – they all fucked it up. Meaning they made a claim that was wrong. So I'll give you an example. In Hinduism, there's a beautiful notion called Shiva and Shakti. And by the way, let's not blame Hinduism. Kabbalah made this a mistake. Lest you think the Jew is blaming the Hindus. Kabbalah made the same mistake. So there's Shiva and Shakti. And they said Shiva, which is the masculine, is X. It's all these masculine characteristics. And Shakti is – and I don't want to go into what they are now. Shakti is all these feminine characteristics. But then go to Daoism and you have yin and yang. Now in yin and yang – masculine and feminine – the Daoist's claim of what the masculine is is the opposite of the Hindu claim. They're precise opposites. So in other words, what the Hindus claim as the feminine, the Daoists claim as the masculine. What that Daoist claim as the masculine, the Hindus claim as the feminine. Is somebody confused here? You see the point?

So what's happening? Forget about the details. What's happening is they're both right and they're both wrong. They're both right in noticing an essential distinction of principles of the cosmos. They're both noticing that there are these different principles of the cosmos that exist. And they're powerful and they exist in us. And those are Shiva and Shakti. Yin and yang. Let's call them masculine and feminine. But then identify them with men and women, or even masculine and feminine. In a way, they're actually exclusive of each other. They can't actually both be right. That's a pretty shocking piece of information.

So we think the ancient traditions had it perfectly. They didn't. What they did was they got correctly that there are essential distinctions in the cosmos. And it's so

tempting to identify essential distinctions with man and woman because, for large periods of history, men and women do reflect, to some large extent, those distinctions. But the nature and the extent to which they reflect those distinctions evolves and changes, and appears differently in different places in the world.

So what we want to do is, we don't want to go to androgyny, in a sense that we lose these core distinctions. The core distinctions are absolutely real. You don't want to lose Shiva and Shakti. Shiva and Shakti are critical distinctions in reality. Yin and yang are critical distinctions. But you don't want to identify them too tightly with men or women. And when I say man and woman, I include masculine feminine. Let me tell you why. What people usually say is, "Well, it's not men and women." We're beyond that. That was the first movement.

It's men and women are men are masculine, women are feminine. Then we got more sophisticated and we said, "No, no. Within the man, masculine and feminine lives. And within the woman, masculine and feminine lives." Which is a more advanced position. But even that is still too tight. It's still too tight of a nexus. Because the slippery slope between masculine and man, and feminine and women, is so slippery it's very hard not to slide down it. And here's where the genderqueer people really help us. And I'm Mr. Genderqueer. I identify. I'm genderqueer.

Meaning I'm Marc-ness. I am Marc-ness. Now my Marc-ness, one of the ways into my Marc-ness is through the unique integration of my different cosmic qualities. We're going to call those cosmic qualities lines and circles. There are about 10 qualities in the cosmos that are line qualities. There are about 10 qualities in reality which are circle qualities. And we're going to have a blast doing these this afternoon and tomorrow morning. And the line qualities, to some great extent, show up in men, but also show up in women. And the circle qualities, to some great extent, show up in women, but also show up in men.

And who Marc-ness is is a unique expression of lines and circles coming together in a very particular way that they never have come together in any other human being that ever was, is or will be. That starts to get interesting. Now did you just feel in your body some clarity just came into the room? Like we're right? All of a sudden you get some clarity. "Oh, there are principles." These principles are line principles, and they're actually quite geometrically a line in their nature. Not by accident. T, for testosterone. O, circle, oxytocin. Coincidence, delightful ... language. And there are circle qualities.

And actually, who I am is, I am a Unique Self. And Unique Self is precisely the category of consciousness that the genderqueer movement is missing. Because the genderqueer movement explains precisely who I am not, but not who I am. So there's this sense that I've got this larger identity, but what is it? Now I'm just going to step in for a moment to Unique Self. And I'm going to just reweave the Dharma for a second. It's going to be essential to everything we do here. What do

we mean by Unique Self? So by Unique Self – and three quarters of us are deep in this. It's going to be in the *World Spirituality* book, it's going to be in *Unique Self Process* book, there's Unique Self Retreat coming up – the third one, I think it is now. Fourth? But what do we mean by – there's a Unique Self Coaching program. Unique Self is hugely important in our Dharma. Let's just restate it for a second. Let's reclaim it, as if we've never heard it ever before. Ever before. What does Unique Self mean?

Unique Self means that there are basically four levels. Really simple, really easy, really beautiful. Level I – pre-personal. I'm a baby. Pre-personal. I'm not good. There are no good babies in the world. Never been a good baby ever. Babies are cute, but they're not good. They're actually quite annoying to their parents. As we pointed out before, parents haven't had sex in 18 months. They have finally kind of had one night, they've put aside some time. The baby start screaming. That's not good. It's not even cute. But the point is, babies aren't good. Babies are pre-personal. There's no good babies in the world. Never been a good baby, ever. Babies are before that place where they awaken from instinct and make choice. So babies are infinitely cute. And as Blake reminded us – and Wordsworth – they're trailing clouds of glory, but they're not good.

Goodness is, you step into your personal. Here I am. I'm in my personal. I'm a separate self. I'm a separate self. That's what I am. Two separate selves. Peter and Mark. We're each separate selves. We're skin encapsulated egos. We have rights because we're separate selves, which is awesome. We have rights that are irreducible rights. The entire western democracy is based in the emergence of separate self. We have rights. The only problem is, it's a limited view. Because I'm more than a separate self. That's actually a false identity. That's actually insanity. How do I know it's insanity? Two ways. Exterior, interior.

Exterior studies systems theory. Systems theory, the most important science – cast theory, complexity theory, general dynamics theory, systems theory in the last 30, 40 years is the understanding that there is no sense in which I exist separately. It is a scientific discipline, systems theory, which basically shows, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the entire notion that I exist separately, that I'm not embedded in context after context after context that defines me, is an absurdity. That's what all of systems theory is about.

Interior, enlightenment, I actually wake up through my interior to my enlightenment and I realize I'm not separate from all that is. I realized, through opening the eye of the spirit and the eye of the heart, that I'm part of the seamless code of the universe. So I move from separate self to true self. I move from pre-personal to separate self, from separate self I move to true self. Total number of true selves in the world is one. One true self. Lerid and Marc are part of the same true self. We're not separate. The experience of separation is insanity. So to wake up to my enlightenment, and what we call in this room the democratization of enlightenment, where enlightenment becomes a live option for every human being

– just like we democratized governance, we democratized enlightenment – we wake up to the democratization of enlightenment and we realize that Peter, Marc, Lerid Pauline – we're all part of the same true self. No separation at all. Is there gender in true self? Of course not. Just a little aside.

The true self is the singular that has no plural. I'm part of the one. I'm part of the seamless code of the universe. That's usually considered the end of enlightenment. What we now have realized is that, actually, it's not. After true self, I awaken again. And until very, very recently the assumption was that uniqueness – you're being unique – was part of your separate self. Those were your unique characteristics. Uniqueness and separateness were obviously conflated. We realize that's not true. You actually awaken beyond your separate self into true self, you're part of the one. You're part of the seamless code of the universe. But that seamless code of the universe is seamless, and it's not featureless. And you are, I am, an irreducibly unique feature of that seamless code of the universe.

So reality is having a Maurice experience. And reality is taking responsibility for Maurice's arousal as he's trying to track the ideas. Reality is having a Maurice experience. And Maurice-ness is uniqueness. And it's unlike any other. And Maurice-ness has nothing to do with John-ness, Tarcza-ness. It's utterly different. And Maurice-ness is not merely a function of his social, psychological and cultural conditioning, as the enlightenment teachers told us for 2000 years. Uniqueness is not a function of his conditioning. Uniqueness is a function of essence. There's an essence called Maurice-ness in the world. So when I meet Maurice, I'm ecstatic because I'm meeting a new quality of beauty. A new quality of gorgeousness that I can be in devotion to. Jealousy falls away because I'm not Maurice-ness. _____ becomes absurd. As long as we're separate selves, we're always competing and grasping. And if we're true selves, there's no relationship. We're just one. When we awaken as Unique Self, then I actually awaken as reality having a Christina experience, and that uniqueness actually leads me to create community. Because uniqueness is my puzzle piece nature. I'm a puzzle piece. And that puzzle piece becomes part of the larger whole. It through my unique idiosyncrasy that the puzzle piece merges with the larger whole, is held by the larger whole, completes the larger whole.

And then I awaken again to evolutionary Unique Self. Which is Unique Self living in evolutionary context. Actually widen my context. I've actually realized that evolution is cosmological evolution, the planets, biological evolution, the biosphere, cultural evolution, which begins the stages of human history that ultimately awakens into, what we call here, the fourth big bang – Unique Self, appears. We actually awaken – uniqueness goes from unconscious uniqueness, because all form is unique, to conscious uniqueness. I'm aware of my uniqueness. I go from unconscious evolution to conscious evolution, from unconscious uniqueness to conscious uniqueness. I actually awaken and I've realized that my Unique Self is the personal face of the evolutionary impulse itself awakening in me. I'm a unique irreducibly personal expression of the process. Who am I? I'm an

expression of the evolutionary ecstatic process. What moves that process? The love intelligence of reality. The Eros that moves everything.

So who am I? Who are you? You are an irreducibly unique expression of the love intelligence and love of beauty that is the initiating and animating Eros of all that is, that lives in you, as you and through you. That ever was, is or will be ever again. That has an irreducibly unique perspective, which creates your irreducibly unique insight, which manifests your irreducibly unique gifts, which allow you to address a unique need in your unique circle of intimacy and influence that can be addressed by you, and you alone. That's who you are. _____. That's shockingly beautiful. It's shockingly beautiful. There's no extras on the set. If that got destroyed by the notions of separate self, which dominated the Western Enlightenment, which meant that you were a cog in the machine, a separate self competing to survive, it got destroyed by Eastern Enlightenment – thank you Joseph Goldstein who brought it to America and did a beautiful job, but fucked it up.

Because it was all about no self. It was all about realizing that, who am I? I am no self. But you know that you're not no self. And your specialness was dismissed as a function of your ego. Not true. How many people in this room think they're not special? Not one. Everyone in this room thinks they're special. But then your teacher tells you, that's a function of your ego. That's your grasping. No it's not. It's not. Your ego can hijack your specialness, of course. Just like degraded pornography can hijack sexuality. It doesn't make sexuality bad.

Actually, my feeling of being special is the unique evolutionary impulse awakening in me. So I'm an evolutionary Unique Self, and as an evolutionary Unique Self, the last stage of awakening, giving my unique gifts, we form a Unique Self symphony. It means unique selves comes together and the universe self organizes. Do you remember that movie called *The Imitation Game*? How many people saw it? *The Imitation Game*? What was it about? It was about Alan Turing. Who's Alan Turing? Alan Turing is a great dude. He has been my hero for the last decade. Those of you who've studied with me – you were with me in the room, Steve – when we talked about Alan Turing in Week 10 of the Unique Self Course. Alan Turing developed this idea called morphogenesis – besides cracking the Nazi code, which is what the movie was about, in World War II. An idea called morphogenesis, which is the beginning of the idea that the universe self organizes. Meaning creativity is not external only to the universe. Creativity is an inherent property of the cosmos. Creativity's not just external. It's an inherent property of the cosmos. The cosmos self organizes, what Whitehead called the "creative advance of novelty," to higher and higher levels of conscious and complexity. But now here's the question.

What causes self organization on the human level? The answer, Unique Self. You self organize based on your Lerid-ness. You self organize based on your Chahatie-ness. You self-organize based on your Marc-ness or your Viana-ness, or

your Carol-ness. It's when you actually crystallize your uniqueness and you move out of it, and you actually act to give your unique gifts, and you unleash the unique creativity that lives as you. Let me ask you a question. Does anything that we just sat have anything to do with whether you are masculine or feminine? No. That's your identity.

That's the intuition of the genderqueer movement that doesn't know how to articulate it. But the intuition is, I have an identity that actually is obfuscated, which means it's confused, my masculine and feminine. Right on. Yes. That intuition – what often happens is, the poets or the avant-garde of the culture is ahead of his ability to articulate what it senses. But what the genderqueer movement is sensing absolutely correctly is that, I am actually not exhausted by this notion of masculine and feminine. I actually feel that it's limiting. And I actually want to move beyond it. That's what Unique Self says.

Unique Self says, who am I? I am Christina-ness in the world. I am Judy-ness in the world. I am Marlene-ness in the world. That's what it means. I'm Jill-ness in the world. That's what it means. That's powerful. Now, what's a gorgeous window into Jill is, what is the unique integration of lines and circles that is Jill-ness? So if Jill's a man and he's a gendered man, he'll have some innate gender differences – hearing, visual, etc. – but who he is is actually, for the first time – ready for this? It's a huge sentence. Who he is is, in part, determined by biology. You can never escape your animal. You never want to escape your animal. And biology means, my animal. But it's only in part determined by our biology. I actually get to choose my identity. Using neuroplasticity. And using the choices that I make. I get to actually, accessing and knowing who my truest – stay with me. These next three sentences are the key sentences. What I do is first I've got to know, what's my innate nature? That's the first thing I've got to know. What's my nature? And our natures are different. Whatever they are. We don't know what they are, but they're different. Of course they are. And our natures are different. So everyone's got a nature that unique. And so the first thing I need to do is know my nature. And don't let society tell me what my nature is. I've got to actually access it myself. Step one.

After I know my nature, I want to honor my nature. Instead of denying it. I want to honor what my nature is. Step three is, by knowing my nature, I don't need to fit my nature into a predetermined society role. I've got three or four boxes and I'm going to fit into one of those boxes. I don't need to fit into one of those boxes. I'm actually a unique expression of lines and circles coming together, and when lines and circles come together, you create something new. And lines and circles can be masculine and feminine, or masculine and masculine. Lines and circles. It's the same sexual imagery. Lines and circles means that new creativity is formed by the unique penetration of lines and circles.

And lines and circles penetrated uniquely in every person. So what we're going to do this afternoon is we're going to go, what are the 10 qualities of lines? In the

universe? By actually framing it that way, what have we done? On the one hand, we haven't effaced masculine and feminine, but we've moved beyond it. We're talking about lines and circles. So if I say, for example, lines are hierarchical, I don't just mean that men are hierarchical. Women are also hierarchical. Hierarchy also lives in the feminine. But line is a quality of hierarchy. And there are 10 major qualities of lines that are fun and fascinating and delightful, and we're going to play with all of them. And there are 10 major qualities of circle. And every Unique Self is a unique combination of lines and circles.

You can breathe for the first time. It's like, that's exciting. Now the reason I took you through this hard process – I could have just started here. Wisdom-tainment perspective much better thing to do. Lines and circles, da, da, da. Start in. We'll have a great time. You've got to get how we got here. We're in Wisdom School. This is how we got here. What this allows for is to actually bring everyone together in a shared language. So if you're a hard gender distinction person, you'll like lines and circles because it's making a distinction. If you're a genderqueer person, you'll like lines and circles as well because you recognized that these distinctions exist in reality. You just don't want to identify them with men or women. But if you lose lines and circles, "So why don't you just get rid of lines and circles?" Because you're left with blah. Do you get what I mean? You actually destroy your ability to know yourself. Delphic oracle "Know thyself." If you don't actually understand the qualities of line in reality and how they play in you, and the qualities of circle in reality and how they play in you, you have no prism to know yourself.

But if you get too caught, "I'm lines and I'm circles –" I've been reading the literature. For example, there's a book by Deborah Tannen called *You Just Don't Understand*, 1990 book. Huge best seller. It was before all of the neuroscience. None of the neuroscience pretty much existed then, so her book was all about sociolinguistics and how people communicate. And I would say two thirds of her examples of masculine and feminine, I found the feminine side. Each one I was like, oh, girl, girl, girl, girl. Man, man, girl, girl, girl, man. But the distinctions were all clear. The distinctions she was making were fantastic, but what she did is, she closely linked them to men and women, which in 1990 was two thirds true. Between 1990 and even today, the world's changed. The world's changed. The amount of women, for example, that don't need men to create their living. Let's just start there. The historical job of a man was to protect, to be disposable when he was protecting – he had to be willing to give up his life in order to protect – and to provide security. That was the basic role of the man.

So if you were a man, you somehow had to fit into that role. That's who you were, and that's what it meant to be a man. Just to get what that means. In World War I, men – millions of men – were about 60 feet away from each other, 80 feet away from each other, in trenches, and for five years killed each other. It's shocking. They fired across at each other, and there's an entire literature – Shawn, you were with me in Amsterdam when I sat with my son, as he was finishing university,

and we read through those articles – literally trying to figure out. Why did men do it? Because the answer is, that's what it meant to be a man. There were no draft dodgers. That notion of a draft dodger is the beginning of the emergence of something new. What it meant to be a man was to do your duty. And to give up your life for it. Let's understand that this kind of notion of the evil patriarchy. Men gave up their lives. They were amputated, destroyed, crippled in order to protect home and hearth. Family. The feminine. The knight is on his horse, saving the damsel. That's with the knight does. That's what it means to be a man.

Now do we want to lose that notion of being a man, entirely? I don't know. I think we want to lose its complete identification with men. Do we need that quality of the line in society? I think we do. That's what the Dalai Lama said to me. "We can't do away with armies yet." We still live in a world which is a complex world. We need that line quality. Do we need to put all of that obligation on men? Well, that's a good question. Kind of interesting. It makes the question interesting. Maybe women should occupy a part of that line quality, and die for their country. What does that mean? As you start to play the game, fluidity means fluidity all around. It's an interesting game. But clearly, if we find our way into it, we realize that line qualities and circle qualities live in both men and women. It's a very powerful understanding. And so what I need to do is, I need to access – we're going to go through each quality and we're going to all have paper – I'm going ask you to come with pen and paper in the afternoon. We'll go through each quality. And then, 1 to 10, evaluate how strong that quality is in you. So it's going to get real personal.

Now, not only do you have line qualities and circle qualities, but you're going to see which ones are strong and weak, and how they come together. So you're an absolutely unique combination of lines and circles. So in some sense – and this is not a word that I would use in a book because it's got all sorts of negative connotation, but just for fun, I'll throw it out – we're all hermaphrodites. Meaning we're all both. But no two hermaphrodites are the same. Unique Self. So one of the lenses into the Unique Self conversation is the realization that no two hermaphrodites are the same. That's my Unique Self.

06-FRIDAY MORNING PART 4

Part 4

Track: 06-Friday Morning Part 4

TRT: 27:22

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Marc: Let's breathe for a second. Let's take a break. Break's over. It was a very short break. We're just going to go one more step. I want to have this all on the table, and we can go to lunch. It'll be completely sizzled and gone. Just relax into this great, long break. Take a walk. Have an awesome afternoon. We'll come back and plunge in. And the entire rest of the weekend is going to go deep, but lighter.

In a certain sense, we're going now to this picture. I know it's hard. I just really, really, really, really appreciate everyone staying with it. People just don't do this. It's not done. We've covered a lot of ground and we're putting ground together in a new way that's never been put together. I so deeply, deeply, deeply appreciate just really hanging with it. I really deeply appreciate hanging with the next two hours. So here we go. No, no, no, it's not two hours.

[Laughter]

But I'm going to go one more step, okay? Because there's still a couple of pieces that we need in place. Then we'll have all the pieces in place. And then the rest of the weekend we're going to just play. But let's go a couple more pieces.

Here's a sentence. We don't need more feminine values. We don't need more feminine values. If I hear one more person get up and say, "We need more feminine values," I will shoot them personally, as an expression of testosterone. That's the dumbest thing I've ever heard. It's just not true. We don't need more feminine values.

Again, let's stop for a second. Let's watch out this plays, because what are we doing? We're deconstructing. And we're going to do a ceremony. We're going to finish this morning with a ceremony in which we're going to let go of our old conceptions which came from our parents. And Vyana and Christian have developed a beautiful ceremony which they'll explain to us. So we're going to end with a ceremony. But let's just feel this for a second. We don't need more feminine. What does that mean?

Historically, the last 2000 years, what was the kind of hot sex? Meaning, the sex that was better? That was more advanced, more developed, 1000%? Who? Men. Right, everyone clear on that? That was clear. Until 50 years ago. The woman's suffrage movement, the beginning of feminism, began to change something. But until 50, 60 years ago, men were definitely, in terms of jobs, they were placed better. There was definitely not equality. Men were basically considered – no one really said it out loud in the last 50, 60 years, but pretty much until very, very recently men were what was happening.

And the women qualities of, let's say, feminine quality of emotionality – now do the feminine have more available emotional qualities than men in nature? They do. They do. Enormous brain science on that. Are men less emotional than women? No, they access their emotion differently. Bracket that for a second. But

the basic assumption was women are somehow less rational, more emotional. They're lost in this intuitive thing. They're associative.

And we burnt a lot of witches at the stake. Let's really get that. We demonized the difference. We demonized the difference. What's now happened is, though, although we don't burn people anymore, we do it through other ways. We have all sorts of forms of social rape, for social burnings at the stake. What we've now done is – post-radical feminism – we've now said, what they call, women's ways of knowing – the same ways of knowing that we're the source of the feminine being demonized – instead of now making the two sexes complete equal, now women's ways of knowing are now superior. And what's considered masculine is considered aggressive, testosterone-bathed, violent, etc. etc. etc.

Now what's happened is the masculine has been demonized. And actually, liberal western culture, we actually don't have an image of what it means to be a man. When I say a man, this has nothing to do with straight or gay. Either side is totally good. What does it mean to be a man? And actually, as in the story we saw about art and school, rough house play is problematic. Natural male aggression is problematic. We don't even understand what aggression means. The fuck it or kill it male testosterone response is demonized and misunderstood.

And in general, in the classical feminist literature – and I once wrote a book draft on this nine years ago, and for lots of reasons decided not to publish it. But because I realized that if I did, the rest of my life would be just in this issue, and I wanted to do Unique Self and I wanted to do ten other things. But I wrote a book draft after enormous amount of study. I spent pretty much one year, 20 hours a day deep in this literature about nine years ago.

I collected, for example, all the times in the casual feminist literature that men were equated with Nazis. Just like in the Nazi regime, men – just casual equations. Casual equations. I collected like 60 times in major books. And not saying men are Nazis. Just casually, just like in the concentration camps. Really? Really? Men casually equated with Nazis?

Can you imagine a book that would equate women with Nazis? You'd be fired from every job you could ever get in one second in society and made a pariah. To equate women with Nazis, it's so crazy that you're just revolted by it. Men with Nazis – I'm talking about liberal progressive culture. Men with Nazis was casually accepted. It's a big deal. So there's a demonization of the masculine. And it was very closely linked with masculine sexuality.

So what we need to do is, we need to realize that actually, whatever masculine and feminine mean – and we're going to actually go beyond gender into lines and circles – neither is preferred. Each has their light and their shadow. And actually, each of the 10 qualities of line has a light dimension and a shadow dimension.

And each of the 10 qualities of circle has a light dimension and a shadow dimension.

And what culture has done in liberal progressive culture in the last 30 years is identified the masculine with the shadow of the line, and the feminine with the light of the circle. That's like, whoa. That's dharma coming at you. That's what's actually happening culturally. Now without the picture, it's almost impossible to see it. It's like every place – it's in every course, it's in every gender studies course. It's in all the Women's Studies department. It's in popular literature, all over the place. It's in movies. It's every place. Until you see it and you realize, Oh, that's what's happening."

We're identifying, in popular culture, the masculine with its shadow dimension, and the feminine with its light dimension. For example, at our Success 3.0 Summit, we had a very close friend of mine who just joined our board – who shall remain nameless at this time – and a second close friend of mine who just joined our board – who shall remain nameless at this time, as well – both got up and put lists up on the projector saying, "These are feminine values and these are masculine values. And we need more feminine values." No! Not true. Not true. We need more feminine – now here's a big new step, last step. We need more feminine and masculine values at higher levels of consciousness.

So let's see what that means. We're in the dharma. No casual phrases. Just do levels of consciousness in 10 seconds. One example. Levels of consciousness. Egocentric, ethnocentric, world centric, cosmocentric.

Egocentric means I have a felt sense of love, care and concern for me and my peeps that help me survive – egocentric. Ethnocentric, I have a felt sense of love, care and concern for me and my people, my nation, my country and my religion. So I've expanded my circle of care and concern. My felt sense of care and concern. World centric, I've got a felt sense of care and concern for all human beings on the planet, but I eat hamburgers. For all human beings on planet, felt sense of love, care and concern. Cosmocentric, I have a felt sense of love, care and concern for all of reality. That's an evolution of love.

As I move through those levels of consciousness, love is evolving. The evolution of love is not a slogan. It's a dharma. So as I awaken and crystallize my Unique Self, what am I crystalizing? I'm crystalizing the unique expression of love intelligence that lives in me. So I am the personal expression of the evolutionary impulse. And if that unique love intelligence that is palling doesn't emerge, then that evolutionary impulse doesn't have that love intelligence to evolve reality.

So, if Paul doesn't emerge as his Unique Self, then love doesn't evolve. Because there's a unique incarnation of love intelligence that lives as Paul. These aren't like words. This is actually the structure. This is the very source code structure of reality. So Paul's got to first show up as his Unique Self, but he's also got to grow

up. The worst word in the world is grownups. There are no grownups. We're growing up. We think we've grown up. Grownups are those decimating words. We're growing up, meaning I'm moving from egocentric, egocentric love, to ethnocentric love, to world centric love, to cosmocentric love.

Now, when we say we need more feminine values, we don't need more feminine egocentric values. We don't need more feminine ethnocentric values. Let me send my kid to be a Nazi storm trooper. That's what ethnocentric – the shadow of ethnocentric – values means. That's what – feminine values. I'm nurturing. I'm caring. I raise my child and offer my child up to the state. We don't need more feminine values like that. I don't think so.

We need more feminine and masculine values at higher levels of consciousness. Oh, that changes the whole game. So we're beginning to get a big picture here. That's not available. We don't need more feminine values. We need more feminine values which are balanced. We need more line and circle values uniquely calibrated in a Unique Self at a higher level of consciousness. Get the difference? It's the whole difference. It changes the entire game. That's what we're looking for.

We're looking for showing up as unique selves, which is a unique incarnation of the love intelligence that lives in me, as me and through me. That has a unique gift to give and addresses a unique need. That speaks to a corner of the world that's unloved, that can't be liberated other than through me showing up as my Unique Self. And to show up as my Unique Self, I've got to know myself. Who am I? I'm a unique calibration of lines and circles.

And if I don't know the qualities of a line, I don't know the qualities of a circle, I'm surely not going to know how they show up in me. But I can't just know the qualities of a line and say, "I'm a man," because that's the old paradigm. That's culture telling me what I am. That's not who I am. I'm not just a man. I'm lines and circles. And whether I'm a man or a woman, I'm a unique calibration of lines and circles.

Now I don't want to go to androgyny. Meaning, for example, I'm a man and I'm going to develop my capacity to listen. Now that I developed my capacity to listen, and I'm now androgenic, because I've now developed my listening capacity, which is a strong circle capacity and not a strong line capacity. That's actually true for lots of reasons.

Listening is a strong, strong, strong circle capacity. Lines, when lines hear a problem, they solve it. When circles have a problem, they want to talk about it. Those are two different qualities. They're different. That's actually real. Now watch for a second. Completely interesting. It's completely fascinating and beautiful. Because when lines have a problem, they're stressed. What produces testosterone in a line is solving the problem. So testosterone reduces the stress.

Listening to the problem increases the stress. So if I can't solve it, I can't solve it, I'm going to go have a beer or go turn on the news or watch football because that will allow me to rest, rejuvenate, get more testosterone through resting, and then return to the problem. The last thing I want to do is talk for two hours about a problem I can't solve. That is not happening. That's just not happening. I don't want to do that.

Now, if I'm a circle quality – and I, by the way, am more of a circle quality in this. I'm total circle quality in this. If there's a problem, I want to talk about it. I want to talk about it. And if I share it with you, and you solve it for me, I feel, not heard, not understood, not listened to and I'm actually offended. That you didn't actually take the time to engage when I wanted you to just listen to it with me. Let's just talk about it. It'll take an hour. And don't solve it for me. Because actually when I'm listened to, oxytocin is produced. And oxytocin calms my stress. Because in the classical circle, which is often the feminine, oxytocin calms stress. Wow. It's kind of interesting.

Now, just follow for a second. Let's say we're doing lines and circles. And let's do the classical lines and circles. Again, I'll give you two examples of it. Let's first do the classical one where the line is classical masculine and the circle's a classical feminine. The circle comes home with a problem. The line listens to the problem and tries to solve it. So the line's trying to solve it because the line is devastated by the circle's pain. We have an enormous amount – like three studies I've read recently about how men respond instantly and faster than women to a picture of someone crying. We tracked it with an MRI. But then, the man shuts down, can't stay with it and goes to the solution. The feminine takes longer to respond, in terms of the MRI scan, to the crying, but then stays with it.

So circle comes home, has a problem. Line comes home. They start talking about it. Line is hurt by the pain. It actually comes from sensitivity, so goes to solve it, because that reduces the line's stress of being hurt and produces testosterone. But the circle needs listening to produce oxytocin, and empathy to reduce the circle stress. So you're caught. You're caught. Now this is really great. Let's go two steps here.

If you don't recognize that there are actually gender differences – testosterone, oxytocin, which actually respond differently to stress – you don't get it. It's just confusing to you. You're saying, "Why does the circle keep talking when there's no solution. Keeps talking about it again and again and again and again and again. And I've tried to solve it. What do you mean I don't love you? I just tried to solve the problem. What do you mean? Why are you getting mad at me for trying to solve the problem? I was loving you and trying to solve the problem." So the line's is in total trouble. There's a huge fight happening. And the line's like, "I don't know what the fuck happened. I was just trying to solve the problem." And the circle calls all of the circle friends and says, "I've been totally disrespected. Line never listens to me. Never." Kind of wild.

Here's a solution. It's wild. Ready for the solution? If the line views the line's mission or goal as listening – turn listening into a goal. If you turn listening into a goal, then turning it into a goal produces testosterone. Completely fascinating. So actually, your goal is to listen. And what are you accomplishing by listening? A very clear objective. You're creating respect and empathy for the circle. So the circle actually feels listened to, not because the line did a pretend listening. In order to do so patch work, which the line doesn't know how to do, line actually accessed testosterone through making listening a goal. Number one. Possibility one.

Possibility two, the line can also access – let's say it's a man – his circle quality. He can actually access the circle that lives in him, because it's not true that men are from Mars and women are from Venus. It's just not true. One planet. One planet. And lines and circles live – and that was the damaging – it wasn't what John intended. But the damaging effect of *Mars and Venus*, for many people, was this notion of, you're either Mars or you're Venus. It's not true. You actually are both the Mars and Venus – you're line and circle. Which means you can't just learn to listen to as a patch work, but you're never going to do it well. You can actually access your circle quality. And actually have delight in developing that circle quality.

Now, just to give you the opposite side for a second. So my very close friend, who I've mentioned often here, like my dharma sister – probably the great teacher of meditative yoga in Kashmir Shaivism today – is Sally Kempton. Sally is, in this respect, a line. So I've talked to Sally every day for the last seven, eight, nine years. We talk about 15 minutes. And sometimes I'll bring a problem. And she will immediately go to solve it. Because she's total line in this regard. And I'm a total circle. I don't want her to solve the problem. I've already thought of the possible solutions. I just want to talk to Sally about it for 10 minutes.

And nine years later, we're just solving this. But it's a classic. So I'm a total circle in this regard. Meaning, I've got a pretty decent head, thank God. So I can think of the options, but actually, I share my life fairly privately. So to be able to talk to Sally about it is actually what I'm looking for. I'm not looking for a solution. I'm looking to talk about it. And I'm a total circle in that dimension. I don't go into a cave and I don't watch football and I hate sports. I don't know why anyone would watch sports. I'm a total circle. I'm like, "Weird." So I've got major circle in those dimensions. And the process of talking per se for me, I use in a particular circle way, which we'll talk about this afternoon. But the point is line/circle.

By understanding gender differences, by not getting caught in them, getting a line quality and circle quality, you actually begin to create a new world. That's where we're moving towards. We're moving towards Unique Self. Unique Self is my essence. It's my Jeff-ness. A window into Unique Self is the precise calibration and integration of line and circle qualities that live in me. In order to do that, I

need to get rid of, I need to let go of, the old images of what being a man and being a woman needs.

We're actually going to begin the next session with doing the ceremony to actually find and identify, what are those images that live in me? We're going to actually get rid of them. We'll ceremonially transform them, let them go, so we then enter into tabula rasa with a clean slate. Literally, a process of recreation. We're going to literally recreate ourselves. Remember, we live in a world in which recreation is possible.

The options available to us are infinite. I can choose to get married. I can choose not to get married. I can choose to be in a partnership. I can choose to be in a serial monogamy. I can choose to have children or not to have children. I can choose to be gay or to be straight or to be bi. The amount of choices available to us is enormous, which means that all of the old role mate relationships that we had – we used to be role mates. We're role mates. We each had to play our basic role, and that basic role of protector, breadwinner, success object, feminine nurturer, house sex object – you had sex objects and success objects. We objectified the body – the woman and the body, the car. But basically, we were in those roles. We were role mates. Within that, we did a little soul mating, but not much. We were basically stuck in being role mates.

For the first time, we've deconstructed those roles. Do you know how shocking that is? We've deconstructed those roles, to some extent. And to some extent they're still in place. We're in this transition moment. We're in a gender transition moment. Lots of the roles are still in place and there's fluidity. So we get to make choices. We can choose the classical role. We can choose something other than the classical role. But we have choices. We can choose classical masculine, classical feminine. We can choose some combination of masculine and feminine. We can move beyond masculine feminine and actually – which is what we're going to do – go to line and circle and say, how am I going to actually combine my lines and circles?

And I've got an enormous amount of options available, which means I'm responsible for the formation of my Unique Self through choosing unique calibration of lines and circles that lives as me. Now that choice is not absolute. I need to take into account my nature. And our natures are different. Because you and I have different natures. We might be overwhelmingly similar, but I'm sure in some part of our combination of lines and circles, we're different. As we should be because we're unique selves. We have to each know our nature. I know my biology, but biology's a tendency. It's not a destiny. So I'm actually responsible for my self-creation.

Now, holiness is self-creation. That's what it is. So for the first time in history, we have the possibility, the capacity for self-creation that never existed before in history. And the way we do it is, we access our uniqueness – step one – as a

quality. You need to figure out, what am I supposed to do? To access uniqueness is to feel into the quality of who you are. And if I say Sean and I say Christian, I'm not confused. I don't say, "Oh." One second. Taste of Sean, taste of Christian. They taste different. They're different qualities. They have different perspectives. You don't have to figure out exactly what to do with it. You just get a sense of your uniqueness and own your uniqueness. And then find a way into a deep revision of your uniqueness through knowing how the lines and circles play in you uniquely.

And it will give you a map that's stunning. Way beyond any placed that Myers Briggs can even begin to dream of. Which is, in many ways, a distorted system. Because this is not a typology of your ego. This is actually how your Unique Self-essence appears in the world. Then what you get to do is, you get to calibrate. You can say, "Let me ramp up a little more circle in those two areas. Let me downplay a little more line over there." But you see it for the first time. And the blessing is that, by the time we leave this weekend, we'll each have actually a personal map of how lines and circles play in our lives, but by enacting it personally, we're enacting it for the dharma for the evolution of love. This is just coming into the world now. And we're going to find it and we're going to play it.

So we'll start in the afternoon with two things. One is we're going to have a Q&A session. So we're just going to start with either a sermon or a Q&A. I don't know the order yet, but we're going to do first a ceremony to let go of old stuff. Probably second. We'll probably start with a Q&A session. Because there was a lot of dharma this morning, and I want everyone to be able to ask, and to talk. We're not going to spend all of the afternoon on it at all, so I'd ask you just to think about what your question is. Write it down, if you have one. If you don't, totally good.

During lunch, five people – before we come back – "You love me." Because that's our context here. Our context is the evolution of love. That's what we're doing. And our dharma is in service of the evolution of love. The evolution of love is to move from "I love you" to "You love me." And from that place, she dances with us. And when she dances with us and the dharma evolves, it comes together. And the dharma's going to be deeper and more profound by the end of this weekend than it is even now. And for me it's clearer now, than it was two hours ago. So we're doing something together. Something's happening.

We've got a big break. In the break, rest, eat, nourish. We just have one small request, which I didn't put into the space yesterday. We just have our little peek-a-boo practice, which is just, during the weekend, if we could all just make a commitment, if that's okay, just to let gossip go. We usually talk about that in the beginning, but the casual remarks we make about other people, just let that addiction go. We're holding people in their glory, in their beauty. Let's talk to a lot of other people, but not about other people. Let's create that sacred container.

And if someone starts to make a little bit of a remark about someone, just say, "Peek-a-boo." And that's part of creating that sacred container.

Five "You love me"s. Think about any kind of inquiry question you might have. As we begin, we'll spend something like 30 minutes on Q&A, if there is Q&A. And then we'll go into ceremony. Then we'll go into lines. Lines, lines, lines. Deep bow, let's just find the silence of presence. Deep bow to the goddess as she dances with us in the center of the room. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. So it is. Amen

07-FRIDAY AFTERNOON PART 1

Part 1

Track: 07-Friday Afternoon Part 1

TRT: 15:30

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Marc: Let's gather our energy and spend just a few minutes really opening up the floor, fully and absolutely. I just ask for your deepest inquiry, which in some sense helps us clarify the dharma. What do we mean by the word dharma? We mean the nature of reality. The nature of reality is, on the one hand, a mystery – and anyone who claims to have dispelled the mystery is lying. And yet, the mystery winks at us, invites us, and beckons to us. The mystery reveals itself. In the laws of spirit, in the laws of nature, the laws of physics, the laws of metaphysics. And those laws derive from, not dogma – we're not interested in dogma.

It's culturally bound. It's contextual. That over-reaches and over-claims, it's rooted in the authority of one person or one institution. Rather, dharma is available to us and transmitted to us. It's both. It's available through transmission, and then through direct experience. It comes from trusted sources and from our own interiors. It comes from the collected wisdom, from the best of the traditional world – all the great traditions – the pre-modern period, the best wisdoms of the modern period and the best wisdom and insight of the post-modern period. And when those are integrated together, we begin to get what I'm calling dharma.

The best take on reality, at this moment as we know it, that we hold in radical audacity and clarity and complete humility. It's an evolving dharma. It gets clearer and clearer and deeper and deeper as it begins to become us, and we become it.

So any inquiry, question, which relates to really anything that we talked about this morning at all? It could be that there's really nothing in the room – that we're in it – which is totally fine. There's no right thing to happen now. And we can wait as long as we'd like for the first question to emerge. But when it does, let it just emerge. We'll listen to it and we'll engage it, however it's engaged. Please Steve,

_____.

Steve: I wanted to ask the question so you can flesh out a point that you were making this morning. It started out as kind of a joke for me, but I've really been inquiring since. So I could make the joke in question. So Himmler's coming back from his routine day at the work and there's Lassie over there and she just saved Timmy. And both of them are at risk and I can only save one. So I'm going to choose Lassie. I'm not going to choose Himmler. But the point you were making was that there's a hierarchy, and that hierarchy seems to imply a value that we should apply to that question. And I just don't feel that. I look at the sentient creatures on the earth, and the deeper I've gone into Unique Self, the more I feel consciousness in other beings. And I don't think the fact that our brain is structured the way it is says anything particularly at all, especially with the higher sentient creatures.

Marc: So let's take a look. That's great. Let's take a look. I totally get it. One, sometimes we kill people. Important to keep in mind. So Himmler was a good dude to be killed. Meaning, what he had done is, he had crossed the line and forfeited – killing 20 million gypsies loses you some rights in the world. Gassing 6 million Jews – not good. So clearly, a human being – qua human being, by virtue of birth, doesn't have absolute right. That's a given. That's one. It's the first part. It's the first address.

The second is, in some correct world – that's why I became a vegetarian. But even when you become a vegetarian, you still generally eat plants. So just notice that. Plants are alive. Plants have some level of intelligence. In the animal world, perhaps a lot. We hear from a voice from heaven. Where did it come from? There it is.

[Laughter]

So yet, we eat a salad. Which means we're making distinctions. And those distinctions are valid. Now it's also true that in the animal world, animals eat animals for food.

So it's a very funny experience when you go to – I take my son Zion, who's having his fifth birthday in September – I take Zion to the aquarium in Monterey. And in the Monterey the aquarium, as you're walking through – it's like one of the world's biggest aquariums. You know the aquarium, of course. Steve's from that place. You walk in – so first, there's a big exhibit about the canaries that were in Monterey, which means all the fish they killed. But no one notices the anomaly.

There's all the sardines walking. There's a big sardine canary thing that everyone's really excited about because it got Monterey and canary growing in Monterey.

And then there's all these signs about preserving the fish. And it's just funny. You walk in and it's like, "Am I missing something in this story?" And almost no one notices the anomaly, but then of course, when you look more closely, and you actually watch the large exhibits – which are basically freshwater in the Pacific ocean there – what you actually see is – for example, there's one of their largest exhibits – freshwater, ocean water sanctuaries – is you've got a whole bunch of hammerhead sharks. And these guys are eating sardines as the exhibit's happening.

In other words, you have a structure in the animal world of eating animals which was not instituted by human beings. Meaning, it's not a function of a human tyranny. That's an important piece of information. And the same thing with plants. Animals are eating plants. It could be that that's a freak accident, but unlikely, in an intelligent universe. So that seems to tell us something about the structure of reality.

Now what we've done is, though, we've turned that difference into oppression. What we've done is – and let me give you a definition of enlightenment. Enlightenment means there are no externalities. I have two definitions of enlightenment. One is enlightenment is sanity. And the second is – which I've never shared with this *Sangha*, which is right here – enlightenment means there's no externalities. Externality means, when you're building a company and you're having negative effects on the environment and the workers in town, and there's all sorts of things happening that are negative, you call those externalities. They're not part of your P&L statement. Those are externalities. Those are dealt with. So that's called being asleep.

Then enlightenment means there's no externalities. It's powerful. So in a human world what we've done is, when we honor the animal world – and even when the ancients hunted, not that long ago, they honored the spirit of the animal that they killed. And there's actually a relationship. Then you're actually in the ecosystem of life in some way, as it was structured by an intelligent cosmos. But when we turn the animal world into an externality – that is to say, we de-sanctify it, we desacralize it – then we allow for, essentially, the mass tyranny and brutal oppression and infliction of pain on the animal world. That's a whole different story.

Because one thing is hunting a deer, the other is raising a deer under conditions of extreme pain for five years in order to produce a certain kind of soft venison. And not letting the deer exercise and creating just a horrific experience of radical suffering and pain. That's what we've done. We've turned difference into oppression. And that's what we need to recover. Those are some important

discernments. I totally appreciate you raising it. Thank you. And great to see you. Awesome. Awesome.

John T: This **lingering** thing of thinking about egocentric, ethnocentric, world centric, cosmocentric – how time plays into that. Another is the idea of balancing a choice that's maybe ethnocentric now, versus the future of world centric.

Marc: Say it again. Say it. I want to make sure I get it.

John T: I'm having a hard time forming the question, but how – not just what level, but when **it's in** consideration. Say weighing how I might preserve something in my ethnocentric past, versus considerations for world centric in this time, or the future. I'm not sure of the question, exactly. Just something wondering about how time plays into –

Marc: Right. You actually raised a really, really important – Did everyone get the sense of his question? Let me try and help that a little bit. And you'll tell me if it's accurate and correct me if I'm wrong.

In other words, whenever you deal with world centric issues, or whenever you deal with realpolitik in general, you're always making a different kind of decision than you're making with an immediate present cause and effect. Whenever you're dealing with large world centric concerns, you're always dealing with a larger expanse of time. So then you have to basically factor in, in a certain sense – where's Sean? That's a lot of what you do when you're trying to run a company.

You've got to factor in long term future scenarios to actually evaluate what you do now. And the more you actually expand your circle of caring – so as long as your circle of caring is you and your peeps, you've got a pretty good sense of what's going to happen and how it's going to play out. If you're dealing with your nation, you think you have a pretty good sense. It's actually much less clear, but still, you can kind of have the conversation. The second you're thinking about the world – all human beings –then it's a much more complex forward-looking trajectory scenario. And the second you're thinking cosmocentric, you're actually taking all life systems into account. So then, the set of things you need to take into account, and the variability, and the future scenario planning becomes infinitely more complex. That's absolutely true. Which is why we actually need specialized attention to actually how we engage these issues.

Now let me say two words about, and then we'll go forward. This takes us into an entirely different conversation. So I don't want to go down this road. It's quite an important road. But I would say 9.8 times out of 10, when people are commenting on public policy, they're looking at world centric future-trajectory issues as immediate issues happening right in front of them. And they actually don't have the ability to factor in the larger picture. The ostensible job of policy makers is to

actually factor that larger picture in. But it actually requires an enormous amount of depth, and a very, very wide-lens view.

So for example – I'll just give you one example; I'm not going to go into it now – but even if you look at something like healthcare. When people comment on ObamaCare in America, they're commenting as if like, "I'm sick today. What's going to happen when I'm sick today?" It's actually not the issue. The issue is, how does X affects Y, which affects Y, which affects Y? And how does that exponentialize either health or suffering? It requires a much deeper maturity and a much deeper investment in thinking. Meaning, if I'm in a simple relationship with reality, I think simply. If I'm in a deeper relationship with reality, I think more deeply. Now the opposite of the holy is not the unholy – the opposite of the holy is laziness. The opposite of the sacred is lazy.

I'll just give you an example, and we'll go into our ceremony. This is just a simple example, and I give it because it just came to mind now, but it's just a good example. I have here, this is 10 pages of notes that I wrote for today's talk. We're going to do this afternoon. I wrote these last night and today, even though I've talked about this over the last 10 years more than once. I've talked about it. I've thought about it. I've got an old set of notes. Not a problem. But I won't teach from those set of notes because it won't do it. Because it's disrespectful to you. It's disrespectful to the sangha. Even though no one would know. But something changes. Right? What I basically did last night, until very, very late last night, is I relearned all the material that I've thought about for the last decade. Why? It's respect for the sangha, but also it's actually asking her to grace us with insight.

In other words, you have to always watch out for laziness. And in redoing this, four things clarified. Because when you step in and you say, "I'm going to be fully –" That's what I mean when I say, "Be generous with your voice. Take responsibility for your arousal." Whatever's happening, step and just keep stepping and keep opening, and when you keep opening, reality opens in response. There are, if you will – if we can stick with the neuroscience framework for a moment – reality is built on mirror neurons. As you open, reality opens to you. As you close, reality closes to you. It's an absolute principle.

So in that sense, our ability to think in world centric and cosmocentric terms, which is this evolution of love, requires an evolution in the way we think. And everyone's capable of it. There's no one who's not capable of it. I'll just give you a really simple practice to do it. Simple great practice. Practice that I use myself all the time. Because I won't talk about an issue unless I've read, not from a newspaper, one position paper in favor, and another against.

So although I lean left on most social issues, and partially right on a number of fiscal issues – so I kind of split – because again, if you go one way, it usually doesn't make sense. So I'm both a democrat, a republican and libertarian, depending on what the particular issue is at hand, because I look at the issue.

But if I haven't looked at a position paper pro and con, I won't talk about it. It's great practice. We talk about so much that we have no idea what we're talking about. And actually, everyone's capable. You just go online, you can find a position paper, pro and against, any issue. Read through it once. And at least you'll begin to sense. And that's part of the arousal of being a citizen. It's a big deal.

Okay. Awesome. Last –going once, going twice – anything else from this morning? Okay. So let's head into ceremony.

08-FRIDAY AFTERNOON PART 2

Part 2

Track: 08-Friday Afternoon Part 2

TRT: 22:54

Speakers

Marc Gafni

[00:00:00]

Marc: We're looking at going beyond Venus and Mars. Beyond Venus and Mars. Meaning, we don't want to be lost in the Venus and Mars paradigm. We're going to leave behind the images that we have of masculine and feminine, and man and woman. And by the way, about two thirds of the images were negative – if you want to just track here – about a third positive. But all of them, other than the ones that are constructive and beautiful for us – we heard one like that from Carol about the safety of the feminine, which is one of the most beautiful images. But all of the images that aren't serving us, as Vyana said, we're leaving us behind.

We engage that ritual because ritual actually moves something, and we're leaving that behind. We're actually engaging in an evolutionary leap in which we're inviting an intermarriage. And actually, the vision of beyond Venus and Mars – actually, the entire vision we outlined this morning – has glimmerings. They're not there yet. They're lost in culture. They're confused in all sorts of ways, but there's a core glimmering, there's a core resonance, there's a core invitation in the great mystical traditions which is called hieros gamos.

Hieros gamos means "God is fuck." A phrase we've heard here occasionally. Of course, it means something particular in our dharma. It's not a casual phrase. God is fuck is not about fucking around. It's about something much more profound, much deeper. God is fuck means God is Eros. It means that reality is the coming together of lines and circles. There are lines and circles all the way up, and lines and circles all the way down. That's the nature of reality. When protons and

electrons are allured together, you've got lines and circles playing. The force of allurements and repulsion, autonomy and communion, actually moves all the way up and all the way down reality. All the way up, all the way down. Yoni and phallus, all the way up and all the way down. And one of the places it expresses itself is in the human realm. God is Eros.

Hieros gamos means that there's a divine marriage happening. Now when a divine marriage is happening that means that the masculine/feminine principles – as they used to be called – and we've now evolve them. The line and circle principles. And I'm going to keep taking you back and forth until we make that movement together. The line and circle principles of reality are seeking to get married. They're seeking fuck. They're seeking Eros. The divine marriage doesn't mean that the divine masculine and feminine went shopping.

"Oh, Bergdorf Goodman, we're married." No, it means Eros. It means merging. That's what it means. So the expression of that line and circle merging in the human realm, God is Eros, that Eros in our realm is the lines and circles uniquely calibrating and merging in me. And when those lines and circles come together in a new inner marriage in me, then I affect and cause the divine marriage.

Wow. Life started to get interesting. It's not just about my narrow reality, but actually, if I actually awaken to my divinity, and at the same time I'm serving the larger reality in devotion, I actually realize that I'm a unique marriage. That within me, there's a unique marriage. That actually, as Luria writes in the 16th century – and he didn't have all of the gender material we have. He didn't have a lot of things we had. So everything we've said this morning was important. We're not making a regressive move. But we're going to borrow his model. He writes, "All of the reality, every moment of reality, every situation is always an inner penetration of lines and circles. And when the lines and circles don't interpenetrate, evil is born. And when the lines and circles penetrate appropriately and receive appropriately, then blessing flows in the world."

[Foreign Language] Circles and lines. That's actually the structure of reality itself. So that when that intermarriage takes place within me, when I actually incarnate hieros gamos, then I'm awakening to my enlightenment. And that is – Tom, our very first conversation back in the day – that's very different than a classical true self, no self enlightenment. I'm not just awakening to the fact that I'm a no self. I'm awakening to the fact that I'm a Unique Self.

But my Unique Self is the unique interpenetration of lines and circles happening uniquely as me, and that causes a complete union on high. Hieros gamos.

[00:05:00]

That causes the yin and yang, the Shiva and Shakti. That causes those principles to come together. Those principles come together because they live in me. And when they come together in me, I participate in the evolution of union in the cosmos. Because as they merge in me, they come together.

So the voice of the divine speaks – we said earlier this morning, referencing long Wisdom Schools from five and six years ago. The voice of the divine, as it were in the mythic image of our culture – *Raiders of the Lost Ark*. Harrison Ford. He's getting old, but looking good. He's had a couple of recent movies. *Raiders of the Lost Ark*. The ark is the Ark of the Covenant. And above the covenant are the cherubs. The cherubs are – whether they're gay, lesbian or straight, it don't matter. They're line and circle principles that come together. And when they merge sexually, from the space in between their merger – they're utterly merged, but even when you're merged, there's a space in between. Just feel the gorgeousness of the image. From that space in between, the voice of the divine speaks.

That's what Yab-Yum is about in the great Hindu tradition. Which why the temples have that image, because that image of coming together is an image of enlightenment. Enlightenment is when Shiva and Shakti are in complete union. When [*Foreign Language*], the principle of line, [*Foreign Language*], the principle of circle – when those merge in me, then I cause that merger to happen in the higher realms.

That's true not only in individual, but actually in every situation, in every political situation, in every organizational situation, in every moment of church politics and in every moment of the development of Shalom, or the center, there's always a play between lines and circles. And if the lines and circles come together and they form a unique union, then blessing is born. And if they don't, then you have exile. If they don't, you have alienation. If they don't, you have the coming apart at the seams. So the actual image for what we're calling beyond Venus and Mars is the image of hieros gamos.

Paradoxically, the ancient image of hieros gamos now becomes alive in us. In the ancient world, it was only the priest and the priestess who could even think about ritualizing hieros gamos. As we democratize enlightenment, we say [*Foreign Language*] "You shall be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." We're all priests. We're all priestesses. We've democratize enlightenment. But now, democratization enlightenment now takes on an entirely new meaning.

It begins with the awakening as your Unique Self, beyond true self. But then it continues into uniquely penetrating and fucking yourself open and letting yourself be fucked open by the precise penetration of your lover and beloved. And of your lines and circles. So the precise extent that I'm lost in depression, the precise extent that I'm inert, the precise extent that I'm soft where I want to be hard, or I'm dry where I want to be wet. It means that there's something missing – I'm not connecting. We're not docking.

The lines and circles aren't penetrating, or some of the lines and circles are penetrating – others aren't. Because there's qualities of lines and qualities of circle. So what I need to know is I need to actually identify, what are the circle

qualities? What are the line qualities? What are their shadow expressions? What are their light expressions? And how do they play in my life? How am I uniquely incarnating hieros gamos in my reality? That's why I'm alive. That's the whole thing.

Now that's not an old therapeutic culture. That's not, "Let me work it out so I can be a little more functional in culture and be slightly happier, and have a little more fun before I die." Boring and futile. But if I actually experienced myself as being infinitely adequate and dignified – which is my true nature – and chosen by reality. So what it means to be a Unique Self, we said last night, is to be chosen by reality. I'm chosen, therefore I'm radically affirmed and radically dignified. And I'm chosen particularly to be a particular unique configuration expression of lines and circles merging in a way in me that they never have or will merge in any other human being.

All of a sudden, my issues aren't about me working it out. It's about me working it out for the sake of all reality. It's about me finding that union – the rapture of my union. When I find the rapture of my union, then I arouse rapture in all the worlds.

[00:10:00]

Oh my God. Oh my Goddess. That's the interior eye of the spirit revealing and disclosing itself.

I'll give you just two short texts, just for a second. One text from the thirteenth century. And I translate it from the Aramaic and it reads something like as follows. And it's describing, of course, hieros gamos. And it says, "Reality, all forms of reality, which does not hold in it a married masculine and feminine." Again, this text – like the Kashmir Shaiva text, it's like the Daoist's text – identify lines and circles with masculine and feminine.

But that's where they're going. We're going to take the next step. "All reality, all forms of reality, which don't hold in them a married masculine and feminine, meaning a merged masculine and feminine. Masculine and feminine that are both receiving and penetrating each other are not higher forms and not reality at all. And their presence is not truly present, and blessing does not flow from them." As it is written, God bless them masculine and feminine. [*Foreign Language*]

Blessing flows when the line and circle penetrate. Blessing only flows when the masculine and feminine dance in their higher one. The Zohar was very clear. The *Book of Illumination*, 13th century, was very clear that masculine and feminine was not about men and women. Because they're actually talking about – all the masculine and feminine characters in the Zohar actually are all men. The _____ [*foreign language*] 11:27 Zohar, the company of people, the band that made up the Zohar were men who each played masculine and feminine roles. So it actually had nothing to do with gender. It was about these principles of reality playing in them.

And then Luria, 300 years later, called these principles lines and circles. And I abstracted Luria and then put him in our evolutionary larger context, Unique Self, all the seven or eight major points we made this morning, and we now introduce a new structure of reality. To be alive is to identify the unique inner penetration of lines and circles as they play in me. That's my marriage. That's my wedding. And that's what we just sang a wedding song. And that's going to be our chant for the rest of our journey because we're here to get married.

And it's not about whether I'm legally married or not. Don't get caught up on that. It's not about that. It's about getting married. It's about actually having a wedding. And whenever you have a wedding, what happens at the wedding? It's paradoxically – the greatest, mystical secrets are always hidden in the open. The best place to hide something is in public, because no one looks. That's always what happens.

So what do we do trans-culturally at weddings? There's always a finger and a ring. Now isn't that interesting? Is that the only way everybody in reality could decide to do it? And in the classical mystical image for couple of thousands of years, the mystical secret, the esoteric secret, was hidden in a place, because public culture couldn't hold it yet. But it was yet hidden in the ceremony. It was actually the bride who gave her finger, and the groom who gave a ring.

It was actually counterintuitive. Because the statement being made was that the groom says – and again, the old way of saying it – "I'm going to commit in this relationship to provoking and emerging my feminine. So I'm giving a ring. I'm standing for my ring." And the bride prefers a finger. So the bride prefers a line – phallus symbol – and says, "I, in this relationship, am going to be provoked and called to the fullness of my masculine."

So actually, in every wedding, mystically, there are actually four weddings happening. There's the classical wedding between the bride and the groom. And in the classical context till 100 years ago till we had evolved sexuality, that was between a man and a woman. Now it's between masculine and feminine, gay or straight. But you've got, that's the wedding. So it's between the two partners – first wedding.

Second wedding – between the line and circle. Now you notice I'm just going to keep moving back between the languages until we just fully land on line and circle. The second wedding is the line and circle – within whoever the groom is – marry. The third wedding is, of course, the line and circle – within the bride – marry. And the fourth wedding hieros gamos, divine marriage. That causes the divine marriage. So those four weddings are taking place.

[00:15:00]

And in a classical wedding, all four are taking place, but every minute of every day all three of them are taking place. It's always happening, all the time. Which

is why in classical Lurianic mysticism, in Safed for example, where Jesus walked above the Sea of Galilee which inspired the Mennonite tradition. The classical image is, before you do anything you say, [*Foreign Language*]. That's my mantra. I say it when I wake up in the morning and I say it a thousand times a day. "May this next act I do be for the sake of the union of all lines and circles." [*Foreign Language*] Aramaic. "May this act be for the union of lines and circles."

So we're now transgender. We're transgender. What's my identity? I'm a Unique Self. Unique Self means I contain within me lines and circles. I'm a unique configuration of lines and circle that can bring a unique blessing to the world that can flow only from me, that can flow only that birth, that creativity, that evolutionary newness, that novelty can emerge only from me. That's hieros gamos. That's what we're talking about. Beyond Venus and Mars is the intermarriage. And you can't do any version of the outer marriage before doing the intermarriage. That's the paradox. What we do is we basically bypass the intermarriage and we go for various versions of the outer marriage.

I want to introduce one more frame, and then we're going to go all the way into at least half of the qualities of the line, depending on the time. I'm going to try and get through all of them. Okay, but here we go.

The question to every life is, what's the context of your life? That's always the question. And the question to every relationship is, what's the context of your relationship? The context of most lives is some version of survival with some elementary pleasantness around feeling like I'm doing something vaguely meaningful and having some sense of security and comfort through some sense of family and relationship. That's what most lives aspire to. The majority of lives on the planet today – overwhelming majority. And the context for most relationships is to dull the ache and edge of loneliness. It provides sometimes a safe avenue for sexuality and creates some level of security.

Now those are valid contexts for life and for marriage. They're just insufficient. I'm not in any way denigrating any of those. Let's not denigrate security. Only people who've never experienced insecurity denigrate security. Security's important. Dulling the edge of loneliness is important. Let's not knock it; comfort's important. But that's not a sufficient context for aliveness. That's not a sufficient context for Eros. That's not a sufficient context for a purpose driven life. That's not a sufficient context for vitality. That's not a sufficient context for joy.

The question is, what's the context? So the context for an individual life is living my Unique Self and giving my deepest gifts. And from that place I feel and experience my full aliveness. That's what the statement means when it says, "Don't ask what the world needs, ask what makes you alive, because the world needs you to be alive." That's what we need. Full radical aliveness, full joy and joy and aliveness are a corollary – a byproduct – of living Unique Self. Now

Carol Paul. What's the context for a relationship? Unique Self. That's exactly the point. The context for a relationship is not the furtherance of the individual.

My colleague Schnarch wrote a book called *Passionate Marriage*. Where he misunderstands relationships. It says, "The purpose of relationship is primarily to heighten individuality." My other colleague and friend Harville Hendrix gets it precisely wrong on the other side. Harville says, "The individual doesn't exist. Only the couple exists." The couple is the fundamental unit. And you actually serve the couplehood. Both are, of course, true, but partial. Each one is actually creating an idolatry around either individuality or couplehood.

But actually, a relationship serves the unique "we" which emerges when two "me"s come together and then they can see something inspired by "she," which is larger than both of them.

[00:20:00]

That's couplehood. I'm actually infused by "she." The unique "we" emerges. And that unique "we" is when two unique selves hold a shared vision together. And there is nothing more erotic. There's nothing more enlivening. There's nothing more passionate, nothing more exciting than holding a shared vision and living into that shared vision, in some sense, together. That's a context for relationship. That's the Unique Self-relational context.

And whenever I talk to someone they say, "Wow. We've been together for long time. It's not working." "Why'd you guys get together?" "Because we liked dancing and Italian food?" Now, dancing's good. Italian food's okay. But it's an insufficient context. The context is beyond Venus and Mars. How do we create together a hieros gamos? In other words, I want a hieros gamos to take place within me, and I want a hieros gamos to take place between me and my partner. Whether it's two woman, two men, or a man and a woman. I want there to be a divine marriage. We are the divine coupling. We are re-enacting the very hieros gamos in our intermarriage, which is the very causation of creation and reality itself.

That's a context for coming together. That's a context that can survive an enormous amount of pain. Now if someone's too narcissistic, too controlling, too involved in just fulfilling their own agenda, then you can't meet. You can't create an inner marriage. Both sides have to give something up. It's not what you get. It's what you're willing to give up in order to form that space together.

So the context we're looking for is beyond Venus-Mars relationship. And with each side has gone through, or is going through, their own process of intermarriage. And ideally your partner – be it your internal partner or your exterior partner – whichever one it is – calls you to higher and higher visions and versions of this intermarriage. So instead of the Venus and Mars – the old Venus and Mars – being just about, how do we communicate better? Beyond Venus and

Mars says, "No, no. How do we actually appear as genderqueer?" Unique selves, unique identities in the world in which this unique calibration of lines and circles is the unique coming together of these principles in us that birth new blessing. That birth new reality. That address a unique need in my unique circle of intimacy and influence.

So for those of you who have been here for bunch of Wisdom Schools, you begin to see how the pieces weave together. How many people get a sense of it? People that have been here. Here's how the pieces weave together, right? Okay. So now let's dive in.

09-FRIDAY AFTERNOON PART 3 – LINE 1 – HIERARCHY STATUS

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Part 3

Track: 09-Friday Afternoon Part 3 – Line 1 – Hierarchy Status

TRT: 41:12

Marc: So we're going to look at 10 qualities of lines. And from now on – although I'm going to use examples of men, sometimes of women, but I want to be really clear – we're talking about lines here. We're not talking about men, or even the masculine. Which is too closely linked to men. We're talking about lines. The quality of lines. And line qualities exist in men and in women. So line qualities – we'll recognize them. So what are the qualities – know thyself. What are the qualities of a line? And what we'd like to do is just move through, gently, some 10 qualities of the line. And I'm going to start in the middle. I'm going to start with a couple of qualities that are really quick and easy to grok so we can get how this works. And then we'll move from there. So let's start.

First quality of lines. Now all of these qualities – I'm going to ask this for everybody in the room, what I'm about to ask, but it's a special request for those people who are really deep in the Dharma. And you know who you are. So that each one of these, I'm going to ask everyone in the room, if they can, to actually take a note in which they write, for each quality, where this quality plays in your life. But not in a word or two, just a couple of sentences. And where the light – we're going to talk about the light version of each quality, and the shadow version of each quality, and we're going to write a book together now. So I'm going to ask everyone – and that's actually the best way to listen. We're going to have an interactive Dharma flowing here.

So after each quality, we're going to look at, okay, where does this play in my life, in its light version and in its shadow version? So this now begins to become

completely real for everyone. And I'm going to ask everyone if – we're going to create at the end – ask them to really – everybody, everybody, everybody, but especially the people who are deep in the Dharma – to save your notes and we're going to create just one address and ask everyone to send in, for each quality, it's light and shadow version. So we're actually now, as a sangha, dharmically, we're going to try and unpack this Dharma, and I hope that we have a complete exchange here. I am looking forward to learn from you 50 times more than you learn for me. So I'm really asking you that we exchange here, and be my teacher, and give me any wisdom, insight you have. And I'm at your feet and devotion. So ready to rock? Ready to go? Here we go.

So the first quality that we're going to talk about is the quality of hierarchy and status. Hierarchy and status. As a quality of the line. Hierarchy and status. Now one of the ways to see hierarchy and status, and as they play, is to actually see how it plays in life. But first, let's just say, what does hierarchy and status mean? Hierarchy means there's a line, and on the line there's something that's higher and something that's lower. That's the nice thing about lines and circles – they, geometrically, are very, very compelling. It's a line. Now how much room is there for somebody to be on top of the line? How many people can be on top of the line? One person, a few if it's a very big top of the head of the needle. But basically, not a lot of room there. So by its nature, you're either higher on the line or your lower on the line. Now higher and lower doesn't need to be negative or positive. So for example, as I said this morning, a molecule is higher in the line than a quark. Because a molecule is hierarchically higher, meaning it has more depth. A molecule contains within it atoms and quarks. A complex molecule has molecules, atoms and quarks. A cell has complex molecules, molecules, atoms and quarks. An organelle has cells – you get the point. So there's a hierarchy. Something has more than something else has.

So hierarchy is a quality of reality. And it's a critical quality of reality. Take hierarchy out of reality. And one of the corollaries of hierarchy is status. Now watch for a second. We almost automatically zoom in on the negative of status. Status. The word doesn't sound to us like love. Love. Status. Status is not a negative. Status means my position. There's a shadow to status. But status, by itself, just means an honest appraisal of my position. Now status doesn't mean famous. Fame was an idea that came to the fore most powerfully in the 16th century, which the average person reached for fame. And Jacob Burckhardt wrote a very, very important essay on fame. And look at Erich Fromm's book *Escape from Freedom*, Chapter 2, the second footnote, he goes through Jacob Burkhardt's essay on fame.

So fame is an attempt to acquire status, not through having actually done the work. I'm famous. But fame actually is a neutral term. Hierarchy in the original church meaning meant genuine status. Genuine ontology. Meaning you've worked for it. Fame and cliché are similar. Cliché means you want the experience without doing the work. You want to act, so it's cliché. It's saccharine. When we say

something's cliché or saccharine, what we're saying is, it's trying to evoke the experience, but it's not really it. It's cliché, it's saccharine. Fame is like it's trying to invoke status, but without actually having done the deep work to actually attain status. And so fame has become a shadow of status.

And fame's got a long and unholy history. As a way of actually creating status without actual integrity. We have things like *People* magazine. Who's in *People* magazine? What's the standard for being in *People* magazine? Being famous. There's no other standard. There's no integrity standard, there's no depth standard, there's no perception standard, there's no love standard, there's no capacity standard of any real manner. It's being famous. Or being attractive in a particular kind of way. So fame is a shadow of status, but status by itself is important.

Status means, what's my appropriate place in the hierarchy of life? What are my capacities? What's my accomplishment? What's my realization? And all of those have an enormously important effect on how we actually evaluate ourselves, and – no less importantly – they have an effect on how we actually play in the world. We're motivated, structurally, to attain status. We're motivated to accomplish. That's one of our prime motivations is status. Hierarchy. Which is, by itself, completely legitimate. It's one of the ways that we actually engage the world.

No status should be defined by goodness, ethics, integrity, truth. When status actually chooses externalities as its basic barometer, that's where the problem starts. But status isn't a problem. Without status, there's no discernment. And actually, there's moves in the feminization of American education, for example, to remove testing. Entire moves in a number of places in education that say, "Let's remove testing. Status hierarchy shouldn't exist because that's a masculine value." But actually, when you remove appropriate testing, appropriate challenge, appropriate competition, you remove one of the core dynamic alive qualities of reality. So status and hierarchy are, by themselves, qualities of the line. Something's above and something's below. I actually engage in a healthy way to realize my most appropriate status.

Now I'm going to give you just a little view into the future here. Paradoxically, in an ultimate world of hieros gamos, every person attains their status, and that status is perfect, and no one wants any status other than their own. That's actually what Unique Self means. I want to read you a little later, tomorrow, a mystical text which describes a redeemed reality, a Nirvana reality, in which everyone's in their status. Because your status actually is your Unique Self. Your status is being precisely who you are, being at your precise place and right place in the hierarchy.

Where you define yourself, not by exterior superficial comparison to someone else, but actually your place in the hierarchy, your status, is defined in the relationship to, have you fulfilled on the fullness of your Unique Self? And if you haven't, you're a lower status. And if you have, you're a higher status. So you actually begin to envision a world of unique selves where everyone's in their

precise right status. We're not yet there. So we still have status in its shadow forms. But status in its light form is the full realization of my complete actualization. That's fantastic. It's motivating, it's enlivening, it's energizing. It's a line quality.

In its shadow form, status will play as an externality. It's comparative. It's superficial, it's based on fame. And what I'll begin to do is, since I haven't realized my unique status – my unique gifts, my unique contribution – I'll begin to compete needlessly to gain a false status in order to look good. So that's where status begins to play in the shadow. So it's got a shadow form, and it's got a light form. Just take a second to try and identify, in writing, just quietly, what's your status? What's your light status? What's your appropriate status? What's your place in life? Which is another way of saying, what's my Unique Self? That's my particular place, it's where I belong in the hierarchy of living and being. Now before we talk and identify shadow status – status in its shadow, which we've already talked about – I'm just going to give you a couple of plays of how this plays in the world. Story.

A couple are both professors. They're living in different cities. And in this particular couple, man and woman in this couple. And whenever the man – in this story, the man is in the line role, and the woman's in the circle role. And again, we'll see reverse stories. So whenever someone meets them and says, "Wow. That must be so hard for you guys to manage the relationship. You're in different cities." So the circle person in the relationship says, "Wow. I totally appreciate that." And tries to explain how we work it. And the line dude in the story is always offended. Like, "Why are you mixing in my business?" And the circle says to the line, "What's the problem? These people are just saying – they're being empathetic to us. It's hard, we live in different cities." And the line person – in the story, the man – says, "No. They're actually saying that they're better than us. That our relationship's not quite working. That they're in a real relationship, that our marriage is somehow not real."

So look what happens. So the circle interprets the comment in terms of affiliation, communion, intimacy – which we'll talk about tomorrow. And the line interprets in terms of status/hierarchy. Get it? So the line's offended. And whenever it comes up, the line is just annoyed and brushes the question off and says, "What? We're totally fine. What's the problem?" Because somehow the line interprets reality through a hierarchical status lens, and then sees this inquiry into this unconventional marriage situation as somehow putting them at lower status. So that's a line/circle interaction, which could happen on either side.

So for example, again, in that story, I would be a circle. Let's just have a little quick poll in the room. How many people in that story, meaning if you're living in different cities from your partner and someone comes to you and says, "Hey, man. That must be really hard. Wow, I don't know how you guys do it." How many people would view that as intimacy/communion? "Wow, thanks. I really

appreciate that." And chat about it. Circle response. Or actually a little offended. Like, "What are you getting in my life for? It's totally fine. No problem." Line response. See the difference? So many people in the room would have a line response? Take a look. It's fantastic. Okay, good. So we've got a mixture of men and women in the room holding the line response. Fantastic. How many people would have a circle response? Okay, great. You see that? Lines and circles. You just saw it play. You see what just happened?

Now watch. It's wild to see it. In the sociolinguistic literature, this is a man/woman story. It's not a man and woman story. Isn't that stunning? You just see it, right here in the room. You just saw the Dharma happening. It's like, wow. Let's go through a couple of them. Actually, this is a ton of fun. When does she get offended, in this story? She gets offended – as long as someone's saying, "Wow, it must be so hard." Right, right, right? But when someone actually says directly, "How do you manage a long distance romance?" when they get explicit, then she gets offended. Why did she get offended? Because now it's a violation of intimacy. It's inappropriate communion. It's inappropriate intimacy. So as long as it's a general thing. "Wow, how do you guys work it?" Then she views that as affiliative. But the second it starts to – long-distance romance – and it kind of begins to touch more directly intimacy, then in this particular story, the professor, who's the woman, begins to get offended. Why? Not because it's affected status, because it's affected intimacy.

Okay, three. Let's keep going. Just to see how these play. It's a true story about a friend of mine who was a very, very well-known rabbi. I knew him 25, 30 years ago. And I remember when he hit 60. And when hit 60, something happened, and something opened in him. And he became a little softer, a little less of an edge, he started mentoring younger rabbis. I was one of them. And something shifted. So I asked him I said, "Jacob, what happened?" And I remember so clearly what he said to me.

He said to me, "I realized when I hit 60 that I was never going to get that job that I wanted. That congregation. It just wasn't going to happen. And for the first time, I had to shatter the tyranny of the dream. And until then, I didn't realize that I viewed every other rabbi as a competitor. Even though I was friendly and nice, but basically, everybody was going for that same job. So I actually couldn't open up. Because I interpreted reality unconsciously in that hierarchy line status dimension. And when I let go of that dimension of status/hierarchy, something opened in my heart and I saw, I began coming a mentor, and I've actually never been as open as I was at this time."

So that's, again, see the play? That's the hierarchy/status dimension, third story at play. So now just take a second and see if you can find that story in your life. Whether you're a man or a woman. Can you find that story at play and jot it down? Somewhere in your life? Now what are we doing here? We're doing sacred autobiography. We're doing sacred autobiography. So it's when you actually find

it in yourself, it begins to become alive. I'm inviting everyone to just go in deep and find it. It doesn't have to be precisely, but we can all locate it. And when you begin to locate it, then what happens is, your line becomes conscious. To say it in a fancy way, your line, which is a subject, becomes an object. And then your line's living inside you unconsciously, then you can see your line at play. And when you can see it at play, you can transform it.

And I'm talking particularly now about the shadow. There's the shadow of a line. There's the shadow of a line. Good? Keep writing if you're writing. For those who aren't, I'm going to give you another example. Image four. He's working at a department store. I worked at one of those department stores when I was 15, 16. This big, huge department store in Columbus, Ohio. This is a story I heard from her. She's working at a department store and there's another woman who's above her. And this is a line story.

But there's a woman in the story. So another woman is above her who's in her department with her. And this woman in the department everybody loves. Why does everyone love her? Carolyn's her name. Everyone loves Carolyn because Carolyn flouts the rules. She's like a super successful manager saleswoman. But doesn't give in reports, comes late, cracks jokes when the manager is – so Carolyn's like wildly popular. Both wildly successful and she's flaunting the rules. Then, Carolyn gets promoted. And Carolyn gets promoted and everyone's like, "Awesome. Carolyn's going to be our boss. This is going to be fantastic." Carolyn becomes the most rigid, hard boss around. So everyone's like, "WTF? What happened to Carolyn?" So what happened to Carolyn? You tell me. What happened? Tell me what happened? What happened? So what was it before, what was it afterwards? What's the basic, exactly, what's happening?

Speaker: Her joy was undermining the _____.

Marc: In other words, Carolyn is a line. So she sees everything in terms of status and hierarchy. And therefore, she's uncomfortable when she's experiencing herself lower in the hierarchy. So now she flouts the hierarchy. She defies the hierarchy in order to affirm her own status. But once she's higher in the hierarchy, then she's higher in the hierarchy, everyone else is lower, so she reifies her higher place in the hierarchy. But her basic quality is a line quality. Does everyone get what happened?

In other words, as long as I'm interpreting the world through status and hierarchy, so if I feel like I'm lower in the hierarchy, I'm going to flout the hierarchy to show that I'm not really lower. Because that's my interpretive lens. Now that I've been promoted, well, I interpret the world through line and hierarchy. I'm happy to be higher in the hierarchy, so I'm going to be really rigid about it to actually affirm my place in the hierarchy. But both cases are basically about a woman who's a line. It's a line quality. And it's actually the same principle operating all the way through. Everyone get that?

So you're beginning to see how this quality of line plays. It's a real quality. Give you one more. Anyone ever been on a narrow street? Five. You're on a narrow street and it's a classical situation. We're going to do this one line/circle in a classical man/woman. So woman's going down the street, guy coming the other way, she wants to park, he stops the traffic and motions to her, "Take that space." So there's X amount of studies on this. So your classical man, your classical line, motions to woman, "Take that space," usually what the woman will do is she'll wave and say thank you and take the space. If, however, a man motions to another man and says, "Take the space," he'll wave and say, "No, no. You take it. Go ahead." How many people recognize that?

Whoa, what's that? So this is a classical – what's happening? In this story, the man is a line, and by giving permission he's both giving a gift, but he's also asserting his place in the hierarchy. And the woman in this story is a circle, so she's not interpreting it as a hierarchical status exchange. She's interpreting it as a communion, an affiliative exchange. And she's, "Great, I'll take the space." But when another dude, line dude, comes down the line and he's offered the space, says, "Fuck you." I mean, nicely. Like, "Actually, I don't need that. You go and I'll park afterwards. Thank you." Like, "I'm not going to have you up-one me and control this on the line." And none of that's said. But 9 times out of 10 the dude who's the line dude – and now that there's a change in culture, and more and more women are actually actively working, and therefore activating much more testosterone and engaged, more and more women won't take the space. So when a woman's in the middle of her day and in testosterone mode, "No, you take the space." Or, she might revert back into a circle mode. But what's happening here is a line/circle play. How I'm interpreting reality, and it's happening all the time.

Opening a door would be a sixth example. I'm opening a door for someone. Is that status/hierarchy/line? Or is that circle, which might be a form of communion. One last example. And this is the example that... Let me just give one or two to really get it and we'll move on. Here's an example. So you just moved to a new town and you've got a new apartment and you're calling the people that need to install the new sinks. And they say, "Oh my God. We don't have anyone to come out and put up your new marble sink for another six weeks." You're starting your job in four weeks. You need the sink. What do you do? So if you're a line, what you'll almost always do is, in a kind of oblique way, you'll assert authority. "Listen, I'm here for this major job, I'm like the chairman of Coca-Cola and we're buying up Pepsi next week and I would totally appreciate –" Right? You'll assert status. Or you'll say, "Oh yeah. You're company? I golf with your boss. He such a great guy." Not in an obnoxious way, you'll just assert that you have status in the story.

If you're a circle, what you might do is you might say – you'll have one of two moves you'll make. One move you'll make is you'll create intimacy, affiliation. You'll start talking and, "Oh, I can't believe we're from the same town. That's wild. We're both from Nantucket. Wow. And you'll start talking about – or your

conversation will go to some television story you both like. But you'll seek a way of sameness, of affiliation, of intimacy. Or you'll take a one-down status. You'll say, "God, I can't believe it. I'm here for this new job, I have two kids, I just got divorced. I totally need your help." The line's never going to do that. Not a chance in hell. But the circle will do that. And the circle doesn't view that as being a loss. I'm actually being vulnerable and creating intimacy through being vulnerable.

Now, here's what's interesting. In all the classical studies that look at this, what happens is, you ask the line about what the circle did, they say it was manipulative. They say it was manipulative. You ask the circle what the line did, they say it was manipulative. So each one things what they're doing is totally legitimate, and what the other side's doing is manipulative. Why? Because what's the prism through which you see reality? And if you see reality, your unconscious prism, is basically a hierarchal/status reality, then of course, that's what you should activate to appropriately move forward. So why would you try and activate intimacy? Who cares that you're from the same town? That's so completely manipulative. But if you view the world as fundamentally an intimate place, then why are you mentioning that you play golf with the owner of that tile shop. That's completely manipulative. The question is, what's your prism on reality? So it's always a line/circle meeting. Good?

Okay, that's the end of quality one. We've got its light. Its light is clear. Let's just say one more thing about its light. Because I want to really drive home the light of hierarchy/status. Hierarchy/status builds hospitals. You've got to get that. I have more capacity, I'm healthier than you, I have the ability, the talent to go to Rwanda and bring a wall to Rwanda. I'm going to. That's what I'm going to do. In other words, hierarchy means, I have more privilege, more status, more capacity, and therefore I have obligation, and therefore I'm going to go take care of you. It's a big deal.

Hierarchy is not hierarchy. Status means I have a unique gift and I have responsibility. Hierarchy, the line quality, creates the protector. I draw a line. I stand on this place on the line. Don't cross it and attack my family. It's a line. Line in the sand. Don't cross that line. I'm defending this line. That's my obligation from my place in this particular hierarchy. So the hierarchy creates hospitals, it creates social services, it creates philanthropy. Hierarchy is very powerful. You remove hierarchy and status from the game, you undercut most of philanthropy and most good works.

Now I'm going to be really careful here. We're going to go for, by the end of this week, we're going to go for hieros gamos. So we're going to take the Goddess and the God and they're going to marry in ecstasy. But right now what we're doing is we're trying to actually deconstruct and see what's happening. So that the positive of hierarchy/status is Unique Self, the protector who draws the line, and the builder of hospitals, the one who takes responsibility. You take responsibility not just for your kin. This is a line form of nurturing. It's not just those people I'm

intimate with. I take responsibility for all those who are lower status than me. That's the positive form of a line. That's the status/hierarchy.

Now its negative form, its shadow form, is I'm higher than you, so therefore you're lower, and I'm not responsible for you. Its higher form would be an obsessive creation of false status. Pseudo-status. Superficial status. Which bypasses the genuine unique work that I have to do to actually accomplish status. But status and hierarchy are a key equality of reality. It's a line quality. Good? Everyone got it? How many people founded it in their sacred autobiography when they were writing? How many people were writing – let me see a show of hands. How many people actually wrote something about themselves as they found it in their sacred autobiography? Fantastic. Do you have any questions on that before we go on? Yes, take it away Jeff.

Jeff: You were saying that one of the things we were going to do this weekend is chart 1 to 10 the presence of this quality. Are we doing that now or later?

Marc: Yes, let's do it right now. Thank you. I forgot, and you're completely right. So Jeff holds us accountable, correctly so. So what we should do is, for each one of these, chart on a scale of 1 to 10 at what level – 1 to 10 – is this quality in your life in its light quality? Let's start there. 1 to 10, how much of this quality do you have? If you have a lot of status/hierarchy, and it's a light quality and it's positive – it's Unique Self, taking responsibility, protecting – Eric?

Eric: Can we put mastery in there, also, as part of a hierarchy or of a status?

Marc: I like the word mastery. Yeah. That's what I mean by Unique Self. That's a great word. Let's put mastery in there. Someone who's taking notes in our Dharma thing, let's get mastery in there. But mastery's a really good word because that's what I meant by your uniqueness. And as you get your hierarchy through mastery – it was actually a missing word, Eric. I love that word. That's really helpful. I was looking for that word and I didn't quite have it. That's really, really good. Meaning it's not pseudo-status. It's status that comes from mastery. Gorgeous. Thank you, teacher. That'd a really great way to say it. Beautiful. Yeah, Cerridwen.

Cerridwen: Actually, I have a bit of a question because when we're talking about Unique Self, I'm thinking about myself within the – looking at myself from my own self perspective, kind of thing. But when I think of status, I think of how the society sees me, and how society gives me access to resources or mates or whatever, depending on how it judges and values me.

Marc: That's exactly what Eric was speaking to. So that's beautiful, Cerridwen. An appropriate status would be an appropriate combination between what my actual mastery is, what my actual Unique Self is, the way I'm expressing that by taking responsibility, by being a protector, etc. That would be appropriate status. And in

that, would also be me having a right place in society. But a pseudo-status would be purely externalized. And it's, I'm keeping up with the Joneses. It's all the stuff that I do, in the Landmark Forum they call it looking good. You're always looking good, looking good, looking good. That idea of "looking good" is the shadow of status. That's status in its shadow side. Good? Everyone got that? Great. So evaluate. Carol.

Carol: I'm also noticing that higher status is misused if you want to exploit lower status.

Marc: Right, that would be the shadow. The shadow would be higher status, and we're going to see that – actually, status is going to be clear in other line qualities, so we'll get to it there. That's why I'm not focusing on it here, but you're correct. The shadow will be, I can claim an externalized form – it's nothing that I've earned. It's not from mastery. I'm white, you're black. That's not mastery. That's bullshit. So mastery means that I take responsibility as the master. That's what the master does. The kung fu master. I take responsibility as the master. Pseudo-status is some incidental quality confers upon me status, which has nothing to do with my actual capacity or mastery. That's the distinction. It's a great distinction. Really helpful. Really helpful. Paul then Steve.

Paul: I also noticed that status operates in the shadow way in me when I feel that – when I judge that I'm not being given the status I deserve. And since I spent 35 years working essentially anonymously, this becomes a huge –

Marc: Right. And when –

Paul: – what I've accomplished doesn't have my name on it.

Marc: So let's stay with this. So when I have a father, as you said pre-ceremony, who basically is understating and not asserting and not claiming, then I actually grow up in that realm and actually replicate part of it in myself, so what actually might be true is – see how beautiful this is everybody – that in my hieros gamos, my assertion in claiming status might be weak in my hieros gamos, and in order for me to actually activate my own hieros gamos, I might have to actually now do a correction and claim that. Did everyone get that? See how stunning it is? Wow. Deep devotion. You just embodied the Dharma beautifully. Beautifully, beautifully. And you begin to see how it all comes together.

So in other words, I've inherited that quality in my family. I've internalized it. I've internalized it in order to get the blessing of the father. That's why we internalize it. I internalize to get the blessing of the father, but then what's happening is there's something missing in my erection. That means there's something missing in my hardness. I'm actually feeling violated, and what Paul's saying very beautifully is, I'm not feeling violated just because I'm egoically stuck. You can feel the sincerity and the depth in his voice. He's saying, there's something off here. There's something wrong here. So that's not ego. That's Unique Self. That's

Unique Self. You can feel the quality of Unique Self and ego. They feel different. Unique Self says, I want appropriate recognition. I want to be recognized. And we're all systematically misrecognized. And to be recognized is very powerful.

Now sometimes life gives it to us and sometimes life doesn't. That's true. And sometimes we have to hold that pain. And I hold the pain of misrecognition myself. Some people get that I'm one of the most brilliant people on the planet. But not everybody.

[Laughter]

And actually, I mean that completely seriously. I actually mean it completely seriously. I'm actually not even kidding. It's actually occasionally painful to me that I'm not able to get a certain kind of teaching to masses of people that I'd like to get it to, because I've read everything, I know all the players, it's the best thing out there. In many, many ways. Straight and simple. No bullshit. And it's often painful to me that, although, in some sense, you could say we've been massively successful, but actually, in terms of the scale that I would like to do, we haven't been yet. For lots of reasons. Which have to do with my biography. And my father. So I'm with you in it, brother. And I'm actually able to distinguish between the egoic dimension of it – which I'm not interested in. But the Unique Self dimension I am interested in.

And so what you have to do is you have to hold that pain, not let it make you bitter. See, that's the key. The key is it can't make you bitter because if it makes you bitter, it closes you down. And the one blessing I would say that she gave me – she gave me many blessings – the one blessing I want to acknowledge now is – for whatever reason, it's a blessing – the pain opens my heart and it doesn't close my heart. So I invite you to just be my brother in that, and let the pain just rip your heart open, break your heart open, brother. And just get more and more – 10 seconds; I apologize – just get more and more open.

And when you can open into that, when you can turn it from an insult – it's not an insult by reality – turn it into the wounds of love. When you turn the insult into the wounds of love, then your heart breaks open and you don't break down. It's that moment when you feel insulted by reality, correctly, and then they teach you that's your ego. It's not your ego. It's your Unique Self. It's recognition that's yours. And it should be yours. And for whatever reason, it might not be coming at this moment in time. Maybe not even in this lifetime. Maybe not even in this lifetime. But let it break you open. Let it break you open again and again. We together this? Total. Total. Amen. Amen. Yes?

Speaker: I just wanted to say – I was just in that Dharma while you were in it, and feeling that choice of bitterness versus being broken open. So that's where my excitement came in and felt it.

Marc: Yeah, no. Thank you.

Speaker: – behind you.

Marc: Thank you, thank you. In Luria, there's like eight relationships between lines and circles. And one of them is face-to-face, one's back-to-back, and there's also back-to-face, is one of the relationships. So we're doing a back-to-face relationship, which is unique in many ways. But there's some things Vyana and I aren't willing to share right now. So here we go.

[Laughter]

Okay, Steve.

Steve: This ties in with the conversation with Paul. And going back to Jeff's initial question. So in indexing, one way I feel it is when I just – in the context of my own life, and where I'm situated, and how I'm operating, and where I in my own practice and where I've come from. I feel beautiful and great and wonderful. And you've said many times when unique selves mate that it's not comparative, but in the hierarchy/status thing – so having had the privilege and beauty of working very closely with you, one of the things that I discovered and felt was, when I'm in the closeness of your brilliance, I almost lose my voice. I almost lose the sense of myself because of just who you are and how you are. And so in this indexing that we're talking about, I'm assuming that I'm talking about my own context and where I am and how I show up in life –

Marc: This is so good. This is so good. See, this is the Dharma. So see how real the Dharma gets? It's so beautiful. It's so beautiful, Steve. Jeff, thank you so much for bringing us to this piece. You're indexing in two ways. One is, what's my own sense of my status, and my place in hierarchy? Which is intrinsic to myself. And – index this – how am I able to keep that, and to hold it in the face of powerful forces? Super important. Super important. And you've done such a gorgeous job, and everyone in our circle has.

Because again, I'm not that easy to be around. I've got 15, 20 teachers in the world who have taught with me that would like to kill me. Because when they're around me, they just feel like they lose their voice and so they project it onto me. So actually, it's not that easy being me. People want to kill you all the time. All the time. It was part of my life, since I was 20, since I started teaching – having people wanting to kill me. People will teach with me and they'll, like boom. Painful, actually. It's actually not all sweetness and light. So we've got to hold that. It gets real. So let's get real.

Okay, so I want to ask everyone, holy brothers and sisters – first off, Paul, write that up and send it to us. And everyone – Steve, write it up. Because we're actually writing together now. We're writing as a sangha. And all of our insight.

Don't let any insight escape now. Because we're now in the sangha. We're in the heat of it, and she's dancing with us. She's dancing with us. So it's a unique moment in time, so everything you have, write it up, write it down. Whether you're going to share it or not, write it up, write it down. I want to collect it into our space so that we can then share it and evolve the source code and see how this line and circle plays.

10-FRIDAY AFTERNOON PART 4 - LINE 2 - AUTONOMY INDEPENDENCE FREEDOM

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Part 4

Track: 10-Friday Afternoon Part 4 - Line 2 - Autonomy Independence Freedom

TRT: 26.06

Marc: Okay. So now the second line quality. And again, you get what it means? These are not man/woman qualities. Very clear. These are line qualities. You see how it begins to happen? Awesome. So the second line quality is the quality of autonomy, independence, freedom. A cluster of words. Autonomy, independence, freedom.

Now that quality of autonomy, independence, freedom is a quality that actually patriarchy has enshrined. We call it the Fourth of July. Independence Day. And our national holiday is the holiday that celebrates, not virtue, not ethical transformation – it celebrates independence. So Independence Day is this notion – we don't even notice that the value that we enshrine, the founding fathers, is the value of independence. It's a big deal. So that value of independence is a beautiful value. In its light version. What does this value of independence do? What does it do?

Spartacus. Late-night TV. 2:00 in the morning. The rerun of Kirk Douglas in *Spartacus*. What does it do? Track with it, ok? In other words, you overthrow slavery. You overthrow tyranny. The violation of freedom has become an absolute value. When you actually talk about the value of freedom, which is a gorgeous value. Which we take for granted. Because actually, the majority of the world today doesn't yet live in freedom. It's a big fact. As we sit today, the majority of citizens on planet earth, they don't live in freedom. Freedom's a stunning value. I'm free from tyranny. I'm free from domination. Whether it's the domination of the church, whether it's the domination of a totalitarian society. That's a stunning value, it's a line value. And rebellion and revolution and liberation are all expressions of this line value. So that's its light quality.

So whenever I'm willing to engage in revolution – and it might be at my company, and it might be in my family system – there's lots of places where I'm actually going to liberate myself from domination. When I liberate myself from domination, it might be in a marriage. When I liberate myself from domination, I am actually accessing a line quality. That's the quality. That's a line quality. And I actually have to let go of some of my circle quality to actually access that line because the line goes straight up. It takes you let out. That's what a line does. Again, watch the geometry. The line takes you out. It steps out. You're lost in the circle, in the system – the line takes you out of the system. Get it? Now what's the shadow? Anybody, what's the shadow?

Speaker: They don't need anyone.

Speaker: No connection.

Marc: The shadow is, I'm freeing myself from responsibility. I'm freeing myself from responsibility. I'm refusing to take responsibility. I'm independent. I'm free. The drifter is the negative shadow image. The Dharma bums in the late '50s, Kerouac and that whole gang, are the positive image. I'm freeing myself from the tyrannies of society and I'm going to launch a beatnik revolution that's going to launch the '60s. But the drifter is saying, "I'm not willing to be shackled down, I'm not willing to take responsibility and I'm free. I'm going to be following the Dead in concert and I'm going to leave the baby with my aunt I'll come back three years later. Because I'm free." But a lot of spinning on the way with Jerry. So awesome.

So in other words, that freedom of going with Jerry, depending on the context of my life and who I am, can be positive freedom, or it can be the shadow of this line quality. But it's a strong line quality. It's light quality we just saw, and it's shadow quality we saw. Shadow quality is freeing myself from responsibility. It's the deadbeat dad who's just not showing up, or the deadbeat mom who's not showing up. It's freeing myself from appropriate responsibility. And only your Unique Self knows what your appropriate responsibility is. You can fool lots of people about your appropriate responsibility, but your own inner calling and core knows, should you show up, or shouldn't you? And are you showing up in your life? That's what it's about.

So autonomy which frees myself from appropriate responsibility – that is the shadow autonomy. It's the shadow of freedom. It's the shadow of independence. Appropriate independence frees myself from tyrannical ideas, from tyrannical people, from tyrannical systems. Does everyone get that? Now let's just take a look for a second. So Boaz and Tali. Y'all know Boaz and Tali? Boaz and Tali, my friends.

I'll introduce you. So Boaz and Tali live in the Galilee in Israel, and Boaz was in the Army. There's a big thing in Israel how your army buddies are a big deal. So Boaz is doing a little hiking in the Galilee, because that's what we do in the

Galilee. We hike. And he meets an Army buddy of his that he hasn't seen in like 20 years, and he says, "Wow, Itzik. [*Foreign Language*] It's so great to see you. I've got this big villa, man. Come over this Friday night, we'll catch a movie. You've never met my wife. It'll be awesome." It feels great. Walks into the house and says, "Tali, you'll never guess who I met. On the trail. Itzik. My buddy Itzik. I told you all about him. I invited him to come over. He's going to stay with us and we're going to catch a movie." And she's furious with him. "What do you mean? You invited him without asking me? You didn't talk to me about it? And you're going to go –" "Just come with us Friday." "I don't care if I come with you or not come with you, but you actually made plans without me." She's totally upset. And he says, "Well, what do mean? I need to ask you? To make plans? Like I have no freedom? I can't meet my Army buddy and make plans? I've got to check in with you?" And then she says, "Well, if I met my friend from the Army, I'd want to call you. I'd want to ask you. I'd want to say to you – 'I can't make a plan, I've got to call – I'd love to see you. Let me call Boaz and see if it works for him.'" You see the difference?

So what she's saying is, actually Nitza Yanai did an entire study about how lines and circles define independence. So circles – in Nitza Yanai's study it was women – but circles define independence as being able to navigate, in an integrated way, all of your relationships. Lines define independence by being able to make decisions without checking in with anyone else. Those are two different understandings of independence. So Boaz says, "I don't need to check in in order to have a buddy over. That's kind of crazy." And the last thing he wants to do is say to Itzik, "Itzik, one second. I've got to call my wife and ask her if it's okay to have you over." Are you for real? There's no way he's doing that. So again, it's a classic line nature/circle nature.

Speaker: Could you just tell me again what the definition of independence is for a circle? Because I totally –

Marc: Yeah. I'm going to talk about it tomorrow, because I'm going to do circles tomorrow. So I'm not going to dwell on it now. I'm just occasionally mentioning circles just to make the contrast, but in Nitza Yanai's study from University of Tel Aviv, the way circles defined independence was the ability to navigate, in a way that everyone gets integrated, all of my different a relationships. Successfully. That was called independence. No one person's weighing me down. I'm able to navigate the whole thing. That's, give or take, how all the circle defined, or the majority defined, independence. While the lines defined independence about being able to make a decision without having to check in. But again, you're seeing a line – yes?

Speaker: If both lines and circles defined independence, then why is it a line quality, and not a line and circle quality?

Marc: Well, because what we'll see is that the quality of independence, the circle quality transmutes into – essentially the basic category of circle, as will see tomorrow, it has 10 qualities, but one of them is intimacy. So what happens is, the circle quality will take qualities which are line qualities and reinterpret them through the lens of intimacy. So of course, that quality's going to exist there, but as you're pointing out, it's going to be reinterpreted through the lens of intimacy, which is what's so fascinating, of course. You're taking a quality which is a pure line quality and reinterpreting it through a completely different prism, which is an intimacy prism. And of course, when a line hears is it, like you, what the line's saying is, "What the fuck? That's not independence." That's the line talking, right? "That's not independence." You hear that? That's what he saying. He's like, "What are they talking about? That doesn't make any sense." That's a line. That's your line talking. Exactly. But the circles in the room who heard that, it perfect sense to them. "Of course. That's what independence – sure." There it is in the room. Again.

Now look at another expression, then we're going to check in individually. So just another example. So this is a talk about Nance and Tom. Nance and Tom are to a couple. No one in this room that we're talking about. Nance and Tom are a couple, and Tom goes out and buys a \$400 stereo. \$400 stereo, maybe it was \$500. I don't know. Maybe it was \$700. It was an expensive stereo. Now they've got plenty of money in the bank, not a problem, but Nance is furious. "You went out and bought a \$700 stereo without checking with me?"

And Tom says, "We've got plenty of money in the bank. I want to be able to just buy a stereo when I want to buy a stereo." It's the same story. And Nance said, "You can buy a stereo, but I want you to want to check with me. Because I'm part of your life. And if I went to buy something, I'd want to call you. And say, 'Hey, should I get this?'" You see the play? Line/circle. Line/circle. So line/circle plays everywhere. In the two stories I told, they're neither shadow nor light stories. They're just wait to see how line/circle plays. Let's just look at one more example.

I don't know, it must have been a decade ago. Was it a decade ago? No, it was much longer. It was 2001. That's 14 years ago, 13 years ago. I wrote a book called *Soul Prints*. And I had given it to my editor, the first draft. And I was going to go and spend several weeks and retreat. Meditating. And my editor _____ sister said, "I've got to be able to reach you at all times." I was going to go from city to city and do little retreats in each city. It's a long story. She said, "No, I've got to be able to reach you wherever you are."

Now I'm a circle in these matters. So I actually loved it. I thought it was so sweet. She needs to be able to reach me, she wants to be in touch, and I felt totally connected. I felt like that was really cool for me. When I told it to a close friends of mine, he's like, "That's infuriating. Why is she controlling you? You can't go wherever you want? You've got to check in with her? Like you're in high school?"

And I looked at him and I said, "No, it makes me feel good. I like it. I like when someone's, 'I want to check in, I want to know where you are.'" That's line/circle.

The line says, "I can go wherever I want." And when someone says, "I need to know where you are. Could you check in with me?" the line feels constricted. The circle feels, "Wow, I'm intimate. I'm connected. I'm part of a system. And I like to be part of a system." Now I have in me both a line and a circle. But in that case, it activated my circle. But again, you see it's a line/circle play. It's always a line/circle play. So let's just check in for a second.

So first, take a moment to write, where does this line quality –? We're doing sacred autobiography together. And this is the opportunity of a lifetime. So where does this line quality play in your life? In its light form? Where am I throwing off tyranny? Where am I stepping out of a system? And I think it's becoming really clear in the room that this quality is not masculine or feminine. It's not man or woman. It's a line quality. And we can all access it. It's my line quality. Where am I being independent, autonomous?

Or where am I afraid? I'm afraid to leave my institution. I'm afraid to assert my independence. I need to be held in the circle because my line quality's not strong enough. Or am I afraid to assert my line quality? Or am I afraid to challenge authority? When it should be appropriately challenged. Or am I afraid to be a liberator when I'm needed as a liberator? So where am I living this line quality? And where is this line quality weak in my life? In its light form. In its light form. Take your time. We're writing our sacred autobiographies. We're actually preparing the marriage contract for the inner marriage. And I want to ask everyone to keep your notes. Don't throw them someplace. We're writing a sacred document here.

Now look at the shadow side. Look at the shadow side. Where am I freeing myself from responsibility that's actually mine? Now remember, what did we say? We're genderqueer. Unique Self. So you know responsibility – this is all in the context of Unique Self. So I'm freeing myself from responsibility that is a function of my Unique Self. It's all happening in the matrix of Unique Self. So where am I freeing myself from responsibility which is my responsibility, and I'm actually claiming freedom and independence, and I'm not actually developing my own inner cock. That means, my inner ability to actually hold my responsibility.

So where am I freeing myself and not actually meeting the invitation, the destiny of my life? Whether it's in a detail of my life, or in a larger frame of my life? So where am I stuck in the shadow of this line quality? And try your absolute best, my friends, not to get lazy on this one. Whether you're thinking about it in your head or your writing, make that effort to actually find it. It's easy to zone out. Like whoop. Try to make the effort to try and find it. That's where the work is. That's where it moves from wisdom-tainment to transformation. There's no gnosis without transformation. Transformation happens when I step in. Just look for it.

You don't need to write the whole story. Find the image of it. Because when you can locate it in yourself, that's when liberation starts. When you can actually locate it and you can find it in yourself. All of these are just stories until we find them in the stories of our own life. All of these are just words until we live them in the stories of our lives.

If you're still writing, keep writing. Now we're just going to do the evaluation. Scale of 1 to 10, how strong in you is the light expression of this line quality, autonomy, independence? And then how strong in you is the shadow expression of this line quality? Cerridwen was first, and then Jeff.

Cerridwen: I don't know how to judge where I'm at with the shadow, because... Yeah.

Marc: So watch for a second. One of the line qualities we're going to talk about is discernment and discrimination. That is to say, that ability to judge. So that would probably mean that in that quality, you're probably weak in that quality.

Cerridwen: *[Laughs]* I'm pretty good at judging. [00:17:49]

Marc: So watch for a second. Where is it weak *here*? I'm reflecting your – I'm just with you. I'm just reflecting you back to you. Which is you said, "I'm not able to self-reflect and judge whether I'm strong and weak in it." So just think about why. Because judging out there is one kind of judging. Judging in there is a different quality of discernment and discrimination. Interesting, right? It's food for thought. Again, I'm only a mirror to you now. I'm operating purely as a mirror. I'm just mirroring you. I'm just mirroring your words back. So it's worth holding. Let's just hold it together for a little bit. We don't need to come to a conclusion now. Let's just be in it together. Jeff.

Jeff: I'm just aware of how complex the discernment is. Meaning I get a very different answer if I think about to what degree do I enact autonomy and freedom in relationship, for example, versus work, or in my case, my intellectual life. I would say a huge degree of autonomy and freedom in my intellectual life, not so much in my relational life.

Marc: So I would actually jot down relational ... It's fantastic. No, this is exactly where the Dharma's getting clear. So Jeff's pointing out, Jeff's saying, "Okay, let's have a couple of distinctions here." Intellectual life – let's call it intellectual/spiritual life. Relational life. And there was a third you said.

Jeff: Someone over here said work.

Marc: So professional life. Work life/professional life. So intellectual/spiritual life, relational life, work/professional life, and there might be a different answer to each of those. That's great to look at. Let's add that distinction in. So if that distinction comes up for you, absolutely add it in. For sure. Again, you're going to

get the clearest view you can imagine of where your hieros gamos is at the end of this. It's kind of stunning. And there's no standardized test that exists anyplace that can give you something even – that's why this is such an incredible life opportunity.

There is no standardized test that can give you this. You're actually using reflection. And standardized tests are actually bypassing reflection. And it's a huge problem, the way metrics are done today. Our academic director, Zak Stein, is a top kid at Harvard in metrics. And it's exactly what he's critiquing. But what we're getting here is actually a real metrics. It's a real metrics. It's an exciting metrics. So everyone got that? Victoria?

Victoria: I'm also thinking about this in terms of like using the words "strong" and "weak," which elicits, to me, if I'm weak... No. So what I'm trying to say is, if we see this as a metrics, it's just the amount of energy, not on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is not good and 10 is good, but on a scale of... I'm thinking of this as a quality, like how much this quality plays in my life. So it's not a judgment on, I should be a 10 in all of these, but that these are – but that –

Marc: It's an evaluation of where you are. It's an evaluation of where you are. So that 1 to 10 is helpful, because 10 would mean, "I feel super strong in this, it's completely clear in my life." 8 would be, "I'm pretty good at it, but there's a little improvement." If it's at a 4, "That's just interesting to me. It's at a 4. I'm not really activating this quality." Now we could figure out why. But that's not our point now. We just want to see what it looks like. Now when we look at your whole hieros gamos, your whole intermarriage, we've got all 20 of the qualities, and you're going to line them all up, you'll get the best snapshot of where you are.

We'll see that the masculine and feminine – which used to be called masculine and feminine and are now called line and circle qualities – actually line up with each other. And they play off of each other. So you'll see, if you have a 4, for example, in autonomy and independence, that's going to play in all sorts of ways on the other side of the spectrum. For now, all we want to see is just to see where I show up there. Just to see that is making subject, object. It's making the unconscious, conscious. You're actually naming a quality. It's a line quality. You understand what it's positive and light are. And you can actually give yourself a self-evaluation.

Now self evaluations, by the way, are potent and powerful. They're not complete. Which is why those of you who function in a work environment know that when you want to evaluate someone, you do a 360. You don't rely on their own self-evaluation. You get an anonymous evaluation from everyone in the system and you see how it collates. Because self-evaluations aren't always perfect. But they're a great place to start. And an honest self-evaluation, where there's not a work agenda at stake in this kind of room, is powerful. Tom?

Tom: Just to round it out, too, in terms of what we're rating here. It seems to me, if you're rating how the shadow aspect of that quality plays in your life, and if you're rating that a 9, then that's not –

Marc: That's information.

Tom: Yeah, that's information.

Marc: That's information. And notice, Victoria's holding a circle moment in the room – at the very moment she's holding a circle moment. "So why are we rating?" You understand what she's saying? That's actually a circle moment. That's a circle moment. And circle moment resists rating for lots of reasons, and yet – and I'll just to speak for a second about Victoria – this is a public thing about Victoria – Victoria's very good with numbers. Which is a line quality. Organizing numbers and making them organized. So you've got to watch for your circle and line in each place.

Victoria: And I think what I'm saying is not, I have no problem with rating it. But what I'm rating is more the quantity, rather than the – because the way you said it, you said, "Well, I'm 8. I have room for improvement." I'm not thinking about, do I have room for improvement? And thinking about, how much does this matter to me –?

Marc: Sweetheart, that's called having a problem with rating. Just to be clear.

[Laughter]

Just so we should be clear about what's happening here. That was a big problem with rating I just heard. So you're saying is, I'm giving a quantity, but I'm not willing to actually give it an evaluation if it's good or bad. That's a problem with rating. That's what rating does. Ranking creates a hierarchy. Ranking is hierarchy. So that would be a moment – this would give you information. You might want to go back to the previous quality of hierarchy and see how you evaluated yourself, in terms of hierarchy.

Because right now, you're not loving hierarchy. Which is okay. It's not good or bad, in this moment. I just want you to see it. You're a voice in the room – there's voices always in the room. This is a powerful voice. It's a good voice. The voice in the room which says, "Whoa, we can do the quantity of it, but this ranking thing is problematic. It's too hierarchical." And that's the sense of it. I'm not going to _____ that's the sense of it. So that's a quality. You're actually seeing it in the room. Seeing it in the room.

So just kind of hold that. We're going to do just one more and we're going to stop. We were supposed to do ten and we're going to do three. We're going to do one more. But that's fine. I'd rather take the time with it and actually have time to do the sacred autobiography. And we have basically tomorrow, we'll be able to finish

all the line and all the circle tomorrow, not a problem. We actually will. Because I was going to finish all the circle by tomorrow morning, so we'll spend the day doing the lines and the circles. And by the way, they get more and more exciting. As the thing begins to build, it's like you're crescendoing. We're just moving into the system. So just take a look at the last quality that we'll do.

11-FRIDAY AFTERNOON PART 5 - LINE 3 – PENETRATION

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Part 5

Track: 11-Friday Afternoon Part 5 - Line 3 – Penetration

TRT: 28.29

[00:00:00]

Marc: Here we go. The third quality. Penetration. Penetration. Penetration is always a good quality to do at the end of the day. Try and evoke some participation, mystique. So this is a quality of the line. The line penetrates. And just notice, the line is status/hierarchy. It's a line quality. Second quality was, the line is independent. It stands alone. It rises out of any system. And again, these geometric shapes aren't by accident. It's not cute. It's the nature of reality. It's a principle of reality. And the line penetrates. That's what the line does. The line is, in that sense, phallic, whether in masculine or feminine. It's a phallic property. It's a penetrating property. It moves, it thrusts forward.

It's penetrating. It can be a penetrating insight. It can be a penetrating glance. It can be the knight on her horse with her lance. Thrusting forward. It can be the knight of the Round Table. The table's round, circle, the knight has his lance and he's saving a damsel in distress. Hmm, isn't that interesting? That's actually the mythology at work. That's actually precisely what's at play here.

So it's a quality of penetration. And it's an aggressive quality. It's a roughhouse quality. The child draws pictures of a rocket ship. Penetrating. Crashing. The child takes – the line child – which is classically, in early childhood, is classically a boy – takes the Barbie doll and actually turns it into a sword. While the classical circle – who in early child is usually a girl – not always, but often a girl – takes the truck and dresses the truck in dresses. All the time. Classical.

We've got on this double-blind studies – 20 of them. I'm not making this shit up. Anecdotal it's true, by the way, also. You can just check it anecdotally. But the amount of people I know who tried to raise their kids gender-neutral, and this happened in their lives. But now they've actually done double-blind studies and

we actually know that baboons and chimpanzees, boy baboons and chimpanzees prefer, what we call, boy toys, and girl baboons and chimpanzees prefer girl toys in early childhood, and it's not because they saw James Bond movies. There's something real that's at play.

But that doesn't limit us. That just tells us it's a line quality. It's a line quality. And as culture evolves, that line quality will be found in men and women. So for example, one of the powers of gay sexuality is the ability to be penetrated. One of the things that the gay community said, beyond biology – there's the biological issue, but there's a deeper issue. I wouldn't say a deeper issue – a no less important issue. Which is, men said, "I don't want to take all the responsibility for penetrating. I want to be penetrated." Very powerful. The experience of being penetrated, and of actually fully surrendering in a deep and profound way is something that actually wasn't available to men. For the large part of society. It wasn't actually a genuine option. Men were actually forced to be exclusively, or almost exclusively, lines. Again, not exclusively, but largely. Largely, men had to be lines.

When you actually liberate and evolve the story, you actually begin to talk about a different possibility. In which the line responsibility can actually be shared by both men and women. It's kind of stunning. You're like, "Whoa. What's that about?" So the quality of a line – and that can happen, of course, in gay or straight relationships.

[00:05:00]

But the point is that the quality of a line is a quality of penetration, and it has an aggressive quality to it. It has an aggressive quality to it. But aggression in the original Latin doesn't mean moving against. It means moving towards.

The difference between moving towards and moving against is an enormous distinction. And victim feminism, for example, identifies the masculine with the shadow of this line quality. The masculine is a predator. So what is being a predator? The predator is the shadow of the penetrating quality of line. Because it inappropriately violates appropriate boundaries.

It penetrates into space which is not its to penetrate. So it's a violation. It's a loss of integrity. But that's not what that masculine is, or what the line is. And moving from masculine to line. I keep moving us back there. The line quality is a quality of penetration. Which is a stunning and beautiful quality. And it's a completely enlivening quality. And it's a ravishing quality. And it's a quality which is filled with Eros.

Alfred North Whitehead, the great process philosopher, actually said that that core quality – they didn't call it this – but that line quality, which we're calling reality surging forward – the penetrating quality of reality – Whitehead called the

creative advance of novelty. He said there were three properties to reality. Whitehead, process philosopher, three properties. The one – so the sense of oneness – the many, and the creative advance of novelty. Three properties to reality. It's stunning.

Meaning, there's an inherent creative drive in reality which is thrusting forward. And it's always creating something that's new. That wasn't there before. It's a stunning quality. It is the evolutionary impulse itself. Which is surging forward, this creative, ecstatic impulse, which is – how does it feel? Does it feel spacious? I don't think so. Does it feel bliss and quiet? I don't think so. It feel urgent. It feels urgent. And we've actually identified urgency as a shadow ego quality.

I had a beautiful discussion – I think a couple of you were there – with Jerry like two years ago about this quality of urgency. Does the quality of urgency have a place? And of course, it does. We don't want to actually feminize values, or circle values, and leave this value out. Urgency actually can be – and the urgency Jerry was rejecting correctly – was the urgency of the ego. The grasping ego that feels this urgency. But there's also the urgency of the Unique Self. Which is the urgency of the artist who's got to create. The artist who's waiting to create is ecstatically urgent, thrusting forward to create something new. And to become an artist of my life is to engage in the process of self creation and transformation. It's to penetrate and re-create again and again and again.

So that quality of penetration – of thrusting forward, of moving towards – is a beautiful light quality. Its shadow quality is the predator. Its shadow quality is the predator. Now stay with me. To be able to access this quality of being penetrated is actually enormously enlivening. Because a) if you're the penetrator, you're accessing the full force of power surging through you. And power is a divine quality. We've interrogated power negatively. We've made power a negative.

Power's not a negative. Power's actually identified by every great mystical tradition as part of the quality of essence. Why is power a negative? Abused power is negative. What does that have to do with power? Power is the essence of reality. Reality is exploding supernovas. Divinity discloses as power. The very word El – the divine word in Hebrew for God – means power. That's of the word means. Elohim is power.

So to access power in penetrating is stunning. And to be penetrated. To be fucked open by reality. And to surrender fully is fully enlivening. So if we leave the penetrating dimension out of reality, both as the one who is ravishing and one who's being ravaged, whether man or woman, we lose one of the essential qualities of reality that makes it worth being alive.

[00:10:00]

And whether that's in the creative process, whether that's in the process of innovation, or creativity, or transformation, this quality of penetration exists first at the level of sexuality, and then at the level of innovation, creativity, and then at the level of transformation.

Those are three levels of this process of penetration, of surging forward to create something new. It's only the shadow quality that's the predator. That's the violator of boundaries. That's aggressive in the sense of moving against, instead of moving towards. And just notice, culturally, how this plays.

So again, victim feminism identifies the masculine with the shadow of this quality. Now, classical patriarchal culture, for 1800 years, identified the masculine with the light of this quality, and ignored the shadow. The masculine is this light quality and just ignore the entire shadow dimension. We have correctly brought the shadow out. We've enacted sexual-harassment laws. That's awesome. We've created appropriate boundaries where they're necessary. That's awesome. But we don't want to lose the quality of being penetrated.

And there's a reason that a bad book sold 100 million copies. How many shades of grey can there be? Really, 100 million copies? Of a badly written book? It was so badly written – and everyone you ask about it says, "It was so bad."

[Laughter]

And of course, it was. But it sold 100 million copies. Why? Because it had good marketing? It didn't have any marketing when it started. It was a dud book. Because it spoke to something. In other words, people want at night what they protest against during the day.

[Laughter]

It's a big deal. We've created this politically correct Eros that doesn't work. It doesn't work. And we think the more intimate we are, the more force and aliveness there is. No. It doesn't work that way. Different conversation. So that's the third quality. It's a gorgeous quality. Elif.

Elif: Could you flesh out a little bit more about the predator as shadow in terms – so you talked a little bit about it in terms of sexuality – but in terms of creativity and transformation?

Marc: Sure. The corporate raider. The corporate raider, for example. So for example, I roomed with someone – who shall remain nameless at this moment – who, when I roomed with him – we shared an apartment in Riverdale, New York. What his family was involved in was called greenmailing. And greenmailing meant you'd buy 5 percent, or up to 5 percent, of a company, because you had enough liquid cash to do it. You then force the company – who were afraid of a hostile takeover

– to buy those shares back at an extremely jacked up price. You've created no new value, no new jobs, no new insight, no new healing. You made money. That's a predatory move. That's being a predator in the realm of commerce. And tragically, lots of capitalism is not conscious capitalism, but is predatory capitalism. Not that capitalism is wrong. That version of capitalism – which is predatory capitalism – is absolutely wrong.

So the predatory moment exists everywhere. It's that moment where, I'm not actually – I'm violating boundaries, I'm claiming something that's not mine, I'm creating benefit and pleasure – or not even pleasure – benefit and kind of a titillating thrill, whether it's of money, or sex, or creativity, with something that's actually not mine. And that's actually not okay. So that's the predatory dimension of penetration.

And of course, in politics, classical war. The crazy thing was that until very, very recently in human history, war, for the sake of expansion, was a legitimate war. It's kind of shocking. Until like, literally, so recently – 150 years ago in human history, 200 years ago – war – why did you make war? To expand. War was predatory by its very definition through most of human history. It was a predatory act.

So we need to recognize that that's the shadow of this line quality. Whether it's expressed, again, by men or women. It doesn't matter whether it's Cleopatra convincing Mark Antony to go to war – which is this line quality in a woman – or in a man. It's a line quality. And it's a line quality with enormous, gorgeous light, and clear shadow. That was really helpful to explicate that. Thank you so much. Sean.

Sean: Just a test, but maybe in a less dramatic –

Marc: Please.

Sean: So I was thinking that the light of this is the ability to move something forward. So the shadow of it, for me, plays out more subtly. When I might be trying to move something forward for my own self-preservation, or out of fear or –

[00:15:00] [Crosstalk]

Sean: So I'm using the penetrating quality, but in a direction that's not –

[Crosstalk]

Sean: It's less dramatic than the...

Marc: No, no, it's beautiful. Beautiful. Let's see if I can reflect it back for us. See if we get it. So moving something forward for the sake of a larger vision, or for the sake

of my Unique Self, or for the sake of sincere and authentic goals is just moving the ball forward. Is the quality of penetrating, moving forward. As opposed to, by the way, getting stuck in process. Getting stuck in the process is the God, wherever that might be written someplace here. Trust the process. Maybe trust the process, and maybe you need some strong leadership.

In other words, you need both. And strong leadership is actually able to move the ball forward. That's part of what leadership does. But then there's also, when you access that penetrating quality to move the ball forward for an ignoble cause. It's great. And that cause might be the gratification to my grasping ego, it might be to take something that's not mine. There's lots of forms of ignoble causes. And some of them are wars, and some of them, as Sean says, are trying to get ahead in a company, not actually by producing new results, but by moving the system. You see that in a company? You can move forward in a company by actually creating more value, which is an appropriate way of establishing your status and hierarchy. Or you can move forward in the company by actually manipulating the politics of the corporation and not actually creating new value. So it's actually a shadow form of this line quality. Beautiful. Anyone else before we close? John.

John: Yeah. So we've talked about the shadow, like we have a particular quality and it's, like in this case, penetration excess has a shadow called, "You're going too far." Where in this would you place, say, just the lack of presence? Like let's say, not penetrating where you need to?

Marc: Fantastic. Fantastic. So what we're going to look at now – and this is our last piece. So really, everybody stay with us for the next about seven minutes. This is going to be – where we're done with the dharma of it, now let's take a look at the following. So a) where is this quality strong in your life? Everyone take a look. We're writing our sacred autobiographies now. You're the only person who's going to write your sacred autobiography. There's no ghost writer for your sacred autobiography. So this is the moment. This is your moment. To show up for sacred autobiography. So where is this line quality strong your life? And where is this line quality weak in your life? We're not yet at evaluation yet. We're now just going to, where's it strong? _____ that's strong. Where's it weak?

I got an email last night that the two last Wisdom Schools were up and recorded and in place. Have all gotten moved forward. It's that quality. That's a strong quality. Move that ball forward. And it got done before this Wisdom School. That's that ball forward. That's it. That's right there. That's that quality. You can feel it. That's what it feels like. It's great. And then, where is it not strong? Where is it weak in my life? Where do I drop the ball? Where do I drop the ball and not move it forward? Eric.

Eric: I can't get the circle quality out that relates to this. Because surrender is related to the penetration. So if I think about my life, and my shadow in my life, it's penetrating at times without looking at the other side, of the surrender, or whether

or not the other side is wanting to surrender, or whether or not it can stand surrender.

Marc: Beautiful. So we're going to look at circle tomorrow, but when we get lost in our own perspective in the dance of line and circle, it's basically the story, Eric – and this is for you, a little present for you – three guys get up to heaven. They knock on the door, Peter's at the gate. And Peter says to them, "Listen guys. Here's the deal. If you step on a duck, you're fucked. You get terrible, terrible punishment."

So the first guy's going around and trying not to step on a duck, not step on a duck. Makes it two weeks, three weeks, steps on a duck. They find the ugliest expression of the feminine in the entire world, they chain them together and they say, "You're stuck together for all eternity." He's devastated. This is a politically incorrect joke, by the way. But it turns against men at the end, don't worry.

So then the second guys like, "Oh my God. Oh my God, that's bad news. I can't let that happen to me." So he's missed it and like four months, hasn't stepped on a duck. Gets up in the morning, steps on two ducks. They find the smelliest expression of the feminine in the entire world, chain them together. "You're chained together for all eternity."

[00:20:00] The third guys like, "Whoa. This is getting bad." So he's like, "All right." He makes it two years, doesn't step on any ducks. And Peter comes and chains him to the most beautiful woman in the entire world. And he says, "Thank you, thank you." And she says, "You idiot, I just stepped on a duck."

[Laughter]

Meaning, we get lost in our perspective. We get lost. We're in our perspective and we actually can't even see the other sides. You're exactly right. That all of these qualities, if it's in a dyadic, actually need to see how it's playing with the other person, 1000 percent. Watch out for ducks. [Laughs] Sorry for that. I don't know who wrote that shit.

We're going to end with an evaluation. Now evaluate, scale of 1 to 10, how much of this quality you have in your life in its light expression, in its positive, constructive expression? This quality of penetration, moving the ball forward, thrusting forward, creating, innovating, transforming, newing. You can think about it a lot. You can find it. You can find it pretty fast.

And then evaluate how much of this negative quality – meaning, how much of the shadow quality appears in your life, the predator quality? And the predator quality doesn't have to be the rapist. The predator quality – there's lots of ways to be a predator. You can be a rapist, you can be name rapist, you can be a social rapist. There's lots of social rape that takes place on the Web all the time. Lots of ways,

as the early feminist says. Lots of ways to violate boundaries. Lots of ways. And they're all tragic.

It could be in business. It could be moving ahead, as Sean said, inappropriately. Without actually creating value. Say again?

Speaker: Crossing an emotional boundary.

Marc: Right. Thank you. Crossing emotional boundaries, which no one can quite call you want, but you know that you're crossing the boundary. Exactly. Exactly. So that would be the shadow. Where does that shadow quality of this appear on a scale of 1 to 10?

Speaker: Hey Marc?

Marc: Yes.

Speaker: The shadow would also include the absence of?

Marc: Right. And the shadow would also include – well, the absence of would be, where is it strong or weak? So if the light quality is weak, that would be, you've got too little of that. So if your thrusting, penetrating quality is at a 3, that itself is a shadow. Is, I think, what you're saying. And I think that's absolutely right. So we're evaluating, 1 to 10, how much of the positive light quality you have, and 1 to 10, how much does the shadow quality play?

So just hold it there for a second. A couple of things, and we're going to close. First, if you've been tracking this not by writing, that's totally fine. You've been listening, absorbing, thinking to yourself as you could, or just following the general dharma, and you're going to apply it to your life in three weeks from now as it reappears – awesome. So totally, I just want to totally bless that path of being in the space. That's a completely beautiful, holy, gorgeous, legitimate way to be in the space.

And lots of people, the way they think and integrate is they can't do it immediately. They just hear the broad thing and jot a couple of notes and they play with it over time. And if you're a person who's able to write and participate in that way, awesome and fantastic. Completely great. So I'm going to ask you, if you're writing, keep your notebook. Keep your notebook. And really take a look at it tonight. Adjust it, calibrate it, look over it. And then we're going to pick up exactly from this place tomorrow. And what we're doing is we're heading towards intermarriage.

We're going to go through seven more qualities. We're going to spend a shorter time, obviously, on each one. But in the morning, we're going to do the last qualities, the seven qualities of the masculine. In the afternoon, we're going to do

the qualities of the feminine, which are going to go – we're going to go very deeply into the feminine and into the goddess, but we're going to do it – we'll already have mentioned, have alluded to, some of the qualities as we're going through the masculine. And then what we'll finally do is we'll take it all – the whole thing – the whole thing's just going to level up stupendously, and a whole new world's going to open, which we're going to introduce on Sunday morning.

So we're moving towards intermarriage. And we're moving beyond Venus and Mars. Where the context for my life is Unique Self.

[00:25:00] The context for my relationship with myself or other is Unique Self relationship. I'm beyond Venus and Mars. I want to integrate and marry the line qualities with my circle qualities. In order to do that, I need to know, what are the line qualities? What are they?

And I need to see, where do I fit in them? How are they playing in my life? I need to see, what are the circle qualities? And just notice that, at the end of the day, we've actually transcended and included the old world of gender. It's still there – we haven't dismissed it; it still there – but we've transcended and evolved beyond it. And the system – with this we'll finish – I guess maybe just the last sentence – this system always is something like, know your nature, step one. Honor your nature, step two. Evolve, expand, transform your nature, without violating it, step three.

So I've got to know my nature – what are my line and circle qualities? And then I've got to honor my nature. This is not, we're writing a scathing indictment or critique. We're just knowing our nature. And then we're honoring it. And we're honoring, Paul, all the places that it came from in our lives. And we're giving it deep honor and acceptance and embrace.

And then we're going to say, now, how do I actually recalibrate my marriage? How do I evolve, expand and transform my nature? To actually move beyond Venus and Mars? To be a person who's not stuck. Beyond Venus and Mars means, I'm not stuck in the line qualities. Let's say if I'm a man, I'm not limited to the line qualities. I'm able to access, fully, the circle qualities. If I'm a woman, I'm not stuck in the circle qualities. I'm actually able to access my line qualities.

That doesn't mean I become androgynous. It doesn't mean I lose my sense of being man or woman. I don't. But I'm able to fully access both my line and circle qualities, and those are in unique relationship in me. And that unique relationship in me is my genderqueer identity. That's my Unique Self. That's my identity, that's actually beyond gender.

And so if you notice, all of these qualities we're understanding in terms of their relationship to Unique Self. Am I free from my Unique Self responsibility legitimately? My hierarchy/status, my independence/autonomy, my penetrating

nature. What my Unique Self is is my phallus. Whether I'm a man or a woman. My Unique Self is the penetrative quality with which I penetrate reality.

My ego is the predator. You get that distinction? The Unique Self is the appropriate penetrating quality. My Unique Self penetrates reality. My ego is a predator. My ego is always trying to grasp. To look good. To get something. My Unique Self's not a predator. My Unique Self is appropriately penetrating. It's moving towards. It's the evolutionary impulse expressed uniquely as me. Wow.

Deepest bow to the line and circle, the God and Goddess, and the center of the circle that holds us all.

12-FRIDAY EVENING

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Friday Evening

Track: 12-Friday Evening

TRT: 26.06

[00:00:00]

Marc: Good Shabbos!

Audience Good Shabbos!

Marc: Good Shabbos, Good Shabbos, Good Shabbos. Ah. It's so good be alive, huh? Thank you. Thank you. Hallelujah. Hallelujah. Hallelujah means "hallel lut." "Hallel" means "hallel lut" means "wild revelry," and then "Jah" – the name of God. That's not bad, right? It's a good recipe for life. Wild revelry, "Jah" the name of God. That's why that word became so popular. Hallelujah. Yes. Yes, yes, yes.

So Shabbos is the wedding. *[Foreign Language]* In Aramaic, Shabbos is the wedding. And Sabbath, Shabbos, is hieros gamos. That's what Sabbath is. It's the wedding between the *[Foreign Language]* Shiva and Shakti, the line and the circle. The entire Sabbath is built as a wedding. And actually, the "niggun," or that chant that we sing, greeting welcoming the Sabbath, is *Lecha dodi lecrat chala*: "We go out to greet the bride." *[Foreign Language]* "We greet the bride, who is the Sabbath." Then afterwards, there's seven sections from Psalms in the liturgy, which are the "Sheva Brachot," which are the Seven Blessings that are said at a wedding canopy.

And then on Friday night in the liturgy it's *[Foreign Language]* "We rest on Friday night in the 'va,' in the feminine, or in the circle quality of reality." And

then that same text the next morning, "We rest in 'vo,' which is the masculine, in the line quality of reality." And then on Saturday afternoon, as dusk is beginning to settle, the same phrase in liturgy repeats a third time, but this time it's, "We rest in the 'we.'" [*Foreign Language*] Because the "vo" and the "va" – the circle and the line – have now merged in union because of the transformation that takes place in Shabbosing. In Sabbathing

So this is the dharma. Sabbath is lines and circles. It's the whole thing. That's the beginning and the end of Sabbathing. And of course, in order to Sabbath, in order to merge lines and circles, we need to get quite enough. To let go of the week, which was the ceremony, or the ritual, or the process called by many names. Christian and Vyana did so beautifully today that process that actually is letting go of the week. Let's just do that process together for a second. And what we're going to do is we're going to breathe in, and on the exhale we're going to let go of all of the anxiety and all of the stress and all of the contraction of the week.

So we breathe in, "Ahhhh." We breathe out the week. And we breathe it again. "Yahhhh." And one more time we breathe it in. Now, "Ahhhh." And on Shabbat we are on strike. Shabbat means "Shvita," "We're on strike." We're on strike from all the pettiness, we're on strike from all the contraction, we're on strike from everything that we're chasing, appropriately and inappropriately, during the week. In Shabbat we're already home. That's what Sabbath is. Sabbath is, there's no place to go. The wedding's happened. We're in the aftertaste of the nuptials. We're in that sweet and beautiful place which is already liberated. And I want to touch that with you. And two or three of us touched this in Holy of Holies in the last couple of months. But I really want to try and touch this with you because it's about how we do this holy merging between line and circle.

[00:05:00]

And we talked today a little bit just about the yearning. [*Foreign Language*] "We yearn." We yearn to merge with you. We yearn to have a world that's perfect. We yearn to have a world in which the dream is realized. We yearn to have a world in which there aren't distended stomachs. We yearn to have a world in which there's not radical injustice. We yearn to have a world when people need to treat people with dignity. And they can't exercise power in order to deny human dignity, which happens in small places and large places all over the place.

We yearn for a world of justice. And what do we do with the yearning when we can't find its fulfillment? What do you do with the yearning that's so intense, so real and so powerful, but it can't find its place to rest in a world that's filled with outrageous beauty, but also filled with outrageous pain? And it's filled with outrageous corruption. And how you find moments of grace? And whenever there's a moment of grace, it gets reduced and translated into some other degraded form.

It's so hard to create a place for the beauty to rest. For the yearning to find root. And when yearning – which is sincere and beautiful and gorgeous and holy –

can't find root, it gets dangerous. Langston Hughes, a great Afro-American poet, wrote, "What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun?" What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun? When there's no place for the dream to rest, what happens to it? And in the course of human history, and in the course of our lives, there's always been two possible movements. One is we give up the world. And the other is we give up the dream. Either we shatter the world, or we let go of the dream.

So for example, the movement that erupted in Europe that became communism in Russia decided to shatter the world. And so the dream was so intense, of a new world, that whatever needed to be done to accomplish it – 17 million Ukrainian farmers dead, that's what you need – we're going to destroy the world. We're going to erase the world as it is in order to fulfill the dream. And when you erase the world to fulfill the dream, you get a nightmare.

And communism was the worst nightmare of the last 2000 years. Communism killed more people than any other single force in human history in the last 2000 years. Fact. Tragic. But it was the dream. Most of the Jews in New York – that's only a slight exaggeration – in the 1930s were communists. The liberal intellectual Jews were, for sure, communists. Because if you had a choice of being a capitalist or a communist, which would you be? Capitalists, all about profit and gain. And you've got a prophetic ethic, and you have this communist vision of a perfected world, of course.

But communism said the dream was so powerful, it's got to be fulfilled now. And it can't wait. And we want Messiah now, today. So communism wants to destroy the world. The other choice is to give up the dream. And that's what most of us do. The dream's just too painful. It's too hard to realize.

So we give it up. And sometimes it becomes bitter. And the gift becomes painful. So we give up the dream. There's a third way. And the third way is Sabbath. The third way is Center for Integral Wisdom. The third way is Shalom Mountain. Sabbath means that we find places to live the dream now.

That every time we come up to the Mountain, we're living the dream. And we're not waiting. We're realizing the dream now, here. This is Sabbath space. This is Shabbos space. And actually, in the rhythm of time, we build in the dream. And whenever we come together as a sangha in Mystery School, or Wisdom School, or a board retreat, or Esalen retreat, we're coming together in the Holy of Holies. We come together in the Holy of Holies and we're already in liberated space. That's what the Holy of Holies is. It's liberated space. Where we can live the dream fully, and not wait. And so what we're doing is we're refusing to abandon the world, and we're refusing to abandon the dream.

[00:10:00]

That's the technology of Sabbath. It's the most brilliant messianic evolutionary technology ever developed in history. Because it allows us to engage the world in

a gradual process of transformation without abandoning the world. Without shattering its structures. It allows us to hold the dream without becoming bitter because we're actually experiencing the dream in its full realization every week. Or every retreat. Or every Holy of Holies. That's what it means to be a band of outrageous lovers. That's what we mean when we say it's our turn. When we say, "It's our turn to hold the dream. It's our turn to incarnate the dream. It's our turn to become a strange attractor in history, to be the memory of the future that invites the dream to its next level of realization. It's our turn. We're that band. We're those people."

And now I want to tell you, with your permission, a story or two about people who came before us, how held the dream before us, so we could actually be with them in a covenant that's beyond time – bands of outrageous lovers living at different places in different times, connected by the invisible lines of connection, which are eternity holding the dream. When I first met Jerry and he told me about why he created Shalom Mountain, you didn't use the words I'm using, but he was saying the same thing. Let's create a place where we can live the dream. Let's create a messianic place. Let's create the Holy Land. Right here. Where we walk. This is the Holy Land.

[Foreign Language] "We take off our shoes" *[Foreign Language]* "because the land upon which we walk" *[Foreign Language]* "is holy ground." We've got to hold it as holy ground. Because that's what it is. So here's the chant that they used to sing before the following story. And it has one word, and the word is Shabbos. That's the word. Shabbos.

[Chant]

And I can feel that you understand – it's so clear – that as he or she would say, "Shabbos," just that word was everything. It evoked a world in which the dream was lived. Shabbos. A world which was full human dignity. A world of full of human gorgeousness, a world in which unique selves each danced at a particular place in the hierarchy, and everyone was in a perfect place, and no one was jealous of anyone else. Awesome. Shabbos.

So I want to go back to a holy, holy story which is a "You love me" story. Which we talked about a couple years ago. I want to bring it back into this space because the story's really about "You love me." Yeah. So it was on a Shabbos morning. It was on a Saturday morning after the "daven," after the prayer. And there was a long line of "yidden," a long line of supplicants, who would line up to see my teacher's teacher's teacher Israel Baal Shem Tov, Master of the Good Name, founder of the great Hasidic movement that swept out of the Carpathian mountains and lit the world on fire. That Martin Buber loved to write about, and Elie Wiesel wrote about so extensively.

The holy Hasidim. And the supplicants would come to the Ball Shem Tov and each would have a particular life crisis, or a life issue, or a request, or they would be seeking a "tikkun," a fixing. And at the end of one particularly long line, a poor schlepper is ushered into the presence of the Ball Shem Tov and he says, "Holy Master. I'm so broken. I'm so downtrodden. I don't know what to do. Everything turned around. I had everything. And then I lost everything. I don't know what happened. I don't know what to do. I just can't bear it."

[00:15:00]

"The gap, the difference between how I used to live and how I live now, is so intense and so painful. I just can't live in that gap. I've just got to die. Please give me a blessing to die."

And the Baal Shem Tov says, "[*Foreign Language*]. Holy one. Do you want to know what happened? I can give you a blessing to die, or I can tell you what happened." He says, "You can tell me what happened? How can you see on the inside of the inside? How do you possibly know what happened?" He says, "I'm the Ball Shem Tov. It's my job. I'll tell you what happened." He says, "Tell me, tell me, tell me. And is there any fixing?" The Ball Shem Tov says, "I don't know. But let me tell you what happened."

"You see, it was seven, eight, nine years ago on Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, the holiest day on the Hebrew calendar. And you were the "shamus," you were a wealthy man. In your hamlet, in your shtetl, in your town. And you were the shamus, you were the beadle, who served people and helped them through the day because it was a privilege on Yom Kippur to be in devotion to service to everyone gathered in the synagogue, to be in full sincerity and worship and devotion."

And on Yom Kippur, you may know, that we don't eat or drink or engage in sexual relations or anoint the body with oil. It's a day in which we actually transcend the physical and live in pure, rarified spirit for 24 hours only to come back and invest that spirit in all of reality. But there's one thing you're allowed to do. As you're in intense radical meditative prayer, you're allowed to smell fragrances.

Remember, some of you? You're allowed to smell fragrances. And so there's a custom that you take a little box around on Yom Kippur, which is called "tabak," which has these holy beautiful fragrances. And it's usually in a beautiful little silver box, and it's very beautifully brocaded and made for that day. And the shamus, the beadle, carries it around and says, "Here, have a little bit," and you smelled some and [*gasp*]. Because smell is the one sense that wasn't corrupted in the Garden of Eden. All the senses were corrupted and need to be clarified, but smell retains its absolute purity. Fragrance is always clear and direct in his message, and fragrance in Hebrew is "reiach." "Reiach" is "ruwach," pure spirit. Pure absolute spirit.

And so even on Yom Kippur, we're allowed to smell. And even when you're very faint after like 20 hours of fasting – if you've ever been, and have done many, many, many of these services, when the tabak comes around to you and you smell it, you're like *[gasp]*. Right? This kind of taste of the Garden, the fragrance of the Garden of Eden actually enters you and you're animated and illuminated and you forget that you're hungry.

And again, you're resold and you're opened up and something opens on the inside of the inside of the inside. "And you were the shamus, you were the beadle, and you were going around. But there was a schlepper there, also. There was a poor Jew who was at the back of the synagogue. And his clothes smelled a little bit and they were a little tattered. And he was just back there sitting in the corner. And you brought the tabak to everyone, but you didn't take the time to go to the back of the synagogue and bring in the tabak, bring the fragrance, to him.

And so the decree was on high that your fortunes should be reversed. And all of your wealth actually has gone to him. And he's now taking your place, and that new wealthy gentleman you didn't even realize was that schlepper in the back of the synagogue, and you've now taken his role."

He gasps. He just gasps and he remembers that Yom Kippur, and he remembers the truth of it, and he remembers now a faint outline of the schlepper in the back of the synagogue. And he remembers also like he was going to go and he just didn't go. He just didn't do it. And he says, "Holy Baal Shem Tov, is there a fixing? Is there a tikkun. What could fix this?" Baal Shem Tov says, "There's one fixing. There's one fixing. Only one fixing. If you go to this man and you ask him for a favor, and he doesn't grant it to you, then the fortunes will be reversed again. And all of your property will go back to you. And he'll become the schlepper again."

So there we are. There we are. So he goes, he travels back to it shtetl, to his hamlet, and he says, "This is easy. I'm going to get all my wealth back. This is not a problem."

[00:20:00]

So he waits outside the door of the man's business, and when a man comes out he just accosts him, completely rudely and he says, "I need a meal right now! Get me a meal right now!" And the men looked at him and says, "Gevalt!" He says – I'll translate from the Yiddish into the Hebrew – he says, "*[Foreign Language]* If you ask, you must surely need. Of course."

And he goes and he gets him a meal. And the poor man who used to be the rich man who's now the schlepper is just shocked. He was so completely rude to the man. He was sure that he would just brush him off and all the fortunate would have already been reversed. But he's not deterred. Okay, so he didn't get him this time. So he waits. Waits until 3:00 in the morning two days later, knocks on his

door, bangs on his door at 2:00 in the morning and he says, "You remember me? You fed me two days ago! I'm hungry again! Get me a meal!"

The man looks at his face and he says, Wow. Gevalt! If you ask, you must surely need. Of course I'll get you a meal." And he goes and he gets him a meal. At this point, our schlepper's getting a little depressed. He's like, "Wow." But he says, "You know what? I can do it." There's a custom that you go every week on Erev Shabbos, on the eve of the Sabbath, to the "mikvah," which is the ritual immersion in rainwater. Something I did every week for many, many years. You actually immerse in the water, and emerge re-created.

So he slips his way into the bathhouse and when the man emerges naked from the water he says, "Here I am! Get me a meal!" The man looks at him and he says "Wow. You must be so hungry. If you ask, you must surely need." And he gets him a meal. And at this point, the schlepper's devastated. This is crazy. And he finally says, "You know what?" He hears that the man's daughter is getting married. In a few days.

Now there's a custom at the end of a wedding when your daughter gets married to do what's called the "mitzvah tantz." And the mitzvah tantz is something that, when you're a father, you wait for it your entire life – it's the dance you do with your daughter before giving her over to her new partner. And it's this very poignant moment. This is your daughter. It's your little girl. That you've raised. And it's like the apex moment of your life. And you know what the schlepper did, of course. Right?

He wait until right before the mitzvah tantz, he's about to take his daughter's hands and he jumps in between and he says, "I am so hungry! Get me a meal! Why aren't you getting me a meal?" And the man looks at him, tears running down his cheeks. He says, "Oy gevalt! You must be so, so hungry. [*Foreign Language*] If you ask, you must surely need." And the schlepper's so blown out of his mind that he just faints.

He just faints on the spot. He's just gone, he's out. He faints. And when they finally bring him to, he says to the father of the bride, "Do you know who I am?" And he tells him the whole story. And he says, "Yes, I knew exactly who you are. I remember you. It's true. All of your monies came to me. And it's right that it should belong to both of us. So let me split it in half right now and we'll share it."

And for the next 30 years, as is told in the Tales of Hasidim, there were two great men in the city who anyone who came to their door was fed and held in every possible way. "You love me. You love me." So we're going to, tomorrow, up our practice by one. We're going to keep the practice going. Before me come in tomorrow just twice ask two people, "You love me?" So we're holding that practice, which is our matrix practice.

But then, as we move into the laughter of the wedding, find three other people – because the same five number – and ask them something absurd. "Could you kiss my shoes for me right now?" "If you ask, you must surely need." Kiss the shoes. "I need a glass of water right now."

[00:25:00]

[*Foreign Language*] "If you ask, you must surely need." My shoulder's a little tight. Could you give me a two minute massage?" "If you ask, you must surely need."

And invite three people to meet you in that place. With holy laughter and holy seriousness. And you've got to find something which is exactly right. Exactly right. And you'll know exactly what it is. And you'll know the boundaries yourself. You'll figure out exactly what they are. Ask for something wild, exciting, gorgeous, beautiful, but that's absurd, out of place, outlandish, strange in that moment. And then the response that you're going to get from every single person in this room is, "If you ask, you must surely need. Because you love me." Amen

13-SATURDAY MORNING PART 1 - Q&A METRICS EXTRA ABOUT PENETRATION

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Part 1

Track: 13-Saturday Morning Part 1 - Q&A Metrics extra about Penetration

TRT: 54:50

Marc: What we're going to do is, this morning in a really spacious way, we're going to spend the morning on the line qualities, of course, as we promised. Then this afternoon – we spent yesterday about two hours, we did the ceremony yesterday in the end of the introduction hieros gamos, yesterday afternoon. And then we went into the line qualities. We're going to begin the afternoon with an art exhibition photo from Jack. It's going to be beginning our afternoon. So we went into about an hour and a half, two hours, something like that, on the line qualities. So we're going to do the line qualities now, and then we're going to do the circle qualities in the afternoon.

But just notice which – is it circle or line – that wants to measure and make sure that we have enough time for both? Is that a circle quality, or is that a line quality? It's a line quality. It's making sure – it's measuring time. On the other hand, it's also a circle quality because it makes sure things are equal. So it's kind of a line/circle quality coming together in that moment. And actually, in every moment you can catch what's going on. Whatever the action is, you can always

catch what's happening in the action. So what we're going to do this morning is we're going to actually begin and we're going to practice. And then I want to actually invite, again, just for 15 minutes, 10 minutes, any questions that are in the space. There were a few questions that floated around. Some came to me in e-mail. If you want to bring them into the space, you're welcome.

If you want to save them for later, you're welcome to, but I was one have time, if there's a burning question – again, a burning question that relates to where we're going – so there's a general question which is therapeutic in nature right, completely interesting, don't ask that here. If it's therapeutic in nature and applies to – so in other words, the question serves all of us and we're in that space, then it's awesome.

When we become lines we don't want to become androgynous. When we become lines and circles we don't want to become androgynous. That's not the goal. The goal is lines and circles, and to be able to have full access to your line and full access to your circle without losing – and this is the key – it's the fine evolution of the dharma from five years ago. And it's, we don't lose our matrix. We have full access to both. But we don't lose right a core quality.

So if I'm profoundly in my man-ness masculine, I now have full access to my circle, which is part of my hieros gamos, my intermarriage, but yet I don't lose that quality of being a man. It's not lost in me. I don't lose that thrusting quality which is uniquely expressive in me. And even though I fully access my circle, and even though the circle in woman form can access the line, there still are gender differences. Meaning biology doesn't get left behind. Stay with us. This is subtle. So what are we doing? We're transcending and including. I'm transcending my quality of line and accessing my circle. But I'm transcending and including. I'm not transcending and excluding.

Now what does that mean in a very, very practical way? Maurice, what does that mean for real? How do I experience that? Really simple. If you call and you want to have a conversation with someone, and let's say you go through the whole listing thing, which we're going to return to this morning. How we listen to each other. Our nail on the forehead conversation. Which, by the way, if you notice, the woman was the idiot in that conversation, paradoxically. I've just noticed that.

Speaker: He was stupid too, though. Because he didn't just grab the nail and take it out.

Marc: Right, where you see that. Okay. He could have just done – a little bloody, but okay. Yeah.

[Laughter]

I've got to say, I'm kind of with him, it kind of scares me, but okay. Just leave it right there. I'm not going anywhere near there, but okay. But when you listen – so

let's say your popularity is – your attractive polarity is that you're attracted to the masculine. To men. So you're attracted to men. So if you call and have a conversation with a man, and he's really listening well, then you have both the experience of being listened to and the polarity of being listened to by a man. It's not the same– whatever your polarity is – but if your polarity is that you're attracted to men, and you call have someone listen to you who's not a man, even if they do just as good of a job of listening, it's a different experience of being listened to. Does everyone catch that? You can catch that in your body, right?

So actually, what you actually realize is, it doesn't disappear. It's not just, let's say in the classical – let's take the hetero example, for example, but it works in the straight/gay always across. But let's take that example just for a second now. So if you're being listened to by a man who has accessed his circle and is really good at listening, you're still having the experience of polarity, of being listened to by a man. That experience doesn't disappear. And actually, if he goes totally girlfriend on you, then actually you lose that polarity. You don't want to talk to him anymore. He's girlfriend.

That's the subtlety. You can actually feel it right there, right? And on the one hand, you want the line to access, in this particular example, his circle, yet as a line. That's the whole point. So the way to say this is, she comes in threes. She comes in threes. She always comes in threes. And she comes in threes means – it doesn't mean threesomes for this afternoon's activity. It doesn't mean that. Sorry. I'm sorry. And it doesn't mean the holy trinity, although it does mean that. Because those might be related, those two. But what it means is she always comes in threes.

So what does it mean, she comes in threes? And those who've been in the dharma with us actually know what that means. She comes in threes means there's always a three-part structure. So for example, the baby's born and baby says, "Where? What? How? When?" And the baby's asking these great questions. Great questions. Wow. And then the baby gets answers. "Oh, we understand where, it's science and sociology and anthropology and religion and theory. And I know where and I know when and I know why and I know how."

And then this adult grows into a sage, the sage says, "Where? What? When? How?" And so the master's ask. I don't understand. If the baby's asking those questions, "Where, what, when how?" and the sage's asking those questions, then we haven't accomplished anything. The same questions at the beginning, the same questions at the end. And of course, all of us in the room know instantaneously, that's not true. That the questions of the sage are completely different than the questions of the baby. Because you went question, answer, question. She comes in threes.

I start with a question. And then I answer the question. Then there's more question, then I answer, and there's more. And then I end with a question. I end

with the mystery. But the mystery that I end with isn't the questions of the baby. It's a completely different mystery. She comes in threes. She always comes in threes. And to actually feel into that, to know that – and it applies everywhere.

So for example, in holy transmission you always want simplicity, but you never want first simplicity. There's first simplicity. Level one. One. Then there's complexity. You've got to be willing to deal with the complexity. Then after the complexity, you get to number three, which I call second simplicity. But a second simplicity isn't the simpleton. It's simplicity that's engaged all of the complexity, then can actually see through it and identify the second simplicity, this higher level simplicity.

So level one simplicity, level two complexity, level three simplicity again. She comes in threes. She always comes in threes. No matter what. About everything. The nature of the structure of reality is that reality comes in threes. And we could literally – I've done it before, with an inner group in Utah in 2010. We spent an entire weekend going through 30 examples of "she comes in threes" and reading all of reality based on this principal. She comes in threes. She always comes in threes. Never doesn't.

And you've also got to look at, what side of it are you on? So there's pre-personal, before the personal. I'm a baby. I'm before the personal. And then there's the personal. I'm actually in the personal. I'm in my personhood. Then there's transpersonal, after personhood. Now watch for a second.

Most Romantic poets, an enormous amount of human potential New Age teaching confuses one and three. The one and three – about twelve years ago I called it a "level one/level three confusion". And actually, that's where I met my buddy, Ken Wilber. Our original conversation was on this, and he said, "What you call level one/level three confusion, I call –" (and he borrowed the term from a very interesting thinker)" – a *pre/trans fallacy*. A level one/level three confusion." What's level one/level three confusion? So for example, in most Romantic literature, it's talking about, "Let's go back to the pristine innocence of the baby." Well, no. That's why I always say, babies aren't good. It's not just a joke. Babies aren't good. There's never a good baby anyplace in the world. No good babies. Babies are cute. But goodness is a quality of the personal.

So I don't want to go back to being a baby. And all the great Romantic literature about going back – Coleridge, Wordsworth – going back to being a baby. I don't think so. That's regressive. I don't want to be a baby. I don't want to get that place. Mary Oliver. Thank you. I love the poetry. Take it home. Because Mary Oliver's filled with pre/trans fallacies. All of Mary Oliver's one big, big trans fallacy. It's about going back to this fluffy – hello? Mary Oliver actually engaged sweetheart the complexity. And then we get to the simplicity on the other side. And Mary Oliver's a classical retro romantic

Now it's beautiful to read, just like Coleridge is, just to be clear. I'd love to write some of that poetry, even if it is a pre/trans fallacy. Greatly written. And it's a beautiful. I mean, I understand. But it's a big pre/trans fallacy. Meaning, what I want to do is I want to get to the transpersonal, not the pre-personal. And to confuse the pre-personal the transpersonal, to go back to this regressive state – you go to Burning Man. Burning Man's an interesting phenomena. Last years I went there and taught at Burning Man and had a great time. Burning Man was a wild scene. And we have a camp, about 100 close people in a circle and we did a whole fascinating, beautiful experience Burning Man. And Burning Man's one big pre/trans fallacy.

Everyone's convinced that because they're in a circle drumming they're therefore highly spiritual and evolved. And they're having an ecstatic experience, usually on drugs. Generally with some other things happening on the side. Burning Man's kind of a wild scene. But that's not spirituality. That could be one or two things. That could be transpersonal. You may be in a circle drumming, you may have transcended. Or you could be just regressive. So I always distinguish between them. She comes in threes. It's always one, two, three. And always, the evolutionary move is, am I at three or am I at one?

Sacred sexuality. A sacred sexuality, really a regression to one. Which is how it's critiqued by two. When level two people see sacred sexuality they say, "Wow, you guys have found a reason to fuck around. Wow, really? You got a job doing that? That's awesome. I'd love to do that." Level two always looks at sacred sexuality as a regressive level one move. Because they don't have an embodied experience of what level three looks like. So therefore, it's interpreted by society without distinction as level one. But if you actually access level three, you know that level three and level one are completely different. They're complete totally different.

But if you don't have an embodied experience of it, then you're only frame of reference is, "Oh, in my experience that's level one." You see it from the outside. And from the outside, you can't distinguish between them. All you see from the outside is the same motions, so you don't have an interior experience of it, so you don't realize it's level three. So two always interprets three as one. It's a huge sentence. Two always interprets there as one. Which is why – I was having a conversation with – about eight, nine years ago at a particularly complex moment in my life, I was having a long conversation with a friend of mine, David, who writes on sexuality. He lives in Madeira Beach. And David said to me, "Never engage in any sexuality with anyone in your circle." He said, "Why? Because when they experience it, they'll experience it as this level three, but then they'll fall out of the level three place. Then they'll share it with a friend who's two. The friend who's two will tell them, 'Wow, you just did one.' Then their own wounds will come up. Then they'll project one onto it." And then, as David said, "Then you're fucked."

[Laughter]

And not in a good way. And so for example, his policy's always been never to engage that world. Now that doesn't mean that's the right policy. It means that's a decision, and that's a legitimate decision. And other people need to bravely and audaciously hold that reality of sacred sexuality. We need sacred sexuality in the world, for sure. But just understand – one, two, three. It's an unbelievably helpful map. You just have that map, you can understand so much of reality. Two always interprets three as one. It's the way it works. And remember, two always desperately wants to go back to one.

So the notion that someone's doing three is an anathema. Because actually, three is rigorous. Three's hard. Three's not casual. There's not like, "Oh, just doing –" No, no. Three actually require so much more discipline, so much more dignity, so much more depth. That's why it's level three. Yes, Nance?

Nance: So where does the impulse come from? If two always wants to regress back, reflect back, where does the impulse to go forward come from?

Marc: Yes. Line. That's the line. Love you madly. That's the line. The line is the impulse towards transformation. That's exactly the line. That's the line. Now the regression back – I mean, Nance's inquiry's so good that it is the dharma itself. The movement back is the shadow of circle. It's the regressive movement to the womb. So one of the circle shadows – and I'm just noting all of the little times talking about circle here that go in our circle time. Just to kind of say that. And it's the movement back to womb is, "I want to go back to bed."

How many people ever, you get up in the morning you say, "I just want to go back under the covers?" That's circle. That's circle. Now it's a circle shadow on a good day – on a bad day it's a circle shadow. On a good day, there's no school, it's a snow day. Oh my god? Right? I mean, can you find that feeling? We're growing up – if you grew up in a snow place, it's one of feelings you can literally find from childhood. You wake up in the morning, you look outside and it's a snow day. Everyone can find it. How many people didn't grow up in snow? Did not. It means you didn't have that experience. Anyone who did not have that experience? That's probably the source of all your issues.

[Laughter]

But we're going to fix that. We're going to fix that. That's happening. Yes, sister. But literally, there's so many experiences we have in childhood, and everyone can access that immediately. Because that's the beautiful circle. It means I don't need to go to school – line. And I get to actually go back to circle and I'm not regressing. It's legitimate. It's a beautiful moment. But that's actually an embodied experience of line/circle, right there. And that's what we've got to do with all of this, we've got to embody it. What're your name?

Steve: Steve. So in the psychotherapeutic world, Mark and Lori world, how would you place that world –?

Marc: We'll talk about it. When we talk about examples – and we'll talk about it later – when we talk about examples of... Well, it was a question. We'll talk about it now just for a second. And by the way, we're going to do a Q&A session – this is it. So we're now actually doing our Q&A session. So in a psychotherapeutic world, again, we haven't done circles yet. So we're going to give them their full due, but just to say, good psychotherapy is hieros gamos. Good psychotherapy is actually doing two things. Good psychotherapy's both guiding and directing, and holding a radical womb space. And precisely, the flaws in psychotherapy are always when there's something lacking in the hieros gamos.

And again, this is lines and circles. Either the therapist is not directive at all, which is most psychotherapy. Errors on that side holding a space reflecting back. Or it's disguised as a womb, but it's really a directive. So it's like the guy who terminates therapy and he says to his therapist, "I've got to terminate therapy." And like therapist says, "Totally. It's very important for you to go on and assert your autonomy. "All the good things. Line, right? He says, "But can you give me some instructions? Like how do I deal with my dreams? He says, "I've given you all your instructions how to interpret dreams. If you interpret them, really work out, go through it all yourself, you'll be fine. And if you really have a question, of course, I don't want to abandon you. So you can call me." So the guys goes for like a week and he's having all these dreams, he's interpreting them. Finally, he has this really hard dream. He works through it the whole night, calls his therapist at 7:00 in the morning. He says, "I had this dream." Da, da, da. "What did you do? Did you interpret it? Great. How did you interpret it? Okay, really good. What did you do then? "Went downstairs." What did you do?" "I had breakfast." What did you have? "Coffee." "You call that a breakfast?" That's it.

[Laughter]

Thank you. And that's it. And as therapist seems to be line, and releasing him to autonomy, and then "You call that a breakfast?" Meaning underneath, it's all suffocating womb. So in other words, great therapy and great teaching – transmission. Transmission is penetrative. And yet it has to hold a quality of "You love me". That's hieros gamos. Right there. Both things are happening at the same time. And both teaching and therapy almost always errors on not holding the hieros gamos. And we said yesterday, we cited Nachman of Breslov. He says tragedy, flaw, or in his word, evil comes to the world when the circle and line doesn't penetrate.

So therapy's a fantastic example. So you can begin to see how real this is. Just in this little conversation this is absolutely real and embodied. It's every place. When

you actually begin to get this prism, the world just starts to open up in a thousand different ways. Is there a last question in the room? Yes?

Speaker: Extremely brief. I just spaced out for a minute earlier. When you were talking about sex, I got the level three, but I spaced out on – what's exactly level one and level two?

Marc: Do you find that happens when you space out when you talk about sex?

Speaker: Not normally.

Marc: Okay. So when we're talking about sexuality... We we're talking about level one, level two and level three.

Speaker: Yeah, I got level three, but just –

Marc: Okay, I got you. So level one would be classical sexuality, which actually doesn't have a context form. Just unbridled. Just hanging fucking around. Level two would be the classical structures of conventionality. And level three we be – think you. We didn't explicate that. You're right. We just alluded to it. Thank you. And level three would be post conventional sexuality, which is out of the classical structures, which might appear in many forms. It might appear in the form of a sacred intimate. It might appear in the form of a post-conventional relationship. But it's post-conventional. It's not pre-conventional. That pre/post confusion. Good? Okay. Gilles?

Gilles: I think I want to just share an insight. I have had the insight, but now it's making sense in the new context. Over Christmas I was in Brazil in the Amazonia, did a lot of spiritual experience. And I had a profound encounter with my Unique Self. And when he showed up he "told me" that he was – to embody this reality needed two other dimensions with him, together. And it was light and love. And now I'm getting that maybe this is the line and the circle, as this showing up with those fundamental principles. It appears like principles of [*Foreign Language*], of embodiment. And at the same time, it feels like a three Psalms. Like just getting inside the inside. Kind of connecting with –

Marc: And Gilles points out two critical things. One is that interpretation and experience always go together. Meaning if I have the structure of consciousness, which is Unique Self, and I have an experience, then I realized that's my Unique Self talking to me. Without the structure I have the experience, and it lacks interpretation. That's the first thing you just modeled gorgeously. The second thing, which was really your point – line, your point – again, it always shows up – is light and love, which you suggest correctly, is an expression of line and circle. And by time we finish today, we're going to see exactly why that's true. So we're going to relate back to that beautifully. So thank you. Yes?

Speaker: At the risk of poaching other people wanting to raise this – where's Victoria? – I wanted to – we had some side conversation about Victoria's question yesterday. And I can either stop now, Victoria, or keep going.

Marc: I was going to talk about that. I'm deeply aware of the question. Tom sent me a lovely email on it. And the place that I'm planning to engage that is when we get to the next evaluation. So I totally got it, and we'll – got it. Okay, good? Good.

So when we talked yesterday about the three qualities – so the third equality that we talked about was penetration. It was the third line quality. We talked about it in its light form and in its shadow form. And actually, maybe this is a good time, since I'm actually going to the qualities. Let's handle that right now, actually. So there's going to be three questions on our little metrics that we're doing. The first question is not a multiple choice, not a number question. And all metrics are best when you're actually writing something. So it's, where does this quality play in my life in its life form? Where does this quality play in my life in its shadow form? That's what we did yesterday. So far so good?

The second question will be, just in general – that's a written out question. I write a story, an incident, and everyone – whether it's major or minor in their life – it plays someplace. So the notion that it doesn't play anyplace – not a possibility. Because everyone's lines and circles. That's the point. So if you think it's not playing, look again. That's one. But two is, it may be a major motif in your life, and it might be not a major – a light motif in your life. So the second question will be, how focused am I – that's the word I want to use. How focused am I on this? One 1-10, am I very focused on this? It's a big issue in my life? Or I'm not very focused on it?

So for example, if you're a strong circle – and this takes into account the issue that Victoria raised yesterday, and Tom explicated and y'all discussed – at least a group of people. So if you're a strong circle, so issues, for example, of hierarchy and status will play in your life. I'm going to be really clear about that. If you think it's not playing in your life you're lying. It's definitely playing, but it might not be major. It might be a light motif that comes up. So you're not focused on it. It's there, and you even were able to think of an example, in light and shadow, but it's not where your energy is. You're not focused on it.

So actually, just evaluate your focus. At what level are you focused on this? At a 10? An 8? Or a 3? And then the third question will be, how much of this do I have? How good at this am I? Am I really good at the hierarchy status thing? I mean, I'm really good at asserting my Unique Self and playing my appropriate role in the story. Whatever. Or my autonomy/independence or my penetrating quality. Or do I feel like I'm not so good at it? I'd like to actually bring it up. I'd actually like to bring it up. I'd actually like to raise it up. S

So the first question is an actual example of a light and shadow, how it plays in your life. Second question is, what level of focus do I have on this? And the third is – right now, if I have very little focus on it, obviously the third question is less interesting. But if I have big focus on it – which most people have some level focus on it – do I want to bring it up? Am I a 10 at this? Am I a 9 at autonomy/independence? Am I a 7? Or am I a 2? So it's three questions. Cool? Good? So now – yes?

Speaker: What's the distinction between, "I'm good at this," or, "There's a lot of shadow of this?"

Marc: Really simple. I'm good at this means... So let's take autonomy and independence. That quality we did yesterday. So I'm good at it is, I'm good at throwing off tyranny. I'm good at speaking truth to power. I'm good at actually freeing myself from my family system. I'm good at freeing myself from the therapist I shouldn't be with anymore, because they keep saying, "You call that a breakfast?" They're suffocating. Whatever it is. I'm good at appropriately asserting my autonomy and independence.

The shadow of it would be, I'm freeing myself from responsible that really is mine. And that's actually connected to my Unique Self. Now of course, I question, "What's my Unique Self?" That's always going to be the question.

Speaker: I should have asked, what's the difference between, "I'm not good at this," and the shadow side, then?

Marc: Again, the "I'm not good at it" would mean I'm not that good – I get it, okay. So "I'm not that good" means I need to be able to free myself more from my family system. I need to be able to assert my autonomy and independence more. I'm either really good at asserting my autonomy and independence, or I'm really not so good at it. That's strong and weak. The shadow – now I get your question. Thanks. The shadow would be, I'm actually freeing myself from responsibility that's really mine. I'm not showing up. I'm here for the weekend. I'm not bothering to discern that question. You get it? You just showed up now. If you were here and you had that question, which is always a question in the room, and you didn't show up and ask it, that's be freeing yourself from responsibility which is your Unique Self. Because you got that question. It's deep in you. It's a clear question. But you don't bother to ask it because, "I don't want to ask it." That would be shadow.

Light would be exactly what you just did. You brought that question in the room and clarified that. Everyone see it? Isn't it great how it's just there? If dharma's real it's just always right there. You don't have to go anyplace for it. It's happening right there. There's no split. It's what Jeff said. In intensions, the dharma's in me. The dharma's in the room. Yes, Tom?

Tom: I'd like to offer that last paragraph ___ email I sent you in response, Jeana, to your inquiry. For me, what helps me with that third question – how good am I at this? – is to think, if I'm a 10 in my light, and I'm a 2 on my shadow, then I'm nailing that in the way I'd want to.

Marc: Tell us which quality you're using, so we'll be able to –

Tom: So let's say autonomy. So do I move into Shalom, kind of leaving my life behind, and I'm operating in Shalom. A big move five years ago for me was that.

Marc: We're assuming that was a light more, right?

Tom: That was a light move.

Marc: Totally a light move, right? But that's clear to you. Now look how clear that is. Everyone see that? Clear as day

Tom: And if I'm never ever drop my responsibility, then I'm nailing it. I've got a 10 on the light, and a 0 on the shadow. But if I've got a 10 on the light and I'm also flaking out on my responsibilities, I've got some work to do on that dimension. And so, for me, the gap between my score on the light and my score on the shadow actually tells me something about how I'm doing. So my gap between the two on second question, tell me something about the third question. If I'm a 0 on the light and 10 on the shadow, I've got some really serious work to do.

Marc: Completely fantastic. I just want to make sure we get – let's get the questions in the right order because, again, what we're doing here – and again, this is what I meant when we said we're going to do this dharma together. So this is a great clarification. This is exactly what should be happening. This is exactly what we're doing. So let's do this. What's the first question? I want to make sure we all get them really, really clear. So it's crystal clear. Because about 75 percent of the room's clear and 25 percent just got a little fuzzy. You can feel it in the space, right? So let's do it again. Let's get it.

So the first question is, where does it happen in my life? An example of where it's happening in the light. Let's say we're going to take autonomy and independence. Where I'm really good at that. I came to Shalom, an example where it's happening in the light. And where is it in shadow, meaning I'm not taking responsibility. Whatever that means, I'm not taking responsibility. I'm the board chair and I'm not showing up to any board meetings. Which is not the case, but that would be an example.

So those are the examples. Question two is, how big is this in my life? How focused –? Our word was focused. How focused is this autonomy? How much in my life am my focused on autonomy and independence? How big does this play in my life? So it's, how big does this play? How much am I focused on it? That's

just a general question. 1-10. That's the first 1-10. Three is, how good am I at it? This is a rating question How good am I at it? So if I came to Shalom five years, like I'm really good at asserting my autonomy and independence, but Jeff added in a dimension yesterday. Which is, how good am I at it? And it's usually good to rate a few parts of my life. Professionally, personally, spiritually. Those are the three we did yesterday.

So you might want to do a little rating around how going am I at it, professional, relationally, spiritually? Those may be the same. Usually not. They're not exactly the same. And then – go ahead?

Speaker: The "how focused I am" – if his is something that is so natural to me that it just kind of flows through, I might not be focusing –

Marc: So that's why – you're exactly right, love. That's why I used the words "how focused" or, "How much does it play in my life?"

Speaker: Okay. So plays.

Marc: Right. You can use either one. Because for some people *focus* helps, other people how much – exactly for that reason, I'm using both. You've totally got it.

Speaker: One's a line thing, one's a circle thing.

Marc: But let me just state – but by flipping back and forth, and I just I want everyone to see the whole thing. So we're in three. The third question is, how good am I at it? How strong am I at it? 1-10. And, what's the nature of – what's my shadow in it? Is my shadow strong in it? Or is it weak? 1-10. Those are the questions. So actually, if we count them – let's just go through it again, okay.

The first question has two parts. Where does it play in my life in light? Where does it play in my life in shadow? It's not a rating question. That's one. One AB. Good so far? B, how much does it play in my life, or how much am I focused on it? It's a general question. That's a rating question. That's the first rating question. Three, again, has an A and B. How strong or weak is my light? How strong or weak is my shadow? That's it. It's a fantastic metric that's great. I totally appreciate the clarification on it. That's a helpful clarification. Really helpful. Yes?

Speaker: The light/shadow are not a see-saw. You can be strong in light, but you've got a whole bunch of shadow you still have to –

Marc: Right. And that's what Tom's point towards. What Tom's pointing towards is that the third one – and Tom, amend me if I get it wrong – that the third one's going to give you a lot of information. So if it turns out that I'm really strong one side of it, but I'm also really strong on the shadow side, that's interesting to look at. The

third one's going to give me a lot of information. Tom, did I get everything you said? Did we missed anything? Thank you. And the email was really helpful last night. It was totally appreciated. Awesome. Christian.

Christian: I'm finding what helps me to find the distinction if it's my light or my shadow showing up is, what's my intention behind it? Is my intention to walk away from my responsibilities? Or is my intention to move towards –

[Crosstalk]

Christian: So is my intentions to be more with my Unique Self, or avoid my Unique Self?

Marc: Great. Love that. Is my intention, am I moving closer to my Unique Self, or am I moving farther away from my Unique Self, is a great metrics. Fantastic. Thank you ____[name]. Okay anyone else?

Paul: It also occurs to me that a distinction is like that. Am I using this? Am I asserting this? Or is it using me?

Marc: Right. So that's great, Paul. Am I using it, is it using me? Those are great distinctions I'm going to hold now just because we can go forever, right? Eric, is this like burning? Go.

Eric: It's the request that, as you lay out the line, you lay out the circle part that we're going to get to later.

Marc: No.

Eric: No?

Marc: No. Answer is no on that. In other words, I totally get – I thought about that. I thought about that, but I'd actually like to be in the line energy. I will occasionally – I've referred to circle like eight times already. I'll occasionally refer to it as necessary. In the end, what I had intended to do – we'll see on time – was actually have the last session do circle/line, circle/line, circle/line, but first I want to be in each energy. I totally get it. In the writing of it, by the way, in the end it could be that they should be the way you suggest. And I get why. I thought about it a lot. Whether to do it that way.

Eric: I get the shadow part of it when I bring the other one up.

Marc: No, I know. I actually noticed that, because every time you did it yesterday you actually modeled that, and it was great. One's not better than the other, but I've got a whole bunch of reasons why I do it this way. But I totally get the impulse, and received and honored. So let's talk about penetration – that third quality – for a second. Because there's a couple of things that are important here.

Let's talk about the three penetration. So what is an expression of penetration? Penetration is usually understood, as we said yesterday, in its shadow context. The predator is the shadow of penetration. Anyone remember from yesterday? So here we go.

So the predator's the shadow of penetration, but penetration by itself isn't an absolutely sacred quality. Now what's the other quality –? And I want to mention this because it's so big in society today, and it's so misunderstood. What's the other classical masculine quality which is always understood as being a quality of penetration? What's the other classical masculine quality?

Audience: Leadership.

Marc: Well, leadership would be a great positive quality. That's worth writing down. There is a dimension of leadership which is penetrative, and there's actually a different style. There's actually masculine style leadership and there's feminine style leadership. But there's line leadership and circle leadership. And leadership, actually, is going to be always – like therapy – a marriage of circle and line. But what's the shadow quality, to be specific? Oppression. In particular, there's a particular quality, which is violence. Violence. The rap that men always get is violence. That's always the men rap. Violence. And particularly the way we hear it most in the line/circle world is domestic violence.

Super Bowl commercials, commercials in major magazines, "X percent of women –" they'll show a picture of a bride and say, "X percent of these women will be murdered by the man they married." And there's an entire literature on domestic violence. And the basic assumption is that domestic violence is this major male problem. It's just not true. And I want to make this really, really clear. This is one of the myths of victim feminism right. And it's categorically not true. Meaning the best studies we have – look at Cathy Young called *Ceasefire in the Gender Wars*. Look at Laura Kipnis' work. Look at Daphne Patai's work. Daphne Patai's a brilliant thinker at University of Massachusetts. Look at Warren Farrell's work, who wrote the most authoritative chapter on this. I was thinking about it before we came here of actually doing an entire session just on this because it's so important.

But the facts are that domestic violence between men and women is equal, slightly leaning towards women, and we're not just talking about sweet domestic violence. People think, "Oh, men smash the women and women just slap them." No, we're talking about domestic violence with serious measurable injury. We're talking about murder. The levels are actually about equal, slightly leaning towards women. That's a fascinating piece of information. Now if I had time, I would actually detail it. This is not my original research. I just want to be clear. But I've collected, I've done a lot of research in the secondary literature. Because I was very, very interested in this issue.

And when you say this to someone – I said this to my friend Sally Campton. "That can't be true." Sally was a major second wave feminist. And she was like, "This can't be true." And everyone kind of said, "Well, it must be not serious." Everyone has a whole list of things mitigating it. "It's just not true" You check all the information, and Warren wrote really the best essay on this. If you'd like, I'll send everyone a bibliographical reference to all the secondary resources on this right. And they're basically ignored in the academy. And it's an unbelievably important piece of information. Because literally what it does is, it changes our view. It's one of the ways we demonize men. And we demonize men as, they are the wife bashers, the wife beaters. And it's so strong. And what it does is it actually poisons love. It actually poisons love.

And if you're raised in an environment in which men – the word man is easily associated with wife beater, and then you went through you're Women's Studies program, where all of the statistics are warped beyond imagination – and Warren wrote to *Ms. Magazine*, and to the Ms. Foundation, on each of his stats and said, "Do you have any challenging stats? Would you like to challenge this in any way?" To each one, there was no response. They responded to the letter saying, "No, we don't." So we actually went to all the classical sources – it's just not true.

Which means that lines live in men and women. And so the shadow of that line lives in men and women. And we think the shadow of that line is a man thing. It's just not true. And when you get that – now of course what happens is, you've got to check reportage. Men report domestic violence much less. So you've got to figure out how to figure out when it's happening. There's one great interview that Warren did with a cop from New Jersey. "Are you kidding? My wife smashed me on the head. I got a concussion. Went to the hospital. You think I'm going to tell the boys that? I'm going to tell the boys that she smashed me on the head? No way."

So there's a reportage issue. Because even men that are seriously injured –the amount of men killed in their sleep. Now often, by the way, when men murder their wives – which happens. Not very often, but it happens. And wives murder their husbands. Not very often, but it happens. But when men murder their wives, or women murder their husbands, it happens differently. When men murder their wives, it's usually a crime of passion. They're angry and it explodes in murder. When women where their husbands, it's usually premeditated. And it's the difference between a sex object and a success object.

So when the sex object – in other words, his person. Status. My woman. When there's a violation of that, it explodes often – not often, but occasionally; I shouldn't say often – occasionally in rage in its most shadow forms. But of course, the woman looks at the man as a success object. Same problem. So what usually happens is, the woman actually either hires a hit man, in which case it's not listed as her having done it, in the FBI statistics. Or participates with a boyfriend in

doing it, in which case it's listed as a multiple murder. Not on the women. So you've got to actually know how to track the statistics.

And this is what Warren did for a couple years, a decade ago. And it essentially got him banned from Women Studies in universities. Warren recently met the president Northwestern who said, "I love your work. Can't have you teaching any place on campus. I could lose my job." So that's kind of powerful. That's really important. And just to be really clear, I'm a goddess worshiper. Meaning all my work, until nine years ago, was *Mystery of Love* on Eros, a book on Lilith challenging the rabbinic literature and reclaiming the feminine and attacking the rabbinic literature for demonizing Lilith. I'm a goddess worshiper, from beginning to end.

And I made a mistake, until about nine, ten years ago, and basically I made the same mistake that I'm now critiquing, which was I naturally identified the feminine with the virtuous, and the masculine with problematic. So the same mistake I'm critiquing, I made until about a decade ago. And it blinded me. It was actually a mistake. It was a philosophical mistake, and it was an existential mistake, and it was a moral mistake, and it was a spiritual mistake. And I'm not completely unintelligent, but I was just so in me. I wrote an entire book. It's the best book around today, on the world, on Lilith. Has more sources on Lilith which traces all the sources in Hebrew, and Lilith, who's the she-demon. I wrote an entire book tracing 2000 years attacking male patriarchy for demonizing the feminine.

And it didn't even occur to me that what they were also saying is that there's a dimension of feminine shadow. Because the notion that there was feminine shadow was so anathema to me – feminine shadow? I was like, "How could anyone attack the feminine?" And I wrote this long scholarly work with my colleague then, Ohad, defending Lilith against rabbinic attack. So in other words, I was firmly in that camp. Now I still stand by everything we wrote in the book, but I now realize, "Oh, they were actually talking about something, also." They didn't quite get that wrong. They actually saw a shadow that I was blind to.

And that's why I point it out. In other words, I'm not in any way – be really clear – I'm not demonizing the feminine. I'm just saying the feminine and masculine are both qualities of divinity. Qualities of cosmos. And they each have light and shadow. And we don't need more feminine values, or more masculine values. We need more line and circle values at higher levels of consciousness. Which is a huge shift. It's a huge shift in the way we think.

So just in terms of penetration and its shadow form, which is violence, I just felt it was necessary to bring that into the room. It's a great example of where you see that lines, in their shadow form, exist in both men and women. And when we can actually identify the line with man, we're actually making a huge cultural mistake. Everyone get that? And the last sentence, I'll just say it again. It poisons love. It

poisons love. That's the point. It's about "You love me" and "I love you." It poisons love. This is about healing love. It's about opening up love. And to do that, we need to have an accurate view of line and circle, and of man and woman. Okay quickly. Carol.

Carol: I was looking at the second quality, freedom. Asserting freedom. And the role of women in Muslim cultures the Afghans in literature, that women who break free by violence... I guess it's the two different qualities ____ –

Marc: Yeah, it's a different point. It's an interesting point. Where sometimes women need to use some level of violence to attain freedom. That is sometimes absolutely true in Afghani type cultures. That's absolutely true. And by the way, in South America today in a number of the Spanish speaking countries, there's a major feminist revolution in which the methodology of the revolution is infidelity. Yeah. There's a major, major thing happening. And Esther pointed this out to me. Esther Perel wrote a book called *Mating in Captivity* where there's actually – and her new book is on infidelity. And she pointed out to me in a conversation a couple months ago that infidelity is actually being used as a political tool to actually break the hold of patriarchy. Which is completely fascinating.

But point being, in contemporary Western culture that's rarely the case. It's rarely the case. Okay. Let's move on. Just last.

Speaker: I just want to make sure that this is what you're talking about, is you're talking about domestic violence.

Marc: Yes.

Speaker: People who live together.

Marc: Domestic violence. I'm talking particularly about domestic violence. Absolutely. Particularly domestic violence. And again, just the last thing. We always ignore what's happening to men. So for example, many more men are raped in America than women. It's just true. When you say that, you're kind of shocked. Many more men are raped in America than women. It's called prison rape. Men are raped in prison all over the place. And we don't even mention it because it's men being raped. Really?

Speaker: Well, it's ____ inmates.

Marc: Well, right. Two problems. You're a man and you're an inmate. So what the fuck, as it were. Exactly. So the issue's not women being raped. The issue's rape. And that's always the issue. That's always the issue. Again, it was necessary for the feminine voice to emerge. The emergence of feminism is an emergence. It's one of the four great emergences and evolutions of divinity in this generation. And I am a staunch feminist through and through. The emergence of feminism is one of

the great revelations of divinity in our generation. But if I can bar the distinction made by a number of early feminist thinkers, I'm a power of feminist, not a victim feminist. It's an enormously great distinction. And we need to actually support power feminism in all of its glory, and distinguish between power feminism and victim feminism. That's a critical distinction.

Let's move on. This is a big topic. Between power feminism and victim feminism. Again, not my phrase. That's a phrase by – a number of early feminists coined it. It's a great phrase. If you want if you want to read here, read Daphne Patai. Daphne Patai's brilliant. She's one of my heroes. But there's about ten women who are off the charts stunningly gorgeous who are the leading power feminists. Laura Kipnis is also one of them. Laura Kipnis wrote a book called *The Female Thing*. Chapter Four – fantastic. Cathy Young, *Cease Fire in the Gender Wars*. There's brilliant women writing in this area. Christina Hoff Sommers – off the charts, Brian.

There's really great, great women writing in this and taking a stand on this. Okay.

Speaker: A moment ago you said, "We don't need more feminine values." What did you say we need?

Marc: We need more feminine and masculine values at higher levels of consciousness. Meaning world centric values, not ego and ethno-centric values. Ego an ethno-centric feminine values will produce mothers of Nazis, nurturing their little Nazis. We said that in caricature, of course. But we need –

Speaker: It seems like there's a distinction here between more line/circle values at a higher level of consciousness, and more light values of each.

Marc: Right. That's right. More line and circle values, which are their light, at higher levels of consciousness. Which means – this is critical, and then we're going to hold questions and we're just going to go forward. But which means that you can't talk about line and circle, or masculine and feminine, without a larger context that says, you can't just show up and you're full line and circle, or wake up to the full – you've got to grow up to higher levels of consciousness. And if you skip growing up – that's what the whole summit was about – if you skip growing up, the whole game's over. In general, we ignore growing up. We say we need more love in the world. We don't need more love in the world. It's not true. We need more love at higher levels of consciousness. That's the point.

You don't need more love in the world. It's just not true. Love by itself is valueless. Because love by itself is always interpreted through its level of consciousness. So we assume love is love at our level of consciousness. That's what we assume love it. But it's not. It's not. In other words, commandant of the death camp, after he does the gas chambers during the day, goes home and plays

with his children and loves his children. Ego/ethnocentric love. He totally loves his children. And he should be shot. Painfully.

Because love – that's why I always talk about the evolution of love. In our sangha, these aren't slogans. We say, I want to participate in the evolution of love. That's the whole difference. Love is not eternal. Love evolves. That changes the entire game. Just last example, and then we're going to hard stop and we're line, going forward. You guys are circling me around. But here's the last example.

So there was a movie I was watching with Sally Kempton several years ago. And it was about a Chinese patriarch who has this very beautiful love affair with his wife. And the son disobeys the father, and so he's supposed to put her to death, but he doesn't. And instead, he beats her up. Appropriately. And she thanks him for loving her. Now if someone did that today, they'd be in prison – appropriately so – quite immediately. But in that structure, that was the loving thing to do. So love was mediated through a prism – a developmental prism – of consciousness.

So the point is, there's not something called love that we're all moving towards. Plato's eternal form. "Let's all move towards love." No. Our great realization is that love is always refracted through a prism of interpretation. So love is an eternal value – of course it's an eternal value – but it's also an evolving value. And our job is to participate in the evolution of love. And when I actually awaken and I actually become better at loving, I myself go through, and evolve through, my own levels of consciousness. Since I'm inseparable from the all, I'm evolving love. I'm participating in the evolution of love. So I'm not involved in a small, separate self game. I'm actually of evolving love through my own transformation. That's a complete game changer. It's so exciting.

14-SATURDAY MORNING PART 2 - LINE 4 - ABSTRACTION

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Liraz

Vyana

Kristina

Nancy

Lerid

Paul

Kai

Susan

Cerridwen

Ben

Eric

Part 2

Line 4 –Abstraction

Track: 14-Saturday Morning Part 2 - Line 4 – Abstraction

TRT: 50:13

[00:00:00]

Marc: Number four – abstraction. So abstraction is a fourth and critical quality of a line. And it basically works as follows. So ocean. Have you ever been to the ocean? Elif? Okay. Now when I say ocean, you know what I'm talking about? Okay, good. So why do you know what I'm talking about? Is it because of our whole – that couple of weeks we spent in France last week working on the book? No, it's not because of that, right? We're keeping it quiet. What's it about? Because we've both been to the ocean. So we have a shared experience. Sam, when I say ocean, you know what I'm talking about? Totally. Why? Because he was with us in France? No.

[Laughter]

Because when I say the word "ocean," it invokes the memory that Elif and Sam and Marc share of ocean. So the word ocean is an abstraction. That's what it is. It's not the ocean. It's an abstraction of the ocean. It's language. Now the Hebrew word for masculine is "zachar." And zachar means memory. Beautiful, right? So what the masculine is abstracts out of reality language which remembers the immediate experience. It's really simple.

It's not more complex than that. When I say arm, this is an arm. When I say arm, I'm talking about a word. And that word is an abstraction and it's a memory of the experience of arm. Now why is that helpful? It's helpful for lots of reasons, but let me give you the first simple one, which is, if I want to give a description to Elif of ocean, but I can't say ocean, I've got to somehow – we've got to get together in a car and drive to an ocean. And then somehow I've got to be able to refer back to that experience. That's complicated in speech. You can't actually create society.

So actually, abstraction is what allows for everything which we call progress. Society. Science. Culture. Psychology. Everything is built in this quality of abstraction. It's the moment in which I begin to speak. That moment where the speech act begins is this moment where I begin to grow up. And ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, which is a fancy way of saying the same thing's true about a baby.

So a baby is in the womb of the mother. And then the baby's in the space of the mother. And then, when's the transition where the baby begins to emerge and to create their own world? The first word. Which is why you remember, when you have a kid, you remember the first word. How many people here have children? And how many people had children in the last lifetime? It's a lifetime thing. How many people had children in the last lifetime? You don't know yet. Okay.

Sometimes you do it one lifetime, you do it another lifetime. It's kind of an incarnation thing.

So whether it's in this lifetime or last lifetime, or you're an uncle or an aunt, or you've got a friend who had a child, you know there's this moment of the first word. It's this major transitional moment. It's like, wow. And the second the child speaks the first word, the child's no longer in the mother's domain. It's the beginning of leaving. It's a powerful, powerful moment.

The second speech starts, I'm out of the womb of the mother and I'm out of the womb of Mother Nature. Dawn man, dawn woman has now emerged. And then the world begins. So at that moment, I move from hunter-gatherer society to early horticultural – that's early farming – and everything we know of society at that point begins. And everything we know of society includes new forms of art, new forms of spirituality, new forms of science, new forms of community. It's all based on the ability to actually abstract. It's that's a very, very powerful idea.

Now let's stay with this for a second. So what does language do for a line? What language does for a line is, allows us to actually abstract content and information out of reality and transmit it accurately. That make sense? So that's that quality.

Marc: What language does is language allows the line to abstract content or information from reality, and to transmit it accurately.

[00:05:00]

Now that's language. Language is called classification. Aristotle classified. And then along came Kepler, Galileo and Newton – they measured. And the move from classification to measurement was a major move. All modern science, the whole revolution of calculus, all modern technology, is all from the move to measurement. And measurement's a higher level of abstraction.

I'm not going to spend an hour explaining that, but it's powerful. Sean, a few people in the room who are into that conversation, it's a powerful realization. When you move from measurement – from classification to measurement – Aristotle's classification, but the modern period's all measurement. Measurement then produces calculus, produces all modern science. Because you've abstracted even more. It's like, wow.

And you don't need to know how that works. Don't let your mind get lost in how that works. Just get that idea that measurement's more abstract. Just think learning algebra. Learning calculus. Is that abstract? Sure. The more you're a circle person, the harder it is to learn algebra or calculus. So geometry was easy for me, algebra and calculus were hard for me. Trigonometry. Because I've got huge circle dimensions.

So it took me a long – I had to get a special tutor for it. Even though I was the smart kid, when I came to that, I'm so – like my natural thing is immediate senses

embodiment. And so I had a hard time learning it. And I've, in general, had to develop my line qualities. I'm actually a more natural circle person. In lots of ways.

So basically, I just want to love the world, and I use thought categories to serve love. But not the opposite. And I start from there. I start from circle. And my line comes in later. And it showed up big time trying to study algebra. Big time.

So that's the quality of classification. Measurement. Measurement means when you go to algebra/calculus, the entire modern science _____ 07:12 evolution can't exist without calculus. Abstraction. So clearly, this quality – this masculine quality of abstraction – brought an enormous amount of good to the world. It brought an enormous amount of love to the world.

No hospitals are built without it, no modern medicine without it. No culture without it. So this quality of abstraction, which is critiqued as this masculine form of knowing, which is dominating and oppressive, actually brings culture – brings the greatest human advances – to the world. It's a very, very powerful quality. So let's stay with that.

Now, how does this play in our world? Let's just look at a couple of things here very, very briefly. So one. This one just occurred to me, which I've actually never shared. So I was living in Salt Lake City about a decade ago with my close friend Daleet. And I asked Daleet to go to the Salt Lake City library and get me a particular book. So she calls me up from the library – and I just remember the moment. It was hilarious. She says, "How big is it and what color is it?"

[Laughter]

And she was serious. I said, "Daleet, just look it up in the card catalog." "No, no, no. I'll just look for it." So I told her I'd had the book before. And her intuitive thing was – now when a woman gives directions, or a circle gives directions – I'm total circle in this – you give direction based on, "Okay, the Howard Johnson's over there and it's got a red rooftop. And then you go and you make a left turn I think over there, right after that gas station, and then you go down to that place with the green fence and you get there." And the line's listening to it and saying, "What the fuck? Like, really?" Or at least street names, left, right, something. And we actually have an enormous amount of information that, when a line gives direction, the line gives directions abstractly.

Now of course, the ultimate abstraction of line society is the GPS. The ultimate abstraction of line society is the GPS. And the GPS's shadow – first its strength and then its shadow. Its strength is, it gets you there. It's just this shocking thing. Wherever you are, you put in your GPS and it gets you there. Now, I can't use a GPS. And Leslie, my assistant, who many of you know, it just drives her crazy. I

call her and say, "Leslie, how do I get there?" She says, "Use your GPS. It's on your phone." "I can't do it. Just tell me how to get there."

[00:10:00]

So she puts it in her GPS and tells me how to get there, and I feel much better having a feminine voice telling me how to get there. The whole thing works better for me.

But what's a GPS? Meaning, you're ultimately extracted from your experience. You don't need to check anything. You're literally not there. And it's normal that you've got to at least look for directions. You've got to see where you are, you've got to locate yourself in the terrain. But here, you don't have to locate yourself in the terrain at all. It doesn't matter where you are. You just put it into a machine, a line machine, and it gives you direction. Complete line quality.

My two sons – who I've mentioned before who are awesome. And they're both Special Forces commanders in Israel. So one of the things they do is terrain. How do you navigate terrain in the middle of the night in Lebanon? So you've got no map. It's the complete opposite. It's complete feminine quality. You actually have to completely – Yair describes it – locate yourself in your circle quality and actually feel the ground. You've got to feel the ground.

And it's the same way that the dog that you just got – and you've had the dog for a week, and then you took the dog shopping some 30 miles away at the new Safeway, because there was a sale, and your mother always went to sales, and even though you don't need sales, but because your mother went to sales you went to sales anyway, which is one of the issues you're trying to work with. So you're at Safeway 30 miles away at the sale. And the dog got out of the car. And you've only had the dog for a week. You get home and the dog's obviously lost forever. And then to hours later, the dog walks in. And you're like, "Holy mother of God." Which is actually correct. Mother of God, it's a circle quality.

[Laughter]

In other words, the dog is completely located – it's doing terrain. It's a completely located, and it's a circle embodied Mother Earth quality. That was a circle quality for you. It's beautiful, right? And because the dog can hear more and smell more, dogs are utterly located in the place. In the circle name of God, that we'll talk about later, is "HaMakom," "the place." It's beautiful. HaMakom, the place. The circle is "the place."

So the animal, which doesn't have a line quality, is an ultimate expression of circle. Of being located in the place. The dog can find its way home. In a way that's shocking to us that none of us would be able to do. No matter how much we're in our circle. See how beautiful it is? It's a gorgeous play.

So when we're talking about directions, the way that directions happen for a line is they're abstracted. For a circle, and they're embodied. Completely different way of giving directions, and it's the abstraction issue. Now again, it's meta-principles versus details. And we'll get back to them later. But that's abstraction. Abstraction is the beginning of meta-principles. We're going to talk more about meta-principle later, but the beginning of the idea of a meta-principle and abstraction begins with this principle. And what's produced by meta-principles? We think, "Oh, that's nothing. Meta-principles – who cares about meta-principles?"

Well, if you love anybody in the world, then you care about meta-principles. How, why, why does that matter? So go to Mexico on a vacation. Now certain parts of Mexico are awesome for vacation. Other parts of Mexico are unbelievably beautiful, but if anything is stolen from you, or you get attacked or you get mugged or robbed, do not go to the police. Because it's not going to help you. There are major parts of Mexico that are completely lawless. And many tourists actually have that experience. Something's robbed, you go to the police, and his brother robbed it. What are you talking about? There's no law. And I've talked to a number of students who had that experience. It first started happening 15 years ago where they were shocked by actually being in a place that's lawless. We actually don't have that experience. We experience ourselves as protected by the law.

Where does law come from? One of the major sources of law is the line quality of abstraction. Law means, I'm making meta-principles. And I'm not making them in response to a specific situation that's happening right now. It's a principle that governs all situations. We're going to talk more about the light and shadow of law later, because there's other line qualities that participate in creating law, but without abstraction, you don't have law.

And law actually expands justice. And justice expands love. The more justice you have in the world, the more love there is the world. And if you don't have meta-principles, which come from abstraction, then you have a world which is pre-law. That's shocking. That's a massive regressive move. So we need these line principles for the evolution of love.

[00:15:00]

Now let's just say one more thing. One more example. So what does the line use language for? Content. Content. So for example, here's a situation. She says to him, "Hey, do you want to stop and get a cup of coffee? They're on a trip. And we're now in the classical masculine/feminine, circle/line. But we could go the other way. Again, on this one, I'm a circle also. But in this story, she says to him, "Hey, you want to stop and get a cup of coffee?" He says, "No." And he keeps driving.

[Laughter]

And he can't understand, why is she seething? She asked a question, she got an answer, everything seems fine. And she's furious with him. And he has no idea why. And she says, "You're so rude and inconsiderate." He says, "What do you mean?" She says, "I just asked you if you wanted a cup of coffee." "I know. I don't want one." "You asshole." "I'm an asshole for not wanting a cup of coffee? What does that mean?" And then the whole conversation goes wrong.

Now how is she using language? It's not informational. She's opening up a conversation. She's not asking for information. She wants to know – what she's really saying is, "I want a cup of coffee." Just to be clear. But because she doesn't want to make a line move, and assert what her desire is – because she's in her circle – so she does it in this other way. But the point is, she's beginning a conversation.

So she's using language in an entirely different way. Language has a different function for a circle than it does for a line. And if I would say it simply, for lines, language is to transmit content. For circles, language is to make contact. And there in you have an enormous amount of communication lines between lines and circles.

It's a huge distinction. And it's the same issue we saw yesterday that we'll talk about later. In that conversation with the nail on the head. But the circle's always trying to make contact through conversation. The abstraction is, I abstract content. And the line's all about content. All about information.

So let's take a look for a second. Let's take a look for a second. So check in your life. Let's check in our lives, where does this quality play in my life? And let's identify really clearly, what is the light quality and what's the shadow quality? So the light quality of abstraction is the ability to convey information, to be clear, to share content, to organize reality in an appropriate way so it's clear, to classify reality. Those are all qualities – if I'm really good at working numbers, that might be an abstraction quality. That's that quality in my life. How does that play?

Speaker: It also would be something around, like I can see the general pattern in the experience I'm having right now.

Marc: Nice. So abstracting means, I'm actually able to see a pattern – in other words, I step out of the experience and I abstract principles or patterns from the experience. Beautiful. Beautiful. Thank you. I abstract principles or patterns from the experience. That would be the quality of abstraction. It's the beginning of creating law. Yes, Lirazi.

Lee Rossi: What about imagination? Is it a part of abstraction?

Marc: Imagination is actually a different quality. Which we'll talk about. Imagination's a different quality. I understand why you relate to it, but we'll come back to it.

Speaker: There's a story element.

Marc: So stay with abstraction. What's the shadow of abstraction?

Speaker Obfuscation.

Marc: No, no. Not being able to articulate it is, I'm not good at abstraction. Meaning, I don't have that quality. I can't see the pattern. So I can't see the pattern. If I can't step out of the immediacy of my experience and articulate it, that's fantastic. That's the shadow.

[00:20:00]

The abstraction means, I abstract from experience and I can put it into language, and then share it. That's one dimension. And two is, I abstract from the immediate experience, and I see the meta-principles that are at play.

So the shadow would be, I can't see the pattern. Or I can't actually abstract words out of the experience and articulate it.

Speaker: Or you won't

Marc: I can't, I won't. The withhold would be, why is it blocked? Why is it blocked? And if I can't do that, or I won't do that, or I'm strong in that – I see what you're saying – I'm not strong in that, for some reason, then I'm lacking in that particular quality of speaking, which transmits information clearly and powerfully. Everyone with me so far?

Audience: No.

Marc: Wait, wait. Let's go slow, let's go slow. Example.

Vyana: Yea. So I think I have an example. I'm a good speaker. I'm good at writing. I don't like to read. So that's my shadow piece. It's not that I can't read. But the abstract piece of reading abstract 21:08 writing. It hits my circles. I want to be in it with people. So I can sit at your feet and learn a lot, but picking up your book, I won't learn. So that's the shadow. It's not that I can't learn that way, I just resist it.

Marc: Right, great. Great. Everyone get that example? And I'll go back to Kristina for a second and then I'll get to Sam. So for example, an example for you KK, is that if you read a lot – because you love to read. I happen to know. But then you've got to work on actually taking out of what you read and then saying it clearly. Even though you understand it perfectly, you have to abstract from it and formulate it in a clear language. That'd be a different shadow. That's different than Vyana's shadow. But before you go on – don't go on yet – I just want to say in this for a second for clarity. Does everyone get those two examples of the shadow? We're

going to go back to KK, and then to Sam, then to Jeff. I just want everyone to get those examples. We've got the land of these examples.

Speaker: It sounds like you're using language just a little imprecisely. I think what you're describing is actually the difference between strong and weak, and not shadow.

Marc: I'm sorry, did I say shadow? I apologize. Thank you, thank you. I'm sorry. Not shadow. Totally received. Not shadow. Great. Strong and weak. Yeah, you're absolutely correct. We're totally on strong and weak. Thank you. Kristina, that's what you were trying to say, love? Yeah, strong and weak. You have something else?

Kristina: Yeah. It's that, what I was trying to articulate earlier is that I can see the patterns, I just have difficulty articulating.

Marc: That's exactly what I'm saying. So on one part of it – you see that's what I said. You get the material. I want everyone to hold for just a second because each one of these examples is important. So you like to read. You see the patterns. So so far, you're doing good abstraction. But then articulating in a language is where, not the shadow, but where it's weaker. So Vyana is saying writing/articulating – that dimension of abstraction works for me. But one of the reasons they work is because they both have a circle dimension. I'm in the immediacy of the speaking.

And writing, I'm in the sensuousness of the writing. But when I'm reading, I can't find that circle dimension, so I actually don't read. I'd rather listen, because in listening, I can be in the dharma in a different way. Does everyone get it? I just want to go slow here so each example's super clear. Are we getting that? I'm learning a ton from this. So I'm enjoying learning. Nancy.

Nancy: I can hear you, I can experience and feel what you're saying and transmitting, but I can't articulate it when I leave here.

Marc: Right. So that would be weak on the abstraction side. Weak on the language – the language abstraction side.

Nancy: And I want to say, I can no longer read like I used to. I just can't seem –

Marc: That's eyesight. Eyesight, babe.

[Laughter]

No, I get it. I get it. Yeah. Totally. And sometimes as we get older, we move more towards our circle.

Nancy: I think that's what it is.

Marc: Right. Totally. Now you'll have to look at, Nancy, do you want to make the part of your abstraction languages weak? Do you want to make it stronger? Or is it fine with you? Which goes back to the earlier issue is, how much am I focused on it? How much of a big deal is it in my life? That's why that clarification is really helpful. Good. Now let's just stay in the strong and the weak. Are you in the strong and the weak? Not in the shadow.

Speaker: No, no. Just so I'm clear. So the patterning is a line quality, but is the articulation a line quality as well? Or is it a circle quality?

Marc: Yes. Language, as we're going to see, has both. That's what you're pointing towards immediately. But for now, I'm staying in the line quality of language.

[00:25:00]

I'm going to point out in a couple of seconds where the hieros gamos happens, which is what you're sensing. But the quality of abstracting and putting it into language we're looking at as a line quality. And there was a dude who lives near me, a nice guy named Leonard Shlain, lives in Mill Valley, wrote a book about 15 years ago which is a mixture of stuff that's way off and stuff that's way on. And it's called *The Alphabet Versus the Goddess*. Does anyone remember that book? There's actually some really good stuff in it. And his point was that the alphabet and the goddess – it was another way of saying line and circle. Goddess/circle, alphabet/language. So there's that dimension there. So that's the dimension of languaging. So anyone else on strong and weak? Yes.

Speaker: I have this question. When you talk about language, it's different in different languages. And if you come from Spanish, your thought is round. And when you are thinking in the American – because I had that problem coming here – it's a straight – you go straight to the point from the first line to the end.

Marc: So within language itself, different languages have different relationships between line and circle in the language. So I would say French would be more... Circle or line – what do you think?

Speaker: I don't know. I'd have to think about it.

Speaker: Unclear.

Speaker: It's a Latin language, there's definitely more circles, but I don't think that French would be more circles. Out of my head.

Marc: That's a wonderful – the relationship. But all language participates in a general line dimension, but within language – and we're going to get to that. Because that's actually pointing to where I'm about to go. But anyone else on strong and weak? Good. So we'll hold strong and weak here for a second.

Speaker: An example, like we see it in you in English. I needed to access my line quality to explain it in Dutch.

Marc: That's right. When we're doing our circle sessions with the community – right, got it. Good. So let's stop for a second here. Yes. Just on strong and weak.

Speaker: Strong and weak. How many points of reference that expression takes to actually make sense. Like if you say "ocean" and you get it, versus, "Oh, the ocean by this place with the water," and kind of the precision. Because there's different levels of precision you can articulate.

Marc: Good. Fantastic. Let's now go inside and find, write down – and you might have already done it – where am I strong in this quality of abstraction/language? And where am I weak in this quality of abstraction/language? Actually in my life. It's not a rating. I'm actually writing it down. And we've had all sorts of examples of it at play here. Good? Awesome. And while people are writing, Lerid.

Lerid: Are we narrowing the focus of abstraction to language in our discussion?

Marc: We're talking about abstraction/language. I'm using them together. Because it makes it easier to hold the abstraction, as it were. Abstraction, of course, is large in language. Numbers, for example, measurement is beyond language. So Victoria, you might be looking at numbers. Abstraction/language/numbers – those are all abstractions. Measurement, again, is a higher abstraction than language. Meaning more abstract. Yes.

Speaker: Somebody telling me the story about their confusion, and I can easily make it clear. What's happening?

Marc: Seeing the pattern that's happening to them is actually a quality of... It's seeing the pattern. You're seeing at the pattern out of the immediacy of experience. Seeing a pattern is a quality of abstraction. You're seeing the principle. You're abstracting from the immediacy of the experience the more meta-principle. Then speaking it to them is the next step. Let's take another 60 seconds.

Okay, number two. Just do a little evaluation. This is our first rating. How focused am I on this? Or how big does it play in my life? How much does it play in my life, 1 to 10? Takes a second. Quick. Three. Rating. How strong am I at this? How am I weak? We're not in shadow, remember. Just strong and weak. And we have lots of examples of it here. In other words, how much do I have that quality? How strong am I at it? How strong is the light quality? Or I don't have the light quality. So I've a weak expression of the light quality. Why is that a change? Is that a change?

Audience: _____. 29:53

Marc: Yeah.

Speaker: It's numbered.

Speaker: It's one number.

Speaker: And the next number would be shadow.

[00:30:00]

Marc: You're saying how strong I am, or how weak I am, would be one number? Okay, right, right. That's right. Good, good. Got it. Now let's move to shadow. Move to shadow. What's the shadow of this? Now we're not in strong and weak. That's correct. Strong/weak would be one number. What's the shadow? Take it away.

Speaker: The shadow side of this, for me, is I'm incredibly articulate and I see the patterns all the time. I fail to act on them knowing that that action is mine to take. I also find the shadow in this, for me, in the use of words to dominate other people.

Marc: Okay. So we're looking at two potential shadows here. One shadow is abstraction – I'm going to reframe it for you – abstraction is so compelling to me that I get lost in it and it doesn't translate into action. See that slight reframe? Abstraction, you can live in the world of abstraction. Abstraction is a central, powerful, compelling world. And action just becomes something else. 10 seconds, Peter, okay? So that's one. Everyone get that one? And then two is, I use my categories to dominate. Which isn't exactly a shadow of abstraction. You're actually using abstraction for – it's a shadow penetrating. Your domination –

Speaker: I mean, in a bad way. I can use words to hurt people.

Marc: No, no. I understand. But it's actually not quite a shadow of abstraction. It's more, you're hurting, you're violating people's boundaries, it's aggressive. It's actually a shadow of penetration, but what you're using is – your baseball bat happens to be words. But it's not the shadow of words. It's the way you're using them. It's more like, with the shadow of abstraction, abstraction is so powerful I get lost in it and I don't act on it. And if you want to use the second one as a shadow here and that works for you, use that as well. That's totally fine. Good. Paul.

Paul: So from a very end of number one that I find it is, yes, getting lost in the abstraction, getting engaged in the abstraction and then losing touch with the people that I might be dealing with.

Marc: Right. So getting lost in the abstraction's a big shadow. Everyone get that? You get lost –

Paul: And I'm no longer in touch with my real experience. And for instance, Carol, might be having.

Marc: Right. I'm disconnected. I'm in the words, but I'm disconnected from the experience.

Paul: And one example of that is, I will start having a conversation. I'll pause and I'm working with the abstraction of the language, the conversation goes on somewhere and three minutes later I come back to continue the conversation that I was in because I've been lost in the abstraction.

Marc: Beautiful. Beautiful example. Getting lost in the abstraction. Fantastic. Get disconnected, alienation. Kai.

Kai: That was pretty much where I was going. That it becomes such of a head experience that the actuality – the cause and effect –

Marc: Right. I talk about ocean, but I'm not ocean. Exactly.

Kai: I can even have a – you can look at racial cleansing or something else, where you're trying to do something good, but all those people have to get killed and there's consequence –

Marc: Right, right. In other words, and the more abstract the line becomes – so for example, if I start killing with drones – and it's basically a line. I'm sending a missile. In other words, the more the line gets powerful, it's ____ 33:39. It starts with a sword, but then it's a gun – and these are all line qualities – and then you can kill with a missile, and it's more and more abstract. Then you press a button, then you do it from a plane. And you actually lose – you're disconnected from the immediacy of the experience because you're making an abstract decision. It's fantastic.

Which is why it's often very, very interesting that you'll have leaders who make a decision, and then they actually go to the place of the conflict, and based on their experience of it, they actually shift their policy, even though they don't have new information. Because the line and the circle came together. And the experience – one of the big things, for example. When I was in Israel, one of the major things we get is, when senators or congressmen would come, we would take them to the center of Israel and we would drive across the center of Israel. And the center of Israel, without the West Bank, is 9 miles wide.

Now just watch this for a second. That's information. That's an abstraction. 9 miles is a measurement. But you get that Israel's 9 miles wide. Israel doesn't have a standing Army. Israel has a citizen's army. Which is why Israel never wants to go to war. There's no Army over there. It's everybody. Citizen's Army. It takes 48 hours to mobilize a citizen's army. Minimum. On the best experience.

[00:35:00]

So if you're attacked, and your country's cut in half, 9 miles, you can't mobilize your Army, you're essentially dead. End of story. Which is why Israel's retaining the West Bank. Now whether they're right or wrong, let's skip that conversation. But you've got to get that it's 9 miles wide. And more than once, twice, three or five times I've been with a senator or a congressman when I was in Israel, and we were in that conversation, and we would drive the 9 miles. How long does it take to drive 9 miles? 10 minutes. And they were shocked. "Are you serious? 10 minutes. We've already cut the country?"

Now they had all the information. It was in all their briefings, all the information was completely available. But the actual experience of driving the 9 miles completely changed. Abstraction disconnection. See how it plays? It's so real. It's a line and circle quality. So we're looking at the shadow – shadow.

Speaker: I wonder if shadow doesn't have to do with lying or distorting. So I think the shadow – and when I was contemplating the shadowing me, when I justify myself, or try and shift my abstraction such as I can manipulate whatever it is that's going on –

Marc: Right. I use language and meta-principles to actually – again, it's a form of disconnecting from the truth of the situation. The truth of the situation lives in the situation, but by abstracting it, I disconnect from the truth of the situation. Every one of these – friends, we're not just casually talking – every one of these is important. It becomes real. Yes, Susan.

Susan: I want to articulate a description 36:48. And I think this makes sense. Judgment. So when I have a judgment against someone, I'm taking what is a very personal, maybe first level consciousness, abstraction, and I'm applying it globally. And you can probably say more about that. So taking one level and then applying it to another level of consciousness and then having then that be the world view.

Marc: In other words, the second I abstract – I have a judgment that's an abstraction – I've labeled this person, for example, in a particular way. Then I'm no longer actually seeing the person. So a label is an abstraction. And then what happens, I can never see them anymore. Because I just apply it globally. Fantastic. That's a fantastic example. Everyone gets, by the way, when we say the strong and the weak of this – are you strong in your shadow, or weak in your shadow – as a couple of you pointed out – that's one number. Because that's either high or low. Good.

So let's just take a look now, write down, how does the shadow play in your life? I'm sorry, I know there's a lot more, but I want to line drive here and move forward. So just write yourself, how does the shadow play in your life? Strong or weak, 1 to 10. And again, what you might do is, here, you might want to break it

out. You might want to say, professionally, relationally, spiritually. You might want to break it into different parts of your life.

So if that comes up for you, just break it down into different parts of your life. You might have a really strong – here's something interesting. You might have, in your relationships, you might have very little of the shadow. But in business, you might have a lot of it. Or the opposite. In business and your corporation, you might have very little abstraction shadow. You're using it in a really light way, not in a shadow way. But in your relationships, you've got a lot of it.

So break it out between personal/psychological/spiritual and professional or business is a nice way to break it down, if that's relevant to you.

Speaker: Is it spiritual bypass if shadow of this 39:05 quality?

Marc: Spiritual bypass has a lot of dimensions to it. It could be. It could be. Or you could use abstraction as a spiritual bypass, for sure. It could be one of the tools of spiritual bypass. You're avoiding the immediacy of what's actually happening. That's great, great. Jot that down. That's great. Yes, Cerridwen.

Cerridwen: Kind of a category here that I think hasn't been touched on. One of the phrases that has been touched on is this, "The map is not the territory." And I think one of the shadows is confusing the map with the territory as –

[Crosstalk]

Cerridwen: _____ 39:46. And another one that's been a big one in my life is – and you spoke to it earlier, about this science, this whole thing in the deconstruction, where what isn't immeasurable isn't real. Which seems like a shadow of this. That if you can't measure it, it doesn't exist.

[00:40:00]

Marc: Those are two great points. One is, the phrase from – I can ever pronounce his name – 1943, Karbycocwi. Whatever his name was. I can ever pronounce his name. But his idea of, "The map is not the territory." Which is a very import and idea. And that's exactly the abstraction connected to spiritual bypass. The map is not the territory. The map is the abstraction. You need to touch the territory. Everyone got that? One. The second point you made, just remind me.

Karaguin: What isn't immeasurable isn't –

Marc: Right, right. The other shadow is that the line quality says, if I can't fit it into my abstraction world, it's not real. Fantastic. Those are two great points. Two great, great points. Awesome. Let's hold here. Last one, Lerid. And then we'll hold. Go.

Lerid: Applying an abstraction incorrectly, great evil's done.

Marc: Right. When you apply it incorrectly, that's when bad stuff starts to happen. That's exactly right. Okay, let's hold here. Let's breathe. Now I want to just invite everyone to just hang in it. Just hang in it. It's like we're at a bar. If you want to get a sense of where we are, we're at a café in Amsterdam. We're chatting. We're a French café. And we're having this conversation. But I want energetically – if I want the energy for the day, we're at a spiritual/psychological/existential/emotional café in Paris, and we're having this conversation. That's what we're doing.

So we're not saying, "Which one do we do? How do we –?" Whoa. We're just in it. It's like the ultimately great experience. It's essential experience. It's what Plato described when he described the Symposium. Plato's great Symposium is when people are sitting around like this, and we're having this conversation. And we're going to break for a little lunch, we come back with it, we're in it. We're in it.

And I just want everyone to find that part of you that wants to do the line drive. "Next one, next one. How many, how many?" You can locate that part of you, right? "We've only done one? Really?" That's a line quality. I just want you to find that. We're measuring – and we're trained that way.

We're trained – it's so in us. And so the circle quality's, "Hey, we're at the café." Which is why the image of the intellectuals in the village in New York or in Paris or in Beirut – which had a huge café – it's like they're kind of mocked by the serious business people. Because they're just sitting there, drinking a little bit, talking about the issue. That's what we're doing. And just, again, watch the line quality. It's there. It's always there. So just let the line quality go. Awesome.

What would be the hieros gamos of abstraction? Just to see it for a second. What would be the hieros gamos? Anyone? Poetry. Poetry. Isn't that beautiful? Poetry. That's what poetry is. So poetry is when the language itself evokes in the embodiment. That's poetry. Isn't that beautiful? So poetry is the hieros gamos of line and circle in this quality. That's kind of awesome. It becomes alive. Yes.

Speaker: Another was a live dharma talk.

Marc: Right. Exactly. No, that's exactly right. A live dharma talk, the idea is that it's not abstraction, it's actually living sensuous alive in front of you. So a live dharma talk is poetry. It's a form of poetry. And of course, what it has to combine is prose and poetry at the exact right place. If poetry's so gone, it's only an experience, it doesn't quite take us there. Poetry's great when it conveys both content, but it conveys content in a way which evokes of experience. When poetry's too lost, or it's too literal, it doesn't take us there. It's exactly that line/circle that takes us there. Brother.

Ben: The grounded-ness is the difference between the light and the shadow here. Like whether it's grounded in reality.

Marc: Nice. Good. Ben, Eric. Last one.

Eric: I'm just going to say, when the abstraction creates a new territory. Like the GPS unit. _____ 44:50 you go deeper into – I can journey in the way I couldn't –

Marc: In other words, in poetry, what happens is, the abstraction becomes a new embodiment. Same thing in dharma.

[00:45:00]

That's the difference between dharma and a university lecture. Dharma is prose and poetry, which are together, which actually create a new reality. Which create a new reality. So here's just an example. Everyone ever heard the phrase "I love you." I love you. I love you. You love me. But I'm going to go with "I love you" for a second. Now is "I love you" conveying information? Or is it making contact?

Audience: Both.

Marc: There it is, right? So it's language, but the nature of the language is that it's trying to convey an experience. So for example, if someone gives me – so often, again, you'll have this line/circle conversation. "You didn't tell me 'I love you' today." "But I told you yesterday. You forgot? What happened? That information kind of readily available."

[Laughter]

And that's a conversation. But something happens where I want to actually, in the language, have an embodiment. So you go to *Fiddler on the Roof*. Where Tevye asks Golde, "Do you love me?" Do you love me? Do you love me? "Do I want? For 25 years I've washed your clothes, I've darned your clothes." And she gives this whole – "I've done all these actions." And then Tevye, in his circle, says, "Do you love me?" "Do I want? For 25 years I've darned your clothes, I've washed your clothes." And he keeps – he's in a circle. That's the moment where Tevye goes from his line to his circle.

And he's not looking for information. It's so beautiful. He wants to actually hear her say it, and in saying it she's not transmitting information, she's transmitting a new higher level of embodiment. And it's deeper, it's something else. It's so gorgeous. And you begin to see that dance. So in this story, Tevye is the circle, Golde responds as the line until she finds it. And she says, "I suppose I love you." And it's awesome. Chahatie. Jot that down. Let's get that clip. Let's see that scene this summer. I would actually love just to play that scene right now, if I had it. How many people have seen *Fiddler on the Roof*? You know the scene, right? So you get it? It's like, wow. It's right there. Awesome. Yes, last one.

Speaker: Can we say that in the circle way, we can transmit information – the goal of transmitting the information is to transmit an intention that creates the context, the new –

Marc: Right. And an intention is an interior quality. Intention has information, but an intention has more than information. It has an actual interior quality.

Speaker: And embodied the information by the intention.

Marc: Right. That's right. Intention's connected to embodied information. That's exactly right. Which is why we said, yesterday, that from a spiritual perspective for transformation, clarity of intention is unbelievably important. Because clarity of intention moves you beyond information to embodiment.

Speaker: These kinds of questions, is it _____ 48:23? It's a line quality right?

Marc: Say it again.

Speaker: These questions that go around now, so are you saying that, is this what you mean –

Marc: Well, it's both, actually. I'm clarifying the information, and I'm seeking to feel it in my body at the same time. It's kind of both.

Speaker: But the question _____ 48:41, is that an abstraction?

Marc: Again, I wouldn't want to put question too closely on either a line or a circle. Because you've got different kinds of questions.

Speaker: Yeah. I mean these questions, the last questions that go around now here, in the room.

Marc: You know, that's a good question, beloved. I'd have to go over them again to know. They're mostly line questions, but we're looking for the embodiment of it. So it's got both. Good? Okay. So.

Speaker: Can I just add in one piece?

Marc: Yes.

Nancy: Just a recognition – and I don't want you to hear this as an invitation – but often we will come into this dharmic experience with the seven steps, the ten, the this – it's numerical. That, in some ways, satisfies my line-ness. And then when we're in the poetry of it, often what happens is something else emerges. The circle is

present. The goddess shows up. That allows 11, 12 or 13 whenever needs to come through to come through. So it's helping me hold that, "Oh, that's why this is so –"

Marc: Gorgeous. Thank you. Again, Nancy's pointed to an embodied experience of line and circle. The more we point to it, the more we see. And if it was missing one of the two – if it didn't have the structure of these seven, but also if it was too rigid – so rigidity would be a shadow of abstraction.

[00:50:00]

You get that? Rigidity would be a shadow. So when something organic emerges that's new – just responding to your invitation – then something happens. Awesome. Awesome.

15-SATURDAY MORNING PART 3 - LINE 5 - DIRECTION GOAL ORIENTATION

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Eric

Jeff

Gil

Carol

Part 3

Line 5 – Direction Goal Orientation

Track: 15-Saturday Morning Part 3 - Line 5 - Direction Goal Orientation

TRT: 46.34

[00:00:00]

Marc: Here we go. The fifth quality of the line, as it exists in men and women – we're in the line qualities – is directional purpose goal oriented. The directional quality, the purpose quality, the goal oriented quality. It's moving somewhere. Its game is, of course, football. We're doing a line drive. 20 yard line, 30 yard line, 40 yard line. We're moving down. That's the nature of a line drive. It's going somewhere.

Now this is a really important one to get. When I was sharing this with one of my friends – actually with Warren Farrell – Warren Farrell says, "I never liked that stuff. Because circles have goals, also." Which is, of course, true. He said, "Even in the classical world, the goal of a circle might be – in a classical old world, where women were circles – the goal of a circle was to get married. But that's also a goal." But what I said to him was – which was actually critical – is that the nature of the goal of a circle is to accomplish the goal. And once the goal's accomplished, we're done.

The nature of the goal of a line is to have the goal. And once the goal's accomplished, you just make another one. Because you need to have a goal. So

it's not related to, "Okay, I've accomplished it." No, it's related to, "I want to have a goal." So it's the difference between a reason and an excuse. If something's an excuse, you remove one excuse, you'll have another excuse. If something's a reason, remove the reason, you won't have the effect anymore. I'll just give you an example of how that works just for 10 seconds.

So take an issue like anti-Semitism. So people give reasons for anti-Semitism. The question is, is it a reason or an excuse? How do you know the difference? Well, if you remove excuse, will anti-Semitism disappear? Or willing a new excuse come up? So if you actually track the history around anti-Semitism, it begins in paganism. And it's the dislike of the un-like. We don't like people that are unlike us. So that's given as the reason. Is it a reason or an excuse?

So when Christianity emerges, so Jew and Christians are more similar, so the dislike of the unlike's no longer there, now there's a new reason. Killed God. That one goes on for a while. 1700 years. I'm mad at you for killing God. And as Lenny Bruce pointed out, in the mid-'60s, for which he got arrested – who remembers Lenny Bruce here in the room? He got arrested for this. When all the ecumenical world was basically pointing out that, "It's just not true, we didn't kill Christ," and the Christians were forgiving Jews, or Jews were forgiving Christians and it was a whole thing.

And Lenny Bruce thought it was kind of absurd. He just thought the whole ecumenical thing was, when Jews who didn't believe in Judaism got together with Christians who didn't believe in Christianity and discovered they had a lot of common. And he thought, "What's this ecumenical thing?" So Lenny Bruce used to do a routine throughout the '60s saying, "We did kill him. It's not true. We killed him. My Uncle Morty killed him. We killed him. He's in the basement. I saw him. He's dead."

[Laughter]

A little Lenny Bruce routine. So then Christian anti-Semitism is decided, killed Christ. But then you would think, oh, now the Enlightenment's happened, in the 17th century. No one really believes in God Christ anymore. So now anti-Semites would disappear. So a new of anti-Semitism emerges, which is called in Enlightenment anti-Semitism. You've got to join the community of nations, and if you don't in a full way. [03:37]

And then when the Jews joined the community of nations and assimilate, then a new kind of anti-Semitism appears, which is racial anti-Semitism. Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Late 19th century. Jews are racially different. And then when you establish the state of Israel – because that's really the only thing left – then anti-Zionism appears. Which, as Martin Luther King said right before he died, "Anti-Zionism is but the newest form of anti-Semitism."

So if you check the world, you see, is it a reason or an excuse? So if it's an excuse, remove the excuse, just a new excuse happens. If it's a reason, remove the reason, it disappears. Anyone remember why we're saying that?

Audience: Goals.

Marc: Right, exactly. The difference between, is the goal in order to get to the goal, or is the goal for the sake of the goal? The simple variable is, remove the goal, what happens? Do you rest, or you find another goal? So it's a great distinction. So it's line drive. So the circle has a goal, but when the circle accomplishes the goal, then it's already accomplished.

Now that's why, for example, a line is devastated when a line loses his or her connection to deepest purpose. There's nothing more devastating than that. Which is, by the way, classically – in the classical world, where men embodied line more than women – the most devastating experience for a man was being unemployed.

[00:05:00]

The experience of unemployment was far more devastating for a line than for a circle. And retirement, equally so. Retirement and unemployment were two equally devastating experiences because there's a loss of this quality of goal.

Now again, let's just noticed that the reason that's happening is because goals have been externalized. My goal is my work. If actually my goals are internalized – my goal is transformation, my goal is awakening, my goal is Enlightenment – then, of course, that would naturally change. But in a world in which goals are externalized, and you no longer are working or you're unemployed, it's a devastating experience.

Now, it's why the line needs to be going somewhere. So for example, let's say the circle says to a line, "Let's go for a walk." So the line says, "To where? Where are we going? Or why are we going for a walk? What's the point of this?" And the circle says, "We're going for a walk in order to go for a walk." And the line's like, "What do you mean? We've already walked there before." So finally, the line realizes it's a good idea to go for this walk.

And the circle says, "You're just totally not present." He says, "What do you mean I'm not present? Where do you think I am? I'm right here. Where do you think I could be?" But what the circle is saying is, "You're actually not participating in the circle experience with me." Because what does the line do? The line turns the walk into a goal. "What am I doing now? Oh, check off. Going for a walk with circle."

[Laughter]

"Okay, doing the walk with circle now. Check it off the list." But the circle has the experience, and the line can't win. Like, "I didn't want to go for a walk, you

were mad at me. And I went for the walk, you're still mad at me." But actually, what the circle's actually saying is, "Step out of your line consciousness and drop into circle." That's the communication.

So this function of linear motion – it's moving forward. I'm meeting goals. I get approval by meeting goals. Those are the qualities of direction. Now, of course, the classical story that actually was first mentioned by Deborah Tannen in her early sociolinguistic literature, and became very famous in the culture, is, of course, a line and a circle. And her story, a man and a woman in a car needing directions. That's where that story came from. It came from the sociolinguistic literature around this.

And so the women will say, "Let's just stop and ask directions." The man will just keep driving around, driving around, driving around. He's not going to ask for directions. Why is he not going to ask for directions? Because he doesn't want to show that he's lost his direction. Because that directional quality – and actually, Tannen doesn't explain it well. This is a better – because she doesn't have a meta-map. But what's actually happening in the deep story is, he needs to actually be connected to that quality in which is directional. And there's nothing less sexy for a man, or for a line – either one – than for a circle to question and not trust the line's direction.

When a circle doesn't trust the directionality of a line, it's like a line saying to a circle, "You're ugly." So a circle saying to a line, "I don't trust your direction," is the same thing. It's a complete de-eroticizing of the relationship. So being trusted. Now that doesn't mean that a circle can't critique a line. And lines and circles can both critique each other. But if you critique a line in a way which is – here's the word – emasculating – and the phrase comes, in the men and woman world, "She's cutting his balls off." What that means is, the circle's not trusting the line's direction. And that's a core quality of the line.

Now again, that doesn't mean that a circle should blindly listen to a line. That would be dumb. It means there is a way to actually engage while actually affirming the line's core ability to chart direction. And it's very hard – if you're a circle, or if you're a primary circle, or if you're in your circle experience – it's very hard to experience the devastation that a line experiences when the line feels like, "My direction isn't trusted." So there's a huge humiliation in it. Now that's the core quality. That's the core quality.

[00:10:00]

Is there anything else? There's a lot more to say, but is there anything else that we need to say about this. Let's just think about this for a second. So before we get to the light and the shadow, let's just say a couple more things. Just to look at the line for a second.

So first, the nature of a line is it's going in a direction. So it's a line quality. The line is goal oriented. All of these – that's what's so beautiful about it. They're all –

it's a line – it's going in that direction. It's also worth saying that, on a line, everyone's got to be going the same direction. Because if you're face-to-face, you're going in opposite directions. So you've got to clash. That's the nature of a line. You're not naturally looking at each other, Eric, as in a circle. If you want it to work well, y'all have got to be going the same direction. If you're going in different directions, you have a potential conflict. So that's one.

Two is, it's just worth noting that the line is angular. It's focused. It's directional. There's not a lot of curves. It's looking ahead, it's not looking around. Not a lot of time to stop and smell the roses would be a shadow. That'd be a shadow of a line. The shadow of a line would be, it's so purpose driven that it doesn't actually stop to live life, to experience reality. And the line dies with a long list of goals not yet accomplished, but never actually was present in life. So looking ahead, not looking around, is both a positive quality – I'm looking ahead, I'm not getting caught looking around – and it's also a shadow – I'm looking ahead, I'm not looking around.

And often, I remember on family trips from Columbus, Ohio to New York, it was 12 hours and my father would clock it. And he would benchmark our progress. And my mother would want to stop at rest stops and look around. And that was a classical line/circle polarity. So we got that sense.

The next thing about a line is, the line keeps moving forward – that's a positive quality – but again, compared the circle, it doesn't come back around. So the line just keeps moving. One woman, another woman, one man, another man, another man, another man. It's one of the reasons why – and the movie *Milk* portrayed it in the pre-AIDS gay community – it was very hard to stop. Because there's this line, there's this masculine line quality, which is *choo, choo, choo, choo, choo*. And it plays in sexuality.

And there were two studies done – very good longitudinal studies – in the pre-AIDS world, both in the lesbian world and in the gay world, which compared the amount of sexual partners. In the gay world, the average was like 397. In the lesbian world, it was 1.7. That tells you something. 1.7. The .7 was kind of exciting.

[Laughter]

That was really hot, .7. But the idea was that the line quality, in your early explosion of the gay world, was an explosion of lots of beauty that we talked about – our political program is fucking – but there was also a line quality. And the line quality had lots of beauty. And it has also, of course, shadow. In other words, feeling into that – and in the gay sociological literature there's some beautiful articles talking about that world, and what that world was about. Which was a world which, tragically, disappeared, or disappeared in the worst possible way. And just huge blessing and honor for that.

Okay, now. Next. When a line sets a goal, after the goal is accomplished, then the line loses interest in that goal. It'll come up with another goal, but it loses interest in that goal. We're done. We're done. So for example – and we're going to talk about this later – but there's a line quality of sexuality. So the line quality of sexuality, when it's done, it's done. Sleep. Turn over, go to sleep. We're done.

Now the circle's just beginning in the conversation. "What do you mean we're done? What do you mean?" The circle's just beginning the conversation, sexually. "Really? You can only handle one orgasm, buddy? Are you serious? We're just waiving into this here." The line's like, "Oh my God. Are you for real?" The line's exhausted, wants to turn over and go to sleep.

Now, happens to be that we've now documented the neuroscience on this. So for example, in the book *The Male Brain*, there's a little section on, what is the neurobiology of why men turn over and go to sleep? But that misses the point.

[00:15:00]

See, that's the point. And it's a reductionist moved. Of course there's neurobiology to it. There's actually an entire interesting reason, hormonally, why men tend to go to sleep. However, if the line arouses it's circle quality, so then other hormones will be released, which will actually allow the engagement in whatever that post-moment is. And that post-moment is, paradoxically, sometimes the most important set of moments.

So the line quality might have a shadow in sexuality, in that once it's accomplished its goal, it loses interest. It goes to sleep, or more structurally/socially, moves on to the next conquest. Because it's conquering, it's thrusting forward. It's moving forward, it's accomplishing a goal. Once the goal's accomplished, it keeps moving on.

Now again, that might be as a shadow, or it might not be a shadow. Depending on what the nature of your relationship world is. And depending on what the integrity of those new relationships are. So we're not coming from a position where that's, per se, a shadow. Maybe it is, maybe it's not. But it's worth looking at. What's the integrity? Does the next relationship have integrity, or doesn't it? And it could be that it does. And it could be that it doesn't.

So we're not in the monogamy/polyamory conversation now. We're just saying that it's worth looking at when the line realizes its goal, and it loses interest, certainly when that losing interest means going to sleep – meaning a kind of disconnection from the full lived experience – then that would certainly be problematic.

Finally, just the last thing, is there's a beautiful West African phrase, which is something like, "We travel so fast, there's no time for our souls to catch up with our bodies." And I often experience that when I'm traveling. It's like we have the

ability – this line quality – to fly from place to place, and we think that because we can do it, therefore we've arrived at the new place. And often, I find myself two days behind. Like I've accomplished the line transition, but I actually haven't transitioned.

And actually, we travel so fast today that we travel in these planes which line across the sky, and we don't actually make time for transition, for reentry, for re-souling. And we think that because we've made a line movement, we've made a circle movement. And that's actually not the case. We need to be able to make a line movement and a circle movement and travel. And when we don't, it actually takes an enormous toll on us. And one of the qualities today in the world of depression is connected to that quality. This is a line/circle quality. And again, we're doing lots of circles as we go.

How many people are aware of the fact that depression is several times as much – twice, three, four, five, six – depends on which set of stats you use – but several times more prevalent in women than men? It's one of the things all the literature addresses. Why? Why is that true? And none of the literature explains it well. *The Male Brain, The Female Brain*, those books, for example, raise the issue. And she basically says, "I got no clue." And it's actually very connected to this.

See, the nature of a line is, the line moves on. The circle always comes back. So when something tragic happens, the circle's always re-experiencing it. Always coming back. And in the nature of – and I'm not going to go to the neuroscience now – but in the nature of the difference between masculine and feminine memory, masculine memory remembers lines, meaning the bare outline of the event. The way feminine memory is structured, it actually evokes the full emotion of the experience. And again, that could be man or woman. I'm, by the way, circle in this, as well. I'm total circle in this.

The circle doesn't just evoke the details of the event. When the circle evokes the line structure of the event, the circle literally relives the entire event, and all of the emotional texture and quality is there. And often, you'll have a line/circle conversation where the line's completely confused. "We dealt with this issue three years ago. It's three years old. We solve it and we resolved it. Why are we talking about this again?" But the circle revisits it and, in terms of the nature of neuroscience and memory, revisits it with the full emotional charge of the original experience.

[00:20:00]

Now, that actually can have enormous positive. What would be the positive of the circle? And again, we're doing lines and circles. It's Eric's influence. But what would be the positive of it? The positive is that you can fix things. You can actually go back and heal. That's actually where that circle quality comes from. It's a healing quality. He's says, "I'm got to go back and heal that moment because I can come back to it. And if I can't come back to it, then the moment's over and gone." So it has an enormous healing transformative capacity.

But the shadow of it is depression. The shadow of it is, it's not over. You keep reliving the tragedy. And the line, one of the ways the line protects against depression is by moving on. And moving on has a shadow quality, but moving on also has a very, very strong positive, constructive quality. What does it allow you to do? Moving on? Moving on. Moving on allows you to move on. Which is sometimes enormously important.

And it's actually the best understanding I have of why depression. And it's one of the anomalous realities. Today's depression is so much higher in women than men. There's, by the way, a second reason – I'm just going to add a second reason, since we're here – and it's directly connected to lines and circles, which is why I'm adding it. The second reason is we're demanding of women to marry lines and circles today in a much more intense way than we're demanding of men. And what that's doing is, so women today, on the one hand, have much more freedom and many more options than men. On the other hand, the demands are much greater.

So let's look at freedom and options. A woman can get married, or not get married. She can get married and have kids, or get married and not have kids. She can have a job when she's married, or be married and stay at home. There's lots of options. Depending, of course, on the economic situation, there's lots of factors, but there's lots of potential options.

Theoretically, those options exist for men, but practically, most men still have to work. And they can participate more in the home – which they do, to some extent – some great extent, actually. That's an interesting question which we're not going to go into now. Let's not get seduced into that question. But basically, men are still classically – much more classically – in the work mode. Now, the one hand, men have one option: work. And if you don't, you're not sexy, you're not attractive, you don't feel – it's a disaster. So men keep going to the work option.

Women have many more options, but in order to fulfill those options, they've got to actually create a new feminine brain. They've literally got to rewire the brain to access testosterone during the day, let's get some oxytocin going at night. The transition is, how do we make those happen? And so we're demanding from the feminine today, and for women particularly, to marry lines and circles. In a very, very evolved way. And we're in this transition generation. It's extremely hard to do.

First off, there's no guidance in the options. Which one should I pick? That's one. Which one's right? I don't even know. And then, how do I marry those two? And there's no guidance in that. And so on the one hand, there's far more options available to women. On the other hand, the demand for hieros gamos is actually much stronger. And so that's the second potential cause of depression. Both

powerful. So let's hold her for a second and see what we've got. So we've got the line – yes.

Speaker: Is there an element that, returning you back or reliving 24:05 that experience and feeling all the emotions of it, isn't there also an element of addiction to it?

Marc: Yes. One of the shadows of – and again, we're spending lots of time this morning on the circles. I just want to mention that.

[Laughter]

We're going to basically very quickly repeat these points, because we're actually saying a lot of very important circle points. So one of the shadows of circle quality would be addiction. And why that's true we'll talk about more, but that's true. That's absolutely true. So let's just do a little summation. See where we are here. And again, we could spend hours on this goal oriented thing, but we've got the basic thing. What's the quality in history which is the goal quality? What do we call it? We have a word for it. The goal oriented, forward thrust of history? What do we call that? Progress. Exactly. Progress. You're making progress. Making progress is a line quality.

[00:25:00]

What's the shadow of progress? The shadow of progress is being disconnected from the cost of progress. Exactly.

So Mother Earth becomes a casualty of progress because until Rachel Carson wrote *Silent Spring* in 1960, we didn't even know there was an environment. Let alone an environmental crisis. We just didn't think in terms of environment. Again, one of the qualities of circle is being a container. Which is environment. But we didn't even notice the container. Not only do we not notice it was in crisis, we didn't notice there was a container. So that's progress. I'll just give you a second example.

My brother was just killed in a car accident nine weeks ago. Which is a crazy, insane story. Maybe it was like seven weeks ago. I was giving a talk at one of our other study centers in Pacific Grove, and my good friend, the minister, Bill says, "You've got to stop, come talk to me." And he says, "Someone died." It was actually a horrific moment because it took a half hour to figure out who died. Which wasn't great. He said, "Someone in your immediate family died." Great. Can you tell me who? So it was a crazy half hour. And my assumption was it was one of my boys. Because my assumption was Israel. So it wasn't my best half hour. But of course, you can't exactly be relieved because it was your brother, so you're in kind of an impossible situation.

Anyway, you kind of tell the story. So he was killed in a car accident. He was actually driving to Baltimore and he was buckled up, backseat of the car, black ice and killed instantly. Car accidents. So I've been thinking about car accidents the

last seven, eight weeks. Car accidents are actually the shadow of the line. We absolutely know that cars produce X amount of fatalities, and X amount of crippling. And we know that when we raise the speed limit, it means the line's move much faster. The car's a line. It's going down the line faster. There's a direct proportion between raising the speed limit and the amount of fatalities and the level of crippling. And yet you've got lobbies in all sorts of states to raise the speed limit. So I can have the line experience.

It's not just that I want to get there faster. It's not an economic thing. "I want to get there faster." People want to have the experience of speeding. It's a line experience. And we've externalized the effect. The fact that you're actually lobbying in Nevada – wherever it is – to have a speed limit that's higher, to have the line experience, you completely externalize the direct statistically measured accurately effect of that. And we take it – all of us – we take as an absolute given car accidents. They're just a given. Until they happen to us, of course. But they're a given. We know X amount of people every day, we're on the road, we pass by them. And we don't say, "Let's not have cars." And when you think about it, it's like, wow.

Now, on the other hand, cars have the saved tons of lives. Ambulances have saved tons of lives. This is what you were talking about before, John, yesterday. In your first comment, it was the first thing you said here. Is that when you're talking in the large meta-sweeps – and Sean, we caught each other's eye – it's hard to do the calculus. The calculus gets much harder to do. But what we at least need to be aware to get out of the line – the beginning of being in the circle is that all the calculus is the circle.

And what does an externality mean? The shadow of a line as externalities. It externalizes what's happening. There's just the line. The minimal thing that the circle consciousness has to do is bring everything into the circle. To actually be aware. But that's the beginning of circle consciousness. That's where it begins. Knowing there's an environment. Knowing there's environmental degradation. That begins to be circle consciousness. Yeah.

Eric: It's an important paradox. Like the D-Day invasion. There's a decision that's made. And the knowledge sitting, perhaps, in the strange hieros gamos of this thing that many lives will die in order to accomplish the goal. And the line has to sit with that.

Marc: Absolutely. Absolutely. So let's take a look at this for a second. We're going to take that and then we're going to go into – that's our last question/comment. I want to respond to it, and then we're going to actually go into the metrics holy exercise. But let's look at it for a second because it's so great.

[00:30:00]

So who am I about to mention? Tom Hanks. Because obviously, Tom Hanks needs mentioning at this moment in time.

[Laughter]

Saving Private Ryan. How many people saw the movie? *Saving Private Ryan*. Now let's look at the movie. It's a classical line/circle move. So the opening scene of the movie is Normandy D-Day. And whenever people demonize man, I send them to that movie. It's unbelievable. I cry just thinking about it now. It's just unbelievable. Man pouring out of the boats on D-Day getting mowed down, knowing they're going to get mowed down. And you see the pictures of the guys talking as the boats are coming to shore – was your dad there? Your dad was in the war though, right? He was someplace – right, right. I just thought of your dad for a second.

Speaker He was training pilot at the time.

Marc: Training pilots at the time. Right. So these guys know they're about to be mowed down and what are they doing? This is a line quality. Hierarchy. They're responsible. And we'll see, it's another line quality that's going to be in more sharply, that we're going to get to later. But this is a line quality. Because one of the qualities of line is protection. And they're charging the enemy line. They've got to cross – they've got to penetrate the enemy line in order to protect. And they're giving up their lives. They're just getting mowed down, mowed down, crippled, mowed down, crippled, mowed down, crippled. And they keep pouring out of the boats.

It's a shocking expression of the nobility of the line. And as Eric says, there's a decision that's made. And the decision is an abstract calculus, which is, "We need to take Normandy. Or we're going to basically be ruled by Nazism." And so back to John. It's a decision in the frame of time. That we're willing to give up all these lives in order for us to sit here. So all those lives enable us to be sitting in his room.

And then the circle enters. And it's so beautiful. And then the circle enters, and the circle says, "There's this woman who's got four kids that have all been killed in the war. And there's a fifth brother, Private Ryan." And so the high command, the ultimate line, then is intoxicated by circle consciousness. And says, "We're going to go save the fifth guy." Now from a line perspective, Sean, it makes no sense. Like, what the fuck? Private Ryan's going to die. Really? Like, who cares? All these guys just died and we're worried about Private Ryan? Really? What the fuck? There's no reason to worry about Private Ryan, in terms of a line calculus

But somehow, the mother – and you have the conversation at the beginning, "We can't have a mother lose my kids." Really? We can have all these 50,000 men dying, not a problem, but a mother can't lose five kids? What does that mean?

That's circle consciousness. And circle consciousness is not quantifying. It's not measuring. And so this is a symbolic assertion of circle consciousness in the middle of the ultimate reign of the line. It's unbelievable. It's stunning.

And then what happens is – and to really get that it's circle consciousness – there's no line calculus. So Tom Hanks, who's the commander of this group of fantastic commandos – they all go to save Private Ryan, *Saving Private Ryan*, and they all die saving him. And you remember the last scene in the movie, Tom Hanks – it's right before the last scene, actually – Tom Hanks has got his back up against the munitions, he's been hit, he's about to die and he turns to Private Ryan and he says, "Earn it." He says, "Earn it." And that's where our Unique Self dharma starts. But we're not going there right now. But that's it.

And so Tom Hanks, he dies and he gives him a line message. Which is, "Earn it." But that's the whole movie, it's about this desperate need to affirm circle consciousness in the middle of lines gone berserk. Wow. It's so stunning. And again, now just watch what happens. You could watch the movie without that, of course. Of course you could. But once you get what's happening, the whole thing just – that's how interpretation [works]. That's not just an abstract intellectual dharma. Just your whole experience of the entire thing completely changes. Thank you, Eric. Beautiful.

And again, this is what happens in the exchange of dharma, is what Jeff was talking about. As we talk and address it, and it arises here... So just to be clear, I never thought of what I just said till this second. To be really clear about that. And I've talked about this movie five different times, but that dimension of the movie never occurred to me until you were a line and you were provoking it, I received your question, and in receiving it, we birthed something new. Did everyone see that?

[00:35:00]

Now if I would be lecturing, the question goes to the wayside. Because I'm not open to you. So then I'm just penetrating you. And then you feel fucked. But if I'm giving you a transmission, and you're receiving it, but I'm receiving you, then we're both fucked open. That's the whole thing. It's like, wow, right? Wow.

And if you describe it from the outside, then two's make it a one, instead of a three. And that's a total insight moment. It's so stunning. It's so stunning. She dances. She dances.

So look for that quality – the light quality – let's just say clearly so we have it clearly. The light quality is moving forward. Accomplishing. Progress. Moving the ball down the court. It's this forward motion. That's the light quality. That's the strong quality. The weak quality is getting stuck. Unable to move the ball down the court. I'm mired. I can't get out of it. That would be the shadow quality, _____ 36:29 shadow quality, light quality. So let's give an example of each in your life. That's first, metrics one.

So now, two. So rate, 1 to 10, how much does this play in my life? How much am I focused on this quality? It's a quick 1 to 10. And three, rate how strong or weak should I be at that quality? So let's rate the last one, strong and the weak of the shadow. How strong is my shadow? How much shadow do I have? And what's the shadow here? What's the shadow?

The shadow is, I'm thrusting forward, I'm moving forward, but I'm not actually present in the experience. I'm actually alienated from the experience. I'm disconnected. I'm not actually entered into reality. The shadow might be – what would be a word for it? Because let's just work on the shadow for a second. That's important.

The shadow might be excessive ambition. Excessive ambition might be a shadow. The classical vision of, we identify the line's ambition, which is shadow side. So ambition may be a shallow quality, or ambition may be a light quality. But the ambition, which is an egoic ambition – in order to look good and stand out; I'm trying to look good and stand out, so I'm driving forward. But I'm not driving forward because I'm creating something new. I'm not driving forward because I'm creating more prosperity in order to be able to do more in my life. I'm driving forward to look good. I'm driving forward to cover up my emptiness. I'm driving forward because greed, which means I want more than I need. My greed means it's not connected to need. It's connected to more, more, more, more, more, per se. So it's not a creative impulse that's goal oriented. Let me say it differently.

In the light quality, I'm pulled forward by the strange attractor of my Unique Self. Got that Gil? That's your vision. I'm pulled forward by the strange attractor of my Unique Self. So I'm moving forward, but I'm actually pulled forward by my Unique Self, which is drawing me forward. It's my daemon.

In the greed notion, it's my ego that keeps pushing me forward in order to look good, look good, look good, look good. So I can never stop. I can never rest. Paradoxically, the Unique Self knows how to rest. Because the Unique Self is pulled forward by the strange attractor, and the Unique Self has line and circle quality. But if I'm in a distortion when I'm primarily line, and I'm pushed by my ego and I'm trying to always cover my brokenness and emptiness with more and more accomplishment, then I'm stuck in that moving forward line quality. That's the shadow. Jeff, did you have something else there?

Jeff: Yeah, but I can just write it to you later.

Marc: No, go for it.

Jeff: Is it also work 39:48 that the shadow is when the goal is a degraded goal? Or an unevolved goal? Right? I have to be incredibly driven to... Well, you can go back to your Nazi.

[00:40:00]

Marc: Right. A bad goal. Which would be pleasure level three. The counterfeit pleasure of level three pleasure is a counterfeit cause. Great. That'd be right. But I'm driven towards a bad goal, which is a great example – that's another take on shadow. It's a good take on shadow. I'm driven towards a counterfeit goal. And the counterfeit goal, it's a really good, new way to say it. When you actually get to the inside of it, it means it's ego pushed. It's to cover up emptiness. At its core. But actually saying it that way is actually helpful. It's not redundant. It's actually helpful, another way. It's a good door in. That's great. Gil.

Jill: Can it be also that not being able to be in the present because you're totally out there in the future ahead of yourself?

Marc: That's a really, really beautiful discernment. Another cause that's driving me forward is that I can't actually stay in the present. So I'm escaping the present by driving forward. That'd be another way to identify – and that's a really good, what Jill's offering, he's got another window, like Jeff did, you do you identify that this is a shadow quality, and not a light quality? Because it comes from being unable to stay in the present. I'm not in the present, so I'm always having a side conversation. I'm always having – something else is going on all the time. Because it's actually really hard for me to sit and actually be right here. But that's meditation. We meditation is sitting in silence. That's not what meditation is. Meditation's I'm sitting here. That's the meditative quality. It's in this room. I'm here.

That's why I always say, try and avoid the side talk. Because you're losing the meditation. Not that I mind side talk. If you notice sometimes there'll be an experience, and we'll say, "Hold silence of presence." Why are we saying, hold silence of presence? Because what ego does is, the ego goes to make a comment to the person next to them. Because it's a way of getting comfortable again in my smallness. In my comfortable parameters.

If I hold the silence of presence, then I'm holding the expansion. So meditation means I'm staying present. It doesn't matter what you're doing. People think meditation is getting silence. Silence has nothing to do with meditation. Silence is just one way of checking whether you're staying present. But actually, you can be walking in meditation. Or sitting in the dharma room, "Am I in meditation or not?" Meaning, am I in the conversation? Am I here? That's great.

So if I feel like I'm driving forward because I'm afraid of the present, the present's too painful for me, that might be what causes – so let's just do the line/circle quickly. So the masculine, or the line form – let's go to line beyond the masculine – the line form of escaping the present is going to be driving forward. The circle form of escaping the present will be addiction. Addiction. Last comment.

Carol: I can see a form of the shadow, for me, is to be addicted to those easy goals, the short-term goals, the do's this today –

Marc: Which give me a quick dopamine rush.

Carol: Right. And then the **bigger** 43:10 goals, the Unique Self –

Marc: That's a great – literally, it's so awesome, every single comment that people have made – and it's much more than usual in dharma thing – every single comment has actually added something. It's actually shocking. So Carol makes a beautiful point. She says another form that she actually did was, she put together the line and the circle. Did you notice what associated in her? She did an association. What she associated was, okay, I want to escape. She put escape together with addiction together with goals. That's if you noticed the associative process, which was not a linear process. It was an associative process.

And what she came up with, very beautifully, was that actually, when I'm doing lots of short-term goals, in order to avoid the true Unique Self goals. So let me say it slightly differently. I'm busy. I'm busy. I'm always busy. I'm being a mom, I'm doing this, I'm taking care of that – I'm always busy. So I love short-term goals. But my short-term goals are actually a way to avoid the Unique Self invitation in my life. Because that causes me too much anxiety. That's powerful. That's powerful, my friends.

Each example here actually adds something really significant. And this is where transformation happens. Again, here's a distinction. It's a great distinction. What's the difference between self-help – most of the New Age movement/Human Potential movement's a form of self-help. The difference between self-help and transformation is really simple. Self-help is, what can I get out of it? Transformation is, what do I put in? That's the whole difference.

So when you show up in dharma, you've got to put all of yourself in. A lot of times people show up and, "What am I getting out of this now? What am I getting out?" And they're checking every second, "What am I getting out of it?"

[00:45:00]

That's not the way to play. That's self-help. And we're not doing self-help here. We're doing transformation. Transformation is, how am I showing up? How do I keep showing up again, every second? And am I willing to move through the discomfort of it?

Because remember, I made you a promise at the beginning. There'll be times when you'll be uncomfortable. You'll be tired, and uncomfortable. Move through the discomfort. Line quality. That's a line quality. You move through the discomfort to actually find my way towards transformation. And then transformation yields, not comfort – you give up comfort for pleasure.

And I meet so many people, my friends, who spend their entire lives going to seminars. Their entire lives. They're seminar junkies. And they never get to pleasure. Because they go in and it's a self-help thing and they check, "What did I get out? What did I get out?" So it's actually a rarefied form of spiritual narcissism. And materialism. It all revolves around me, it's all serving me. If I'm uncomfortable, I check out.

But you don't get to pleasure unless you're willing to incorporate the pain. All pleasure includes being willing to bear the discomfort. And if I can't bear the discomfort, I can't transform. So Wisdom School is about pleasure. It's pleasure school. It's a radical pleasure. And at the end of the process you're like, "Wow. I've got this whole map. I stayed in every single time, or most of the times, and I can now go back and actually see my life in a way that I could never see it before. And then I deepen those insights." Then we're in the game.

16-SATURDAY MORNING PART 4 - LINE 6 - LIVING ON THE EDGE

Part 4

Line 6 – Living on the Edge

Track: 16-Saturday Morning Part 4 - Line 6 - Living on the edge

TRT: 20:14

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Claire

Diana

Nance

[00:00:00]

Marc: Number six is living on the edge. What does feminism have to say about boxing? Nothing good. And boxing's pretty horrible actually, if you think about it. What the fuck's boxing? It used to be a couple of guys – now there's, of course, women boxing, because the line is now playing in women. But it's a couple of guys beating each other up, says classical feminism. But of course, anyone who's got a line quality in them knows that it's not quite that. That's not quite what it is. It's two lines pushing their edge. That's what it is.

And the Rocky movie's exciting when Rocky pushes his edge. When you push your edge, it's exciting. And when you do push-ups – you sit down and do 50 push-ups – if we all sat down and did push-ups right now, which you guys are too wimpy to do, I understand. But it's okay, I understand. No push-ups, it's fine. But when you push your edge, where's the excitement of the line, whether it's a man or a woman? It's always the last couple. That's where it's happening, right? It's not you're doing a little exercise bullshit. But it's only when you go the extra, it's the extra – that's the phrase – the extra mile. The extra mile is that. That's your "pushing your edge."

So when you see the big scene in a boxing movie, the big scene in every boxing movie is always the same. How does the scene go? I'll play it for you and you'll all remember it from a boxing movie. Where you see the things going, round one, round two, round three, round four, remember that scene? It's in every boxing movie, until you get to like round 13, and these guys have pushed their edge, and they're like right at the edge there, and you're like, "Wow!"

Now, what are they doing? They're killing each other. That's a separate problem – brain damage, concussion. I'm not saying that's the right way to push your edge. That's a separate issue. We're going to bracket that issue for a second. But the point is, they're pushing their edge.

Lance Armstrong's pushing his edge. And it took a couple of steroids and we bring him down. And we bring him down fiercely because someone who pushed their edge indicts us. Just to be clear, between you and me, if I took all the steroids in the world, I couldn't do what he did. If I became a steroid, I wouldn't come even close to what he did.

[Laughter]

It's like, really? I am a steroid. I can't even begin what he did. And the guy got brutalized for lots of reasons. It's a complex story. But one of the reasons he got unfairly brutalized is because he represents this thing of pushing the edge. And every other line person who didn't push that edge wants to bring him down and show that he didn't do it. So we try and bring those people down all the time. That's what we do. We try and murder people who push the edge in different ways. Yes?

Speaker: Have you seen these guys in the flying suits who jump off fjords? Have you seen this?

Marc: I have seen the videos.

Speaker: Unbelievable. It's literally living off the edge. And they're just flying down these –

Marc: Unbelievable, right? So check that. Could you jot it down? Let's get a clip of that. And let's get a clip, also, of my friend Kristen Ulmer skiing. How many of you know my friend Kristen from the board meeting? So Kristen and I shared a house for three years. She's a very, very close friend. I actually married her – not me, her – I performed her wedding. And Kristen, who's a complete sister of mine, I actually remember we met one night. We fell totally in love that night, and it was just the wrong time of life, so we immediately transmuted our energy that night, the one night we met. We just sat and talk for two hours into sister energy. So she's been my sisters since that night.

It was actually funny. I lived with her in a house for three years. She's wildly attractive. Never had any contact – she was my sister. She became my sister immediately, and she's a very, very close sister to me. And she's on our board. And she was one of the four or five people who started extreme skiing. And she and four or five of our friends created the extreme movement. She was the number one female skier in the world for a decade. And Kristen is a line person. So she would be dropped – you just brought it to mind – she would be dropped into raw snow, and she'd ski. And you watch Kristen coming down a mountain, and it's the goddess. It's the line circle.... It's just beyond imagination.

I mean, I wouldn't do that, I'm a circle. The way is ski is I'm Jewish. I buy ski clothes, and I'm done.

[Laughter]

Why would anyone move beyond that, I do not know. And I'm very happy with my ski clothes. It's good. Boots are – yeah, don't do boots. You just wrap your leg in cast, you put it up, and you say, "Man, that black run was unbelievable." There we go. But it's that quality of the line. It's a wild quality.

So living on the edge is a line quality – and again, I'm citing Kristen as an example of it so we don't limit it to men.

[00:05:00]

But by and large, it's more powerful in men. Testosterone actually produces it. And we actually have an enormous amount of data, getting this all new data in the last decade. So for example, do the statistics of, in a flood, how many women drown? How many men drown? Many, many more men. Because men always miscalculate. They take a risk. So if a man was in his car, he comes to a flood zone, he'll be six or seven times more likely to think he can get through, and drowns. Where the circle approaches the flood zone, and says, "Bad idea, go the other way." There's a whole set of statistics. There's a certain form of Japanese monkeys are born – this exists in male and female, not just in the human world, but in the animal world. So how do you pronounce "M-A-C-Q-U-E?"

Audience: "Mac-ak" "Mac-auk"

Marc: One of those two. The Japanese M monkeys. You guys decide between you and let me know. But the Japanese M monkeys are born, 1:1, male and female. By the time they're adults, there's 5:1 female to male. Why? Because the other four got killed doing crazy shit. That's what happened. This is an ultimate miscommunication between line and circle. A young boy who's taking his skateboard and saying, "Mom, I'm going to go skateboard and do these flips." And the mom's saying, "It's dangerous." And he goes, "Duh. Of course, it's dangerous. That's why I'm doing it!"

In other words, it's the attraction to risk taking, to living on the edge, is actually built-in. It's both a gender quality, which is far more powerful. Can you imagine girls saying to each other, "Hey, Jackie just took her skateboard and did a double flip off it?" So they'd say Jackie's crazy. But if they say, "Bret just did this." Wow. Good job Bret, and you're still alive. So risk-taking – living at the edge – is a classical line quality that, of course, exists both in men and women.

Now, here's a big sentence. This is exciting, exciting, exciting, exciting, really exciting. And we should get Tanya in touch with Jeff because it's relevant for our book. So was anyone here at Actualize? No. Who was at Actualize? Steve was at Actualize. And who wasn't? Chahatie was at Actualize. So at Actualize, which was an event we did about a year and a half ago, two years ago? Two years ago, was it that long ago? I did it with my buddy who's Eben Pagan. We did this event called "Actualize." And we spoke there about the dharma of what I like to call "unique risk." "And that's really important. Your Unique Self has unique risk. So it's a risk that's yours to take.

And to actually be able to identify your unique risk is hugely important. Your unique risk is a function of your Unique Self. So there's a general risk-taking that appears as lines, which is a meta-quality. But when you actually awaken as a Unique Self, then you take that quality of risk-taking, which is a line quality, and you direct it towards your Unique Self. You get that? That might be a financial risk. It might be buying the mountain for a couple of years. It might be buying a house across the street. There's risks that we can take which are financial risks. We're risking security, for example.

I might have a property some place in Canada that I might let go of in order to buy that. Just making something up. But I'm taking a risk. What am I risking? I'm risking circle security. I'm taking a risk. Why? Because it's connected to my Unique Self. You get it?

Now, not every risk that's connected to your Unique Self should you take. But that's where your unique risk is. Your unique risk is, "I'm going to step out of my marriage. I'm going to stop doing this kind of interior, and I guess open, I don't know, a Pilates shop." Whatever it might be. And taking a unique risk is a big deal. You cannot realize your Unique Self without taking your unique risk. That's an absolute rule, both in Unique Self coaching, which Claire heads up with

Barbara, Sam's wife, and the whole Unique Self coaching program, which just finished their first cohort of Unique Self coaches. So there's the first ten Unique Self coaches in the world, which is awesome. And Adaelie is one of them. A big, huge hand for Unique Self coaching. Give a big hand for Unique Self coaching. Yes.

[Applause]

Awesome. So we need to build into Unique Self coaching ____ 09:50 unique risk. How do you identify your unique risk? And the Unique Self process book that Jeff and I are working on. What's your unique risk? It's hugely important. Claire?

Claire: Yeah, so unique risk is actually not just one risk.

[00:10:00]

It's any risk that you take that's related to the emergence of your Unique Self.

Marc: Correct.

Claire: And it's related to your unique obligation.

Marc: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. So what you have to do is, in order to actually live your Unique Self, you've got to access this line quality – whether man or woman – of risk-taking, but in a way that's connected to your Unique Self. Because your ego, your separate self, will always take the wrong risks. And your true self is going to think you're always going to survive because you're part of the one. Don't listen to that. It's like part of the one, it's all fine, really? No, I think you're going to die. You get it? Okay, so that's that quality. So let's look at it. Let's finish this quality.

Number one, let's look for an example, here we go. Part one of our metrics. Where does this play in my life? So what's its light, what's its shadow? Its light is two lights. Two core light qualities. First light quality is, I take risks that are – let's call them "within reason" – whatever that means – in order to access my aliveness before my Unique Self. I'm accessing my aliveness. Two is, the ultimate light expression, is I access my aliveness by taking the risk that's connected to realizing my Unique Self. With me? You with me everyone?

Little parenthesis for you, here's a parenthesis. Often, the time that people feel most addressed by reality is when they meet a person who might be their partner. It could be a business partner, it could be a close friend, it could be a romantic partner. So often, you'll see that people take huge risks in choosing their partner. It could be choosing a teacher, it could be choosing a partner, it could be choosing a close friend. But there's huge risks. There's a dude named Arthur Brooks, who I'm looking forward to meeting. We've been circuitously exchanging information. He's head of the American Enterprise Institute. And Arthur Brooks,

he often writes in the *New York Times*, and he's a compassionate conservative. He's the conservative the *New York Times* likes. He's that dude, because he's a wild guy.

So he just wrote on Valentine's Day this great piece in the *Times*, how he was in Spain, doesn't speak Spanish, sees a woman out in the street, passes by or calls out to her, she calls out to him, he's engaged to her the next day. They've been married now for 23 years, three kids. But that's Arthur Brooks. He's got the sense of like – so we often take this wild risk in regard to our partnerships because it's one of the places we feel addressed. We can feel the sense of something important is happening, which is why people often break boundaries. And if you think that people ever leave relationships cleanly into the next one, it's rare.

It's always complicated, because there's always a risk that's at play. Because that's one of the places you see risk at play. So again, the light quality of risk is risk reasonable for aliveness, and risk which helps manifest my Unique Self, fulfill my unique obligation, etc. The shadow of risk is the risk that the ego takes to cover over emptiness. So instead of the risk producing a genuine aliveness or a genuine Eros, what it produces is a pseudo-Eros. It's a pseudo-aliveness. It's covering over the fact that I'm not really alive. That's one shadow form.

And the second shadow form would be a risk that's just disconnected from my Unique Self. It's not my story. Great risk, but it's got nothing to do with you, what the fuck are you doing? Really? It's just not my story. It's just not connected to my Unique Self. Everyone got that? Diana.

Diana: It could be 13:50 related to taking a risk that's actually not about your risk. It's like almost contrary.

Marc: Right. Unless it's a reasonable risk connected to reasonable aliveness, but if it's this huge risk and it's not connected to your Unique Self, what are you doing? I'll just give you one example of a Unique Self risk. Just a quick example.

So we just ran the Success 3.0 Summit. I've mentioned a couple of times. And I did something which I had a fiduciary responsibility to do. I set up an independent company to run it, so that our board members shouldn't be liable if it went down. It's my responsibility, my fiduciary responsibility, to the board. Sean actually suggested to me, just leave it in the board, it's not a problem. But I decided to create a separate company anyways.

So I'm signed with my friend and co-board chair Kate Maloney on this event. And we stood to lose several hundred thousand dollars if the event didn't work. There's no cover for it. So on my bank account, Kate's very rigorous on money. So it was clear we we're going to have to split the difference, whatever happened.

[00:15:00]

And for lots of reasons, we only actually started recruiting for it about eight weeks before. So about eight weeks before the event, there's about 40-50 people signed up for it. To break even, it needed, I mean in the end, there were 700 people at the core day. But you needed actual, for the whole event, at least 400 people to break even.

So here I am, seven weeks before the event, standing to lose several hundred thousand dollars. That's not a good scene. And I can't really share it. I can't involve the board in it because I'm then breaking my trust with the board, because they actually weren't involved in creating the project. So the second I do something like that, I want my board to support me and to fund everything I do because I'm trustable.

The second I'm not trustable and I'm off on some wild goose chase, and I'm involving them to cover it, well, then I'm not a good CEO. So I can't really raise money for it seven weeks before because it's too embarrassing. Really, running this seven weeks before the event, and so we just went nuts for like three weeks. And we overfilled the event and it was wildly successful. That was a unique risk. It was Unique Self. It wasn't a crazy risk. It's part of our Unique Self, at that moment in time is, we wanted to run this event. And lots of things came out of this event.

So for example, Jack Canfield, who I mentioned before, came on board in the Outrageous Love Stories Project. Sally Ranney, Ted Turner's partner – a fantastic woman – made a quarter of a million dollar pledge to back the Outrageous Love Project. Etc. But all this came out of this wild insane risk. And I had to bear the risk. And there was really no one – I didn't want to talk to people too much about it because it even sounds too crazy talking about it. So part of leadership in that moment is that you actually hold that anxiety by yourself. You hold it by yourself. You just hold it. And when it works, you get to tell the story, and it sounds unbelievably heroic. And it when it doesn't work, the whole thing falls apart and you're irresponsible and an idiot. And everyone says, "Yeah, we knew that he wasn't responsible." You get it? And that's the nature of the risk.

In other words, when it works, you're brilliant. You're a brilliant, strategic leader. When it fails, you're an idiot and irresponsible and everyone shows all the reasons why they knew that that was true, and now you've fulfilled it. That's the nature of a risk. Same thing if you're in the corporate world. People who live in this world – you can see in the room who gets this – you get it. So taking unique risk is a big deal and it's scary. It's scary. Starting Unique Self coaching is scary. It's a scary thing to do. But it's like stepping in in that way.

So taking unique risk is a big deal. The shadow, again, is, I take an inappropriate risk. I take a risk not connected to my Unique Self. That's an inappropriate risk. I take a risk which is an ego risk to cover over my emptiness to get a pseudo-hit of aliveness. Claire? Claire, fantastic, right? Last question that we'll write.

Claire: Is the shadow also to put others at risk?

Marc: It would always be a shadow. You only get to take a unique risk for yourself. That's right. Which is why, for example, I didn't involve the board. Although, I was planning to send you a bill. There you go. Last one, Nance.

Nance: I think there's something about sharing some of the anxiety – so just you sharing some of the anxiety – there's kind of a, "Whoa, you really did risk," that ignites something in me. So I think there is something about the shadow would be to hide that you're actually in big risk.

Speaker: I agree.

Marc. Right. I would say I completely hear that. I would say the question is – and there was no right or wrong here, but let's just go back and forth for fun. I would say the question is when. The question is when. Now is a really good time. And there are one or two close people in this room, maybe two or three, that actually I shared it with as it was happening a few weeks before the event. But it's a very discerning moment, what you can share and what you don't.

So let's write. Here we're writing now an example in my life where I took the light side of risk – aliveness, Unique Self – and then the shadow side – pseudo-aliveness, non-Unique Self. Okay, here we go. Now, let's rate 1 to 10 how focused am I in this quality? Or as we said, Kai, how much is this part of my life? How much does this show up for me in my life? How focused, or how much is this part of my life, 1 to 10? And, Jeff, I'm going to try and get all of them this time.

Three, how strong or weak is this light quality in my life, 1 to 10. And finally, how strong or weak is this shadow quality in my life.

[00:20:00]

And we are, just to get everyone a sense of how strong is the shadow quality, be totally in. Just put the number down. You don't have to think about it a lot. We are going to finish lines. We're going to be finished by 2:00. We're going to finish the lines. We're line driving, okay? So here we go, because we're going to spend the whole afternoon on circles. We're finishing lines.

17-SATURDAY MORNING PART 5 - LINE 7 - DIVISION DECISION

Part 5

Line 7 – Division Decision

Track: 17-Saturday Morning Part 5 - Line 7 - Division Decision

TRT: 26:05

Speaker

Marc Gafni

Steve

Elif

Nancy

Gil

[00:00:00]

Marc: Quality seven. Quality seven is division. Division. And someone mentioned earlier making a decision. Or in line medicine, making an incision. So in other words, what's the quality of a line? A line says, "Don't cross that line." A line makes a decision. It decides. The word "decide" means you split it with a line. The sword splits it in two. In Buddhism, Manjusri's sword is the sword, line sword, of discernment. Manjusri's sword is the sword of discernment.

So division, discernment, discrimination is a line quality. And that quality comes together with abstraction to create law. It's permitted or it's prohibited. It's right or wrong. The entire quality of – and it's connected, of course, to the cluster of hierarchy. Some of these are connected in a cluster, but each one is a different face of it. So this ability to discern between right and wrong. So here we go.

So there's division. There's discernment. There's making a distinction. The ability to make distinctions. The ability to make distinctions. Dharma is very connected to the ability to make distinctions. So law emerges from this quality of decision. Judgment emerges from this quality of division. Now, the circle says, "Don't judge me." Or one of the ways the circle indicts the line, the circle says, "You're judging me." And because "feminine values" were thought to be better, so the lines go, "I'm so sorry, I'm judging you." What the line should say is, "Yeah, I am."

Now, you can judge from a place of Unique Self or you can judge from a place of ego. Clearly. But to actually appropriately exercise judgment and discernment and distinction and division, is a very, very big deal. That is the quality of law. That is the quality of to be able to discern and to see things clearly. It's a big deal. You didn't ask me about imagination, Peter. We'll come back to it. And Liraz mentioned it. We'll come back to it. I just remembered that.

That was a discernment you made, a judgment you made. So we'll bring that back in. So that's a very, very strong quality. Now, if a person can't make a decision, they're impotent. And that impotence is the inability to make a decision. And part of line leadership is the ability to discern, to judge, to evaluate, to make distinctions, move forward – that other quality of a line – and make a decision. Impotence is the inability to make that decision. So that's the power of the quality. It's the power of law, distinction, discernment. It's not confused.

And the inability to make distinctions is huge. And we have a phrase in English which is called "moral equivalence." How many people have heard that phrase? What does moral equivalence mean? It means I compare apples and oranges. I equate things. I say – and I'm very firm on this position. And I'm not embarrassed by it, and I know that always, in a liberal room, you get shot for saying this, but it's okay, I'm going to say it anyways – any moral equivalence between a democracy and 22 states that are non-democracies is problematic.

And when that one state has a little army of 7 million people, and it's surrounded by 100 million people, it's problematic. Now it doesn't mean that both sides don't have flaws. Both sides do have flaws. But a moral equivalence between a democracy in which women have rights to vote, and which is pluralistic and democratic, and all of the people on the other side of conflict, which are all some version of dictatorship, fundamentalist, oppressive of women, to the extreme degree, little problematic. That's called the moral equivalence. It's a moral equivalence.

So more equivalences are problematic. Equating men with Nazis – moral equivalence, problematic. It's a lack – the circle often has a complete inability to make distinctions. The circle can't make distinctions. Everything's in the circle. It's blurred. The ability to have a penetrating insight which creates a distinction is a line quality.

[00:05:00]

And you get stuck in therapy, for example, when the therapist, back to Steve, is holding the line quality and doesn't want to lose the love, which is really a pseudo-love, back to you making distinctions. And saying, "Actually, stop. It doesn't hurt that much." It's very, very powerful.

Here's a distinction coming at you. Naftali of Ropshitz, one of the great Hasidic masters. And he tells the story, and he would tell it every Yom Kippur, every Day of Atonement, of a king who has this son. And the son is completely lost in tears. The son just cries all the time. And tears, of course, are a classical circle expression. It's a circle expression. Not men or women, but it's a circle expression.

And so the son of the king is completely lost in tears. And everyone tries to heal the son of the king, because you try and heal the son of the king. It's good insurance. And the son of the king can't be healed, until this old master comes wandering through and he says, "I can heal the son of the king." And the king's desperate at this point. This master has no credentials, but the king's tried everything else. So they let the master go in with the son.

And the master comes out an hour later and slowly, the boy starts crying a little less, and a little less, and a little less, until he stops crying, reenters life and then cries occasionally as is appropriate. So they say the king brings in this old, apparently wise, man who's able to heal the child, the son, in a way that no one else was able to heal him. And he says, "What did you say?" He said, "Well, I

actually just sat with him for an hour. And I just whispered something in his ear." "Well, what did you whisper?" "I just told him don't cry more than it hurts. Don't cry more than it hurts."

We're afraid to say that. We're afraid to say that. Because when we derive our Eros, our aliveness, from our wounded-ness, and the story of our wounded-ness, our circle story that we keep coming back to again, and again, and again, not because there's something left to heal – you can actually come back to a story your whole life, if there's more to heal there. I want to be clear about that. If there's more to heal, come back to it on your death bed. Fantastic.

But if you're coming back to it because it's a way of escaping your Unique Self, so you keep coming back to it in order to access a pseudo-sense of aliveness, that you've got to keep crying. But you're crying more than it hurts, actually. You're actually disconnected from the original experience. You're now in the experience of crying. And that's beyond politically incorrect to say. So when therapy becomes the radical holding container – circle – but actually is unwilling to make that discernment, which is a penetrating Manjusri's sword discernment, then it becomes ineffective. It's no longer transformational. It's like, wow.

And if you trace history for a second – then we're going to quickly and immediately do our – in about a minute and a half – we're going to do our little metrics. But if you trace history 40-50 years ago – where are we now? In 2015? Let's say in the '50s. Till like 1964, '65, '66. The basic deal was, you came with a problem, chin up, buckle up, pull yourself up by your bootstraps. Whatever the issue is, deal with it. And the way you deal with it is, fit into the role that society prescribed for you. You say you're gay, be straight. Work it out. You think you're an artist, get a job. You've got an old wounding, not interested. I got wounded also. You think I wasn't hurt when I was a kid? Pull it together.

And that's what society said. So it was a straight line without circle. There was a line, no circle. Then, all of a sudden we realized that's not working. People are traumatized and wounded and devastated. And I'm actually not straight, I'm gay, asshole. Maybe that's not the right word there, but anyways. You get the point, right? And actually, I am wounded. And actually, I'm traumatized. And actually, I'm going to pass on this abuse to my children, if I don't actually go back there and work it out.

So this line thing was insufficient. We need to bring circle on line. We need to actually go back to the trauma and revisit the trauma. We need to create things like mat trips, which are unbelievably important in an evolutionary development, which said, I'm going to do a mat trip – meaning I'm going to go back to the place of wounding, I'm going to revisit it, because there's healing there. And if I've got this line quality, and I move on before actually going back to complete the circle, I'm going to actually continue the cycle of abuse and devastation. Wow.

[00:10:00]

But then what happens is, you can get stuck in the circle. You get stuck in the circle, and we start losing our ability to discriminate. Because the circle actually has a very powerful allure of pseudo-Eros. I gain a lot of attention. There's an enormous amount of energy in it, especially if my memory is a circle memory. I'm revisiting the actual memory of the actual, original trauma which actually paradoxically enlivens me. It's paradoxically enlivening. So I actually have to now bring – or I can get stuck for years and just keep redoing the same trip again and again and again, because it's got a pseudo-Eros to it.

So now, that doesn't mean I should stop. It means I should do hieros gamos. I'm going to being really precise here. I want to marry the line and the circle. So I might continue doing my mat trip to the day of my death, because each time I'm going to get something new out of it. But at the same time, if that's authentic and real, I'm also moving forward.

And the way to tell is, am I using my circle as a way to avoid moving forward in my life? And if I am, it's probably pseudo-Eros. What does that require? Distinction, division, discernment. That's the story. Don't cry more than it hurts. That's a discernment. It's completely politically incorrect. How can you possibly say to a person who's hurting, which is what the circle would say, how can you evaluate how much that hurts? The answer is, you can.

Not all things hurt the same. How can you say that? That's not your interior experience. Fuck you. Actually, let's do it. Let's go. Let's play. Now again, it's very sensitive. It's a very fine call. And actually, if you're not an outrageous lover, and you're not in radical love, and your heart just doesn't break for people, then you shouldn't be making that discernment. Because then, what's happening is your line quality is actually disconnected. And we're actually not interested in what you have to say.

But if you're coming from a place of outrageous love, and your outrageous love says, "Man, I want your full manifestation. I want your full gorgeousness. I want your full realization. I want the most beautiful version of you. The most extraordinary version of your life, to manifest. And my heart breaks when it doesn't." And the person would feel like you're coming from that place of outrageous love. Then those discernments are actually effective and important.

So our light quality is distinction, division, which creates law, which creates right and wrong in other appropriate ways which are able to make distinctions that are creative and constructive and move us forward. Our shadow quality is – what's the shadow quality? Is a distinction and division which loses contact with the immediacy of reality and experience. We've got a meta-principle. Let me say it again. I've got a meta-principle. This is the principle. It's good, it's right and wrong. But actually, I'm not in the actual situation. And in the actual situation, right and wrong actually aren't so clear. And the application of right and wrong actually doesn't work so clearly here. So when you actually know the people, I'm

with them in a room, that which I was completely sure was wrong actually gets a little more blurred.

So in other words, when principles of law either disconnect you from love – possibility one. Disconnect you from the deeper truth of the experience – possibility two. Disconnect you from the intuitive wisdom inherent in the actual situation – possibility three. So when the law, I'm following the law, I'm doing it right, I'm making sound, analytical judgments, but I'm actually not in touch with the corporate culture. My pulse isn't actually on how the company feels.

So even though all my decisions add up, I'm actually disconnected from the immediacy of the circle, the environment, the experience. I'll give you an example of the shadow, and then we'll go into the metrics. Here's an example of the shadow. The dude's name is Solomon. So Solomon is the king. And it's the most famous story of Solomon. Anyone? The most famous story of Solomon. The babies, right? So he said bring two babies to Solomon. Two mothers, excuse me. Thank you. Two mothers, one baby. I'm not good on numbers today.

[Laughter]

Two mothers, one baby. Thank you. And each mother says, "It's my baby." Now, what would the law be here? DNA. Thank you, spoken by a lawyer. Up-to-date. Well, what would the law be here? But of course, Carol's right. The law would be check. Find information.

[00:15:00]

Facts, evidence, witnesses, something. And people actually don't realize that this story is a subversive goddess story. And in two volumes I wrote once called *Radical Kabbalah* that a couple of you have. I talk about this story. This story is a hidden subversive story, mystical story, hidden in the public.

What does Solomon do? Tell me the story. What does he do? "I'll slice the baby in half." Is that a judicial proceeding? Is there precedent for that? So everyone reads this story as this quaint story. It's not a quaint story, right? That story is a subversive goddess story in a tradition of law. You get it? It's powerful. There's a law tradition. The Hebrew tradition is law. And then you've got this subversive Solomon energy which is circle energy. It's she energy, and Solomon says, "Cut the baby in half." And the Talmud says, in Tractate Eruvin 21a, that Solomon was excommunicative for that.

And if you look at how the Bible treats Solomon, it's not that positively. Solomon actually gets *[Foreign Language]* his heart strayed after his women, or his line strayed after his circle. And he actually is negatively read by the bible, profoundly so. Because what's Solomon doing? Solomon's doing a goddess project. Solomon is saying, "I can actually access, in this situation, a direct circle intuition." So he cuts through the legal process and he says, "Cut the baby in half," knowing intuitively that the true mother would rather give up the baby. That's not always

true. That's not an absolutely, right? That's the reason you have judicial process, because you actually can't rely on – imagine if California 16:55 relied on that as a meta-principle in court. Disaster. But in this moment, in this time, in the Unique Self of this time, in the uniqueness of this moment, the Unique Self of Solomon meets this unique moment in time, accesses his circle quality and decides the law. But decides the law in accordance with a circle property. Beautiful, right? You've got his sense there.

So we now know the light quality of decision. And the shadow quality of law and decision is being disconnected from the reality. And I just gave three examples of the shadow. I'm disconnected from the reality. I'm disconnected from the deeper truth of the experience. In other words, the principles of the law don't allow me to actually access what's really happening now. I'm disconnected from love. So find the light version and the shadow version of that in my life. What's the light version of law, order, decision, discernment, distinction, division? And where does the shadow property of this line quality appear?

Steve: I think I get it, that a shadow side of this, for me, would be a fear of making the wrong decision, paralyzing me, out of not wanting to look bad or just –

Marc: That's interesting. So what you're saying is that an inability to access the quality of decision-making – I would call that a 'weak' actually. And it may produce a shadow result, but I agree, Steve. I would call that a 'weak.' Because you're not accessing that quality. Now of course, not accessing that quality – and that was the point you were making before, Tom – those are correlated. But I'd call that, that's the weak version of it.

Steve: And another facet of this, for me, I have a question about is, I feel like I have a wonderful ability to see both sides of things, and that that sometimes also tips into a weakness of not taking sides.

Marc: Totally. That's great. I so see all the perspectives that I become impotent and paralyzed. And I would say that a person's impotent when they're unable to make a decision, because a decision requires me to cut through. And when I'm circle – just watch this. This is for you, Eric. And we've done so much circle this morning. I think we've done more circle than line. But a circle means all of the perspectives are in the circle. Nothing is outside. Does everyone see that? I see all the perspectives. They're all in the circle. So therefore, I can never take a perspective out of the circle so I can never decide. You see that? Beautiful, right? That's great. Dharma's just so beautiful. It's just beautiful. Yes, Elif 19:53.

Elif: What if you're very good at making decisions and judgments and discernment, and fundamentally that comes from your intuition?

[00:20:00]

Marc: Great. That's right. That's beautiful, yeah. That's beautiful. And actually, there's a book you should look at called *The New Feminine Brain*, which talks precisely about this. It's about a woman who is a very, very talented line person. And was also a medical intuitive. And she wouldn't tell each side of her life about the other side because she don't want to be invalidated in either side. And it really deals with this. It's beautiful. That's really a great point. Great. Nancy?

Nancy: So does that mean that lines are not taking everything into consideration? Like the circle has –?

Marc: No, a line can take everything into consideration, but then make a decision. I would say the circle quality by itself, without hieros gamos, will be lost in perspective taking. It's great. That's great. Great. Great. I just want to notice again, everyone, just deep bow to the goddess – every single comment is adding an enormous amount of depth. There hasn't been an extra comment here. But we're not going to have anymore. So we can keep moving. Okay.

So now, let's evaluate. How much am I focused on this in my life? Or how much does it play in my life? 1 to 10, it takes a second. Three, how strong or weak am I at deploying this line quality? That was really well said. That was the clearest way we've said that. Wasn't it? Let's get that sentence down. How strong or weak am I at deploying this line quality? It took me like eight of them to get it right. But that's how I want is said. How strong or weak am I at deploying this line quality. Great. It's just a number.

And finally four, for the fourth piece, how strong or weak is this shadow in my life? How much or how little? It might even be better to say that one. How much or how little does this shadow form of this quality show in my life? And again, the shadow from this quality is being disconnected from reality, relying on general principles, disconnected from love, disconnected from the truth of the experience. And I'm making decisions, discernments and judgments, but those judgments disconnect me. And let's give you an example, okay? Let me give you an example of this one. Again, I'm trusting my subtle body. I don't feel like this one's fully landed in the room. So let's get this one so you get it really straight. Okay, here it is. Ready?

You haven't called your mother for nine years. Why? Because you had an argument nine years ago which was the culmination of many arguments. And you remember exactly what happened. And when you analyze it, it was very clear she was wrong. She was wrong. So you don't call her. Because your judgment/discernment, based on all the principles of ethics, she was wrong. You don't call her.

But what's happened is, you're disconnected from the reality of the situation. The reality of the situation is your mother is experiencing eight years of pain because you haven't called her. So fucking give up your division and distinction and

discernment, give up being right and call your mother. You get it? So people stay in – you get that quality? It's an exact example. Again, now I feel like we've landed it. That's what it is right there. Your judgment's right. You're in your judgment. Does everyone get it now? Does that help? Gil.

Gil: The word, intransigent?

Marc: Can you say that again?

Audience: Intransigence.

Marc: Intransigence. It's a French word. Intransigence. Yeah. I'm intransigent because I'm stuck in my judgment. My stuck-ness here is actually in my judgment. My judgment becomes the place where I'm stuck because it's right or wrong. There was a... I don't know, what's his name? I can't remember. Did y'all see this movie that just came out like four or five, maybe it was six months ago, maybe it was longer, about a judge who's this old dude, and his son is this hotshot lawyer, and he gets in trouble because he hits someone, and his son comes to defend him.

Speaker: Robert Downey Jr.

Marc: Right, Robert Downey Jr. and Robert Duvall? What was the name of the movie? *Bad Judge*. Right. What was the name of the movie? Anyone?

Audience: *The Judge*.

Marc: Let's jot that one down. Which is Robert Duvall and Robert Downey Jr., a movie about the judge, we'll find it. But the point is that this judge is really good at the law. But he learns through a complex human situation, where all of a sudden, the law, as applied to him, is not just. So his whole life, he's a servant of the law. And his son, Robert Downey Jr., is a hotshot lawyer, and his son twists the law. How many people saw the movie? One or two?

[00:25:00]

If you remember, at the movie, Robert Downey Jr. is this hotshot lawyer who's hired – he's making a fortune – because he can always make the law do what it needs to do. So he's rebelling against his father. His father is the law, and he's saying this is bullshit. He actually sees the shadow of his father's inherence to the law, so he basically makes his career making the law, showing the law as bullshit, making the law do what it needs to do.

Then he goes back to visit his father, disastrous trip, and as he's leaving, they're going to arrest his father because they found he was – whatever the story was. They weren't sure what, but apparently there was some evidence that his car had hit someone, that he had sent to prison, who had gotten out of prison. And he's accused of doing the murder. And then all of the systems of justice break down. And there's this whole meeting between this line quality. And both the father and

the son are both line qualities, but the son is mocking the line quality. He's using the line quality and mocking it at the same time. What they've got to do is they've got to be able to meet in the circle. Kind of what happens there.

18-SATURDAY MORNING PART 6 - LINE 8 - AWARENESS

Part 6

Line 8 – Awareness

Track: 18-Saturday Morning Part 6 - Line 8 - Awareness

TRT: 11:25

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Tom

[00:00:00]

Marc: So eight's going to be really quick. Eight's really quick. Here it is. Ready? So eight is going to be the quality of awareness. The quality of awareness. I'm just going to talk about it for a second, coming from left field, the quality of awareness. I actually originally listed it as the first quality, but decided not to do it as the first quality because I thought it would be just too confusing for lots of reasons and just witness our reactions to the quality. It's like, "What does that mean?"

So what is awareness? Awareness is pure consciousness. Awareness is the answer to the question of, "Who am I?" I'm not my passing thoughts. I'm not the fleeting immediacies of experience. Awareness is the realization it's all an illusion. And what's true? The field of awareness. Ramana Maharshi. Who are you? I am the field of awareness. I am pure consciousness. So it's the line that seeks to move beyond the details of reality into pure essence. It's the classical meditative move. It's the reason that many, many more men are doing meditation, and many more women are doing yoga. Not by accident.

Now, of course, the line in the feminine will do a meditation. And of course, there's forms of meditation that are circle meditation. Which I'm not going to talk about now. But the classical meditative move is to move out of the ephemeral changing movement of reality, out of monkey mind, and to locate that stable axis mundi, that stable pole of consciousness of awareness which is beyond reality. And there's all sorts of jokes. Sometimes when I'm talking about this, there are sorts of jokes that fuck with your mind. Like, "Ahh."

For example, there was that dude, who goes to the psychologist – or actually, a very expensive psychiatrist – and he says, "You're not going to believe this, because this is really – you're not going to believe this." By the way, no one's

going to laugh because it's too subtle, but when you get it, it's wild. So he goes to the psychiatrist and he says, "It's crazy, my brother in law and my sister, they're fucking with me. What I do is I go to a city and they take down the real city and they put up a fake city." So the guys says, "Wow, that's a big problem. Wow. What happened?" "I went to New York, but it wasn't New York. They had taken down the real New York and they'd put up a fake New York."

The psychiatrist's like, "That's a big problem." And they're working with this problem. It's a huge problem. And he's really holding that space where he was like wow. He says, "You know what, I've got a solution for you. Buy a ticket to Dallas. Put the ticket on the mantelpiece. They'll think you're going to Dallas. And then go to Miami." It's fantastic. So the guy thanks the psychiatrist like, "You are so wise. Thank you so much. That totally helped me." He buys a ticket to Dallas, puts it in the mantelpiece. As he leaves the psychiatrist's office, the psychiatrist picks up the phone and says, "Hey guys, set up Miami."

[Laughter]

What does that mean? Does anybody know what that means? What's real? What's real? Set up Miami. What's real? Of course, the point of the joke is, who's what in it? You're not sure who's what in the story. And it's one of my absolute favorite jokes. Subtlety. Set up Miami. You sometimes feel like that in life. Someone just set up Miami. This whole thing – you ever have that? You step out of the whole thing. It's like, whatever. So that experience of meditation is, I want to get out of that. I want to get out of that whole thing.

I want to be in that stable place which is unchanging, which is atman, which is Brahman, which is the eternal Dao, which is Jian. I want to actually be able to locate myself in that place where I can rest. I want to take refuge in the Buddha. I spent a lot of my adult life teaching this precise thing. That precise practice of doing that precise thing. That's a quality of awareness which is always about, in some sense, moving beyond. Moving beyond. Now what's its light? It's white quality it, it accesses a true nature of reality. Obviously. You're not stuck in monkey mind. You're actually meditating. You're actually accessing big mind. You're not in small self.

What's its shadow? Its shadow is that actually it can be, what Clair called earlier, a spiritual bypass.

[00:05:00]

It never actually enters the present. You never fully enter the present. So you might be at an ashram in India meditating and it's surrounded by starving people. Because I haven't entered the present. When I don't enter the present, then actually, I don't value the present.

We have, for example, a distorted view of Buddhism. Because we view Buddhism through a particular prism of Buddhism in the west. But actually, Buddhism itself,

historically, monks committed so many massacres. The amount of Buddhist monks participating in the Japanese imperial army massacre after massacre for shogun after shogun is legion. Because what Buddhism basically did was, it disconnected from reality. It disconnected from reality. It actually said, let's move beyond the reality so whatever I'm doing in this ephemeral world, whatever! You get it?

So the shadow is, I'm disconnected. And again, I want to just give a big compliment to everyone in the last six or seven minutes for dealing with the heat and dealing with, "Wow, I haven't eaten in four hours and I need to move." So really just big, big compliment to you. Just like in a Vipassana meditation. You meditate for nine days. There's a moment that your back hurts. There's a moment that it's too warm. That's the place always where you lose the meditation. That's always how Vipassana works. No one who's ever done Vipassana, it's the place where you're uncomfortable. It's a little warm. It's a little hot. And you just stay in. You move through it. That's always where it happens.

I'm a little tired. I move through it. I'm not being served. I'm in devotion to something larger. How many people have sat at Vipassana retreat? So everybody knows that's true. You're knees start hurting. It's uncomfortable. You want to be out of that room as fast as you can, and lots of people leave in first two to three days of Vipassana retreats. They just can't hold it. But when you can hold it, something happens. So I'm just inviting everyone and thanking everyone and for the depth of holding it. Here we go.

Find a place in my life where I was actually accessing meditative awareness, or I was actually accessing consciousness or awareness. And I was able to rise through my awareness beyond the details of the situation. Beyond the ephemeral, beyond the changing. By accessing pure consciousness, essence, I moved beyond all the stuff in the present and it gave me clarity. Now trying and access a moment like that. And it might have been in a dharma talk. It might have been in a retreat. It might have been in a practice where I just access pure consciousness. I accessed awareness.

And again, my friends, beloved brother and sisters, finding that moment is where the dharma happens. The moment you find it, even just for a second, that's where it becomes alive for you. Then after you find that, find the shadow. When did I check out? Use meditation. Use process. Use practice. Use my consciousness or pure consciousness, or some form of that, or some form of spirituality to check out of experience. I was using it as a spiritual bypass. Where did I use it to check out?

By the way, if you're a meditator, the answer to both of them might be meditation at different stages of my life. So two, 1 to 10, rate to what extent am I focused on this? To what extent does this play in my life? I'm sure there's a bunch of people, this just doesn't playing in your life at all.

Speaker: Deploy.

Marc: Deploy is the next one. That's the next one. This is this, to what extent am I focused on this? To what extent does this quality play in my life? Deploy's coming up. Three –Tom, frame the third one for me.

Tom: How strong or weak is the light or shadow quality of deploying this?

Marc: It's just light, right? Not the shadow.

Tom: How strong or weak is the light?

Marc: How strong or weak is my deployment of the light quality, and this positive line quality? Awareness, pure consciousness, rising above the details, living in essence. How strong or weak am I able to –? We got it perfectly last time, but we have it written down. How strong or weak is that light quality in my life, 1 to 10? Good? Just a number.

Finally number four, how much or how little does that shadow quality show up in my life? The last quality we're not going to do now because we're going to do it like we've done. We've talked a lot about that circle in relationship to line. So the last quality, which is the major one – there are actually two more; one I'm not going to do – but the last major one is actually sexuality. But I'm not going to enter that now.

[00:10:00]

I'm actually going to do it in relationship to circle when we get to circle. I will do the line in relationship to circle.

What we're about to actually do is we're going to finish with a practice, and the practice is going to be an intense finding our embodied energy of the line quality. What's the line dance? So we're going to actually find that energy. Instead of drifting out into lunch, we actually want to gather this line energy.

So we were at our edge. We could have diffused at our edge. Or we could have gathered our energy and pushed the edge into the dance. Everyone saw that? And everyone see what happened as the energy transitioned? The dharma then became embodied, but we had to push an edge. That's a line. We could have just said, "Okay, we're done. Boom. You can't find us. Done." But when we push through, we take a risk – line quality. We dance in these particular pieces that Vyana and Christian chose. We then embody it. The dharma's embodied.

Five people, before we come back, "You love me." Or what's the other possibility? If you ask, you must surely need.

19-SATURDAY AFTERNOON PART 1 - INTRO TO CIRCLES

Part 1

Intro to Circles

Track: 19-Saturday Afternoon Part 1 - Intro to Circles

TRT: 10:46

Speakers

Marc Gafni

[00:00:00]

Marc: Here we go. We have a huge, big afternoon. I'm just going to ask everyone to relax. Easy, easy. We're going to let go of all those line need to finish everything in a particular time. We're now on our circle space, totally expansive, spacious. Of course, we've already spent so much time talking about circles. This probably takes – the whole thing – 20 minutes just to run through the circles, not a problem.

Now remember, we have this session, which won't be too long, and then we have all tomorrow morning. So we have plenty of time. Equal, for those of you who like things that are egalitarian. "*Egul*" in Hebrew, circle, egalitarian. If you like that, we've got plenty of space. But really, let's actually sets our intention. That's really where we're starting now. We're letting everything go and we're entering into, not a new world, but the next step. The next big step. And what are we doing? Let's just find ourselves. What are we doing here? What are we talking about?

We're talking about nothing less than enacting the future of man and woman. That's what we're talking about. We're talking about enacting, inviting in the evolutionary feminine and the evolutionary masculine. We're talking about moving beyond Venus and Mars and enacting, articulating, evolving, bringing down, as they say in the mystical traditions _____[Hebrew] 01:31, bringing down a new vision of what it means to be enlightened. Enlightenment meaning hieros gamos. Realizing my intermarriage. Which is a new next step vision of what it means to be a Unique Self. A Unique Self is my essence. It's my Steve-ness. It's my Edie-ness. It's my Ben-ness, with no Eric-ness finding its way in at all. It's pure Ben-ness. And that Ben-ness that actually finds its way – that Unique Self – then is a particular and unique combination of those line qualities and circle qualities.

So those line qualities and circle qualities are, at this point, we see beyond gender. I think we've seen it really clearly in the room. That these line qualities are actually applied to men and women. And as we'll see, these circle qualities apply to men and women. But the properties exist. These are qualities of reality. They're actually geometric. They're built into the very structure of reality.

We're transcending and including gender. So we're recognizing that gender differences are real. We're taking into account the best research of the last 25 years, and especially the last 10. We're recognizing that actually, first day studies – day of birth studies – and parallel studies of gender in the animal world clearly reveal intrinsic difference between the masculine and feminine brain. And the word used in literature is "intrinsic difference." Yet we understand that that's not the end of the story.

That's not, as the conclusion is drawn, a reifying of, therefore there's men and women, and these are your qualities. There's Venus and Mars. And now we want to move beyond Venus and Mars. Because as we've revealed this intrinsic gender difference, we've also revealed neuroplasticity, which is the ability to – through practice, through action, through activating emotion, through changing environment, we can actually evolve our ability to have an expanded reach, and to reach beyond our old male brain. So yes, there is a female brain, but the female brain of 25 years ago is not the female brain of today. Shocking. It's a shocking realization.

So we're holding this paradoxical position where, in the one hand, we're recognizing gender's real. Absolutely real. It's my matrix. It's my biology. And biology is my tendency. It's not my destiny. We understand that it's oppressive to children and to other living things to ignore gender, because then you basically treat little boys like little girls, and little girls like little boys, which is devastating to them in their ability to actually grow. So we need to recognize and honor gender, and also honor the ability to evolve and expand.

So if I'm a little boy, we're going to honor the fact that I might be drawing lots of grays and blacks. We're not going to shame me for not drawing colors because I've got a lot of M-cells in the thickness of my retina. At the same time, as a little boy, I'm going to be encouraged to develop both my rough house play and, as I grow, whatever else emerges in me has a place.

We want to actually encourage, through transmission of values, the emergence in boys, things that are classically called feminine values.

[00:05:00]

Of course we do. We want to encourage the emergence of the circle in men, and we want to encourage the emergence of the line in women, so that every person gets to this place of hieros gamos. Of intermarriage. Where I'm actually rooted in my matrix, but I'm not stuck in it.

I have free access to the full range of my line qualities and the full range of my circle qualities. We're now realizing that those things that we used to call masculine and feminine are actually too tightly connected to man and woman. The connection is too tight. It might have been true 25 years ago, even. It's less true – 25 years later, it's not true anymore. We actually saw that in almost every key line quality, there were many men and many women in the room who

identified with some dimension of that line quality. We just saw it, evidential, in the room.

So what we're doing is we're saying, okay, the new vision of enlightenment is hieros gamos, is the intermarriage. And the intermarriage is when I awaken to the unique integration and calibration of lines and circles as they live in me. And that unique creativity allows me to give my unique gift. That produces my evolutionary creativity, that produces the artistry, the gorgeousness that is the glimmering and shimmering expression of my Unique Self in the world.

To the precise extent that there's a lack of integration, that there's an imbalance between my line and circle qualities, that I'm very weak on a bunch of line or circle qualities or they don't balance properly – to that precise extent, I'm going to be playing in shadow. To that precise extent, I'm going to be unintegrated. To that precise extent, I'm going to be not in Eros because my lines and circles aren't penetrating or receiving each other. I'm going to be de-erotized. I'm going to be alienated. I'm going to be desiccated.

And that's going to produce all sorts of shadow results in my life. Which actually appear fully, powerfully, potently in the world, I've got to appear as a full Unique Self, which means that I've realized the intermarriage of the unique configuration of lines and circles as they appear in me. And that intermarriage in me causes the evolution of love. That causes the larger mystical merging of the properties of lines and circles in reality. We've actually established that all of reality is made up of lines and circles.

If you don't know, what is reality? Reality is lines and circles. Every situation, every moment in time, every dynamic. And we've seen it actually at play in the room. Every dynamic in the room, there's actually a play of line and circle always happening. And you begin to identify it and how you play with these. Are they relevant in my life? How strong or weak is my deployment of that particular quality in its light dimension? How much or little do I have of that shadow dimension? Where can I find it in its light dimension in my life? Where can I find it in its shadow dimension? I'm actually in the process of writing my second autobiography.

As Eric requested – although he's moved. He used to be over there, and now he's God knows where he is. He's over there. He's over there some place. We did at least seven to eight times this morning. We actually saw line and circle together juxtaposed with each other, because Eric put in a special request for that. So we've actually touched circle quite a bit, but we're now going to enter circle fully in its own right, not merely as a comparative or adjunct of line. We're going to enter through the door of circle. And of course, we'll compare back to line. We'll see how it plays together with line, and we'll begin to see a full picture.

Now we're going to go. We're going to do, of course, whatever we do today. We'll finish whatever we didn't finish today, tomorrow. We may finish all of the circles today. But whatever we don't, we'll finish tomorrow morning. Then in the last section, we're going to add in one more new dimension which changes the whole game. The whole game changes with the last dimension. There's big, big, big surprise at the end. It's not like we're done with circles. Oops, done. No, actually then we add in one more dimension, which is the certain spice that you put in the soup when you think the soup's done. Literally, you'll see – I promise you – it changes everything. So there's something that's going to happen at the end that everything is going to completely move and change.

Now we want to remember that lines and circles are obviously – I mean, we studied it explicitly – the circle is the sexual expression, or the erotic expression, of the feminine. The line is the sexual, or the erotic, expression of the masculine. That's where we got the principles from. Of course, the point we're making, as the Hermetics taught us, "as above, so below." That it's not a coincidence that actually the erect line phallus exists in the world.

[00:10:00]

That's a symbol of an expression of a reality. The world's not desiccated. The world's one. It's one, unbroken, seamless, integrated whole.

So that powerful expression is an expression of a principle of reality. And it's not an accident. Of course, the circle is the curve of the breast, the curve of the belly. It's the curve of the feminine. So the curve of the feminine – the feminine as circle – the masculine line actually begin in biology, but then they transcend biology. These are principles of reality that are happening at every place. My hieros gamos, my intermarriage, the marriage of those unique lines and circles in me.

20-SATURDAY AFTERNOON PART 2 - CIRCLE 1 - INTIMACY COMMUNION

Part 2

Circle 1 – Intimacy Communion

Track: 20-Saturday Afternoon Part 2 - Circle 1 - Intimacy Communion

TRT: 42:28

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Paul

Susan

John

Doug

Tom

[00:00:00]

Marc: Here we go. The first quality of the circle is – and not all of them have precise juxtapositions, but some of them do. So the ones that do, I'm going to give them really clearly. So there's autonomy, independence on the one side. That's a clear line quality. On the other side, what do you have? You have communion or intimacy. Intimacy, communion. So the circle, the first quality of the circle is intimacy and communion. Powerful.

Now let's just take a look for a second. All of what we listed yesterday – and I'm not going to review them all because it would take a lot of time – but we talked about approximately ten different situations yesterday in relationship to autonomy and independence. And in each one of them, what did we say? We looked at a man-woman or a masculine-feminine or a line-circle. We were always looking at, yesterday, from the line perspective. I'll just mention a couple of them, just so we call them back to mind. What one comes to mind immediately? Actually, I'll give you a new version of one that we didn't mention yesterday, but it's part of the same gestalt.

True story. A woman gets out of the subway on 23rd street – something like that – in New York. The woman in this particular story is a circle. She happens to know how to get where she needs to get. She needs directions in Manhattan, but she knows how to get there. She walks out of the subway, but feels a little bit lost. Stops a guy who's representing a line in this story and asks for directions. He doesn't know how to get there. So she, circle woman, who knows directions, meets line man, who doesn't know directions, and he proceeds to give her directions. And she proceeds to listen and say, "Thank you very much. I really appreciate it." And then goes the exact way that she knows how to go. A very strange story. One that's actually discussed at length in literature. Some version of this story.

What's going on? First off, why is she asking directions? She knows how to get there. She asked Mr. Line directions, why is he giving directions if he doesn't know how to get there? The story's confusing, right? Then three, why doesn't she correct him? After all, she knows that he's giving her wrong information. She's sitting there receiving the wrong information, and then very lovely says, "Thank you so much." And then goes on her way. WTF – what the fuck? What's happening?

So of course, it's all really clear to us, given our prism. She gets out. She feels a little disconnected. So she looks for connection. She's using speech, not to get information. She's using speech, not to get content. She doesn't need any content. She's using the speech act to make contact. So she's made contact.

Now for him, contact's not enough. He uses speech to do a) provide information, but b) because he happens to be a line, knowing directions is quite important to

him. And not knowing something – so knowing directions is important – he uses speech to give information, not just for content. And three – the **whole thing** comes together – someone who lacks information has a lower status. Lacking information puts you one down in the totem pool, which he's certainly not going to do. So he proceeds to give her wrong directions. It's kind of shocking.

And it's been tested time and time again. And there's different versions of this that come up in the literature, but it's fantastic. Their explanations of it aren't always that clear, but the basic structure's there. It's a beautiful story. Because you actually see the inner penetration of the line and the circle. And this is a comical example of it, but it's a great example. Because you actually see what's happening.

Now let's say that a circle – let's say she would stop and ask a circle – whether a man or a woman – a circle for directions. And the circle wouldn't know directions. The circle would probably say, "I don't know directions." Why? Because first off, they already would have made contact. Transmitting content is not the point of a speech anyways. But more than that, the circle doesn't view not having information as a lack of status. You get that?

Therefore, at public lectures and at corporations, there's a general principle, before they got retrained, at a public lecture, circles will always ask more questions. Circles will always ask more questions, which has historically often been women. Why?

[00:05:00]

Because the circle doesn't experience asking a question and not having information as a loss of status. But a line's like, "I'm not going to ask a question."

Actually, one of the things that's happened is that circles have entered corporate culture. One of the things that's happened, which has been tragic, is they've gotten acculturated to the corporate culture which is, "Don't show that you don't have information." So actually, at a meeting, you're not going to ask a question. But actually, not asking questions is not helpful because you actually don't know what's going on. So it's just a great play here.

What we're looking at, of course, is – we just looked at for a second – we looked at the shadow. This was a quick look at the shadow of what? We looked at the shadow. It was a shadow of both a line quality shadow, but it was also a shadowy dimension of intimacy. I find myself asking for something that I know already. It's not a shadow in terms of a negative thing, but it's a lack of clarity. Let's put it that way. Let's not call it a shadow. It's a lack of clarity. Let's keep going.

So we see how this plays in speech. Everyone good so far? Good? Okay, good, good, good. Now let's keep going. I have a friend to Fern Weisman who, for the last 30 years, has been going – she lives in Boca Raton, Florida – to what they call the Tuesday Night Club. I knew her 30 years ago in Boca Raton. She's still living in Boca Raton in the same place, and she's still going to the same restaurant with

five friends. Every Tuesday night. They've missed maybe one – or a death occasionally. But basically, 30 years. And they get together at the same restaurant. What do they do? They talk. What do they talk about? I don't know. Same thing they talk about every week for 30 years. They're not playing cards. They're not doing a project. They're just getting together on Tuesday nights to talk.

Now, you're not going to find many lines getting together for 30 years on Tuesday nights to talk without at least some official goal-oriented project or something to do. Even if it's playing poker. I'm not getting together to talk to guys. I'm getting together to play poker. Oh yeah, we talk while we play poker. Or we're working on a project together. But if we're working on a project, then we can ...right? Which is why often – and this is very, very often – men who were in the army, particularly in war time situations, have an enormous longing for that time of life. Not because they liked the killing. God forbid. But because there was an intimacy that was fostered by having a shared goal which allowed for – a shared goal and danger came together – which allowed for the formation of an intimacy that actually wasn't easily available.

Now one of the things that the gay movement has contributed to America is men get to love men. Actually, men get to be intimate. Emotionally intimate. That's one of the things that was actually lacking in the classical line dimension of masculinity. But you actually see how it plays.

Intimacy, we can get together to talk. And the purpose of this talking in the Fern Weisman Tuesday Night Club is not to exchange information. It's not a rotary club. The rotary club is a classical, and it began as The Rotary Club, The Lions Clubs. Know what those are in America? So they classically began, essentially, for men to get together, but their official goal was business. Exchanging business connections. So that makes sense.

But just to get together to talk – crazy, crazy, crazy. So that's a beginning of this sense, or of this notion, of intimacy. Intimacy and communion are very, very different than autonomy and independence. They're different qualities, and they express a different dimension of speech. Speech in each one – talking, conversation – serves a completely different role.

Now let's just play for a second. What would the shadow of intimacy and communion be? What would the shadow be? And we're going to move here. So what would the shadow be? Anyone? Choking. Too much intimacy. The shadow might be too much intimacy. So mothering might become smothering. Mothering might become smothering. It might have too much intimacy. So my shadow might be too much intimacy. For example, in the original Hebrew, the word for "to struggle" and "to hug" is the same words. So you're wrestling, you're hugging. It's close. And actually, a hug, when it gets too tight, is a strangle.

What is a hug? A hug is a circle. That's what a hug is. A hug is a circle. That's what it is. Which is O, oxytocin. Circle, hug, circle. Always playing.

[00:10:00]

T, a couple of lines – testosterone. So you've got this circle, but when you hug too tight what do you have? You have the shadow of intimacy. Which is what? A violation of autonomy. A violation of autonomy, of freedom. You're not free.

So intimacy that effaces freedom – a family system that doesn't allow for freedom and autonomy where it's necessary is intimacy that got too tight. So we often spend an enormous amount of time trying to liberate ourselves from a family system. So what's a family system? Look at it. Look at it. It's great. A family system is a circle. It's the image of a circle. I'm stuck in the circle. The intimacy is too tight. It's not too tight because I'm always getting cards from my mom. Because that's not what it means. I want to make sure we get ten seconds, Susan. You get what this means?

When I say the intimacy is too – it's not that I'm always getting cards from my mom. It means that my role in that system is completely pre-determined. I can't get out of it. Everything's really close. There's no room to recreate myself. There's no room to transform.

How many people have ever had the experience of going home after not having been home for many years when you're already an adult to the family home you were raised, and for vacation you might go home with your brother or sister there with you, and within a period of X amount of hours of being home, you've fallen into all the old patterns? Your parents are relating to you like you're 14 years old again. You're having the same dynamic with your sister that you've ever had.

That's the shadow of intimacy. It's close. It's intimate. But it's also predetermined. You're not free to transform. Which is why they say [*Foreign Language*] "There's no prophet in his city." It can't be a prophet. It's too intimate. You get that? You're not free to emerge as a prophet. You're not free to transform. You're not free to fully express your line quality. So that's one of the shadows of intimacy.

What else might be a shadow of intimacy? So it's smothering. What else? Paul?

Paul: I think gossip. Gossip which creates a sense of us, but by excluding and denigrating others.

Marc: So there's intimacy and there's pseudo-intimacy. The shadow of intimacy might be pseudo-intimacy. And intimacy works like this. I get together with Kai and we have a really deep relationship. We have this deep conversation. We feel like we've created a deep space. We're both in the circle. We're both in the circle together. Possibility one – true intimacy.

Or possibility two – we get together and we just don't have anything to say about each other, so we talk about Jill. "Remember that guy Jill? That dude with that weird accent who was at the thing, and the hair, and he kept talking about being in the Amazon some place, and something about light and love? So weird. What kind of accent is that? I wish he could learn English." Nothing personal.

So when we talk about Jill, what are we doing? Of course, we madly love him, but what are we doing? We're saying, wow, we can't find a way to make connection so we can't find our way into the circle together. So what are we going to do? We're going to place someone outside the circle to give ourselves an illusion that we're inside the circle. You get it? That's how pseudo-Eros works. I promise, I'm right over to you. That's how pseudo-Eros works. So pseudo-intimacy is, I place someone outside the circle to give myself the illusion that I'm inside the circle. So that would be a shadow of intimacy. Or, it's not really a shadow – it's a pseudo-intimacy. Susan.

Susan: A cult or certain fundamentalist church groups.

Marc: Absolutely. The shadow of intimacy is groupthink. That's exactly right. A cult. The shadow of intimacy. That's completely right. The shadow of intimacy is groupthink. Cult is an expression, of course, of groupthink. That's the shadow. Meaning it's more important to be intimate than to be right. It's more important to be intimate than to be in integrity. It's more important to be intimate than to be truthful. So whenever I sacrifice integrity for intimacy – now be really careful here. I want you to stay with me really closely here. Because this is a very fine distinction which we need to make. All intimacy requires sacrifice.

So if you want to have absolute truth and integrity in everything, live by yourself and die. In other words, when I say live by yourself, I don't mean by yourself physically. I mean cut off from people. Whenever you engage people, there's always a sacrifice. As the master said in the third century, you're always balancing between truth and peace. And peace always has to give up something for truth.

[00:15:00]

And truth always has to give up something for peace. You always need balance between truth and peace. That's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about that place wherein you so desperately need the intimacy that you're willing to give up your essential autonomy and independence at its core. That's what Susan's pointing to. That's a cult. That's groupthink. That's a big deal. That's a big deal.

Now, watch for a second. In the line world, when there's a perception of an affront to status, status has been affronted. For example, in the South, a black man looked wrong at a white woman. This is the worst shadow of this. It's the worst shadow of it. It happened all over the South until not too long ago. 60, 70 years ago. So a lynch mob happens. In other words, the men come together. The line at its worst comes together, and the person's lynched. Basically, it's the worst expression of this quality of our status has been affronted, based on the shadow of

discrimination and the shadow of status. And the worst violence – the shadow of penetrative violence – takes place.

On the other side of the coin, on the circle side, affront "the intimacy of a circle." *John Tucker Must Die*. See the movie. John Tucker go out with a couple of people, breaks up with them and he's not sure if he's going out with two of them. Their intimacy is affronted. They go try and plan his murder. And everyone laughs through the movie.

In other words, when intimacy is affronted, affront to the intimacy of a circle, so the circle forms a lynched mob just like the line does. It's really important. So just like groups of men can all be in a violation of their integrity – and the fact that there's a lot of men in the lynched mob doesn't make the lynched mob any better. It's men in their shadow, or lines in their shadow. Same thing's true with the feminine. The feminine also can do a cluster fuck, where groups of women support each other intimately to, for example, make false accusations. It happens all the time. This is what Christina Hoff Sommers has written about extensively. It's always about, not a violation of power, but of "intimacy." A perceived affront to intimacy. That's really important.

So masculine shadow is tripped. The tripwire for masculine shadow is, threaten my status. And it doesn't have to be a real threat. It's a perceived threat, obviously. The tripwire for feminine shadow is a perceived threat to my communion, to my relationship, to my intimacy. Did everyone catch that? It's powerful. And once you to get that interpretive key, a lot of things become clear.

So what else is a shadow of intimacy? So groupthink is a big one. That's a big one. Group think or fusion. Those are all those shadows to intimacy. John.

John: Just using a relationship to avoid being in your aloneness or loneliness. Like you're almost objectifying the person.

Marc: Using intimacy to cover up, or to avoid, my need to actually identify the depth of my singularity, my Unique Self in its full power or autonomy and independence. So I'm using intimacy to cover up my inability. I'm always in connection. I'm always talking to people. I'm always helping. I'm always doing something. But I'm actually a void dance. I'm dancing around the void because I'm afraid to fall into the void of not knowing my Unique Self. Of not knowing who I am. So you can have a classical circle persona who's always helping, always in contact. Now that could be holy and beautiful, or it could be a cover up. Now even if it's a cover up, the help is all valid and beautiful. Let me make that clear. Nonetheless, the place that you want to be doing that from is as an expression of your Unique Self, not as a cover up for not having found it.

I'm going to do one more piece. We're going to hold here. We're going to hold here. And we're going to take lots more. Every comment has been super helpful.

Let's just do one more thing. The assumption is – and this is also super critical here – that circles are intimate, lines are about autonomy and independence, and also about penetration and aggression. But one of the things that's missed is, of course, circle aggression.

Circle aggression. There's lots of aggressions. We we're talking about domestic violence this morning. But I want to talk about it in a more deep way for a second. Line aggression and circle aggression work differently.

[00:20:00]

And circle aggression can only be understood when you understand the primacy of intimacy for a circle.

Let me just give you a sense of lines for a second. In the line world – and I'm not talking about the pathological war world. I'm talking about the classical, the normal line world. Aggression is often externalized, and it's just put into the space. So just to give you an example. I just wrote down a few examples of this. I just jotted it down in the break. Guys getting angry at each other, teasing each other, being aggressive towards each other. So you make fun of a person's mother.

"Your mother!" Everyone knows that, right? Here's just one. "Your mom is so dumb she thinks Taco Bell is a phone company in Mexico." That's what guys say to each other. "Your mother's so dumb she thinks Taco Bell is a phone company in Mexico. Your mother's so old I told her to act her age and she died." That's like a classical. You told her to act her age and she died. "Your mother's so stupid she thinks Fleetwood Mac is a hamburger at McDonalds." There's a kind of way that lines talk to each other, which is an externalized aggression.

One of my closest male friends is Warren Farrell. Whenever we meet, we actually begin by insulting each other for about two or three minutes. It's just hilarious. It's just the way we start. That's the way we start talking. It's funny. It's a way in. I'll say, "Warren, that book *The Myth of Male Power*, is was like the dumbest thing I ever read. And your footnotes, there were six that were wrong." And he says, "You believe in God? You're such as idiot Gafni. God, you're such an antiquated fundamentalist."

That's how we launch in. That's how we start talking. What it does is it externalizes aggression, because Warren and I are very, very, very close friends. And we've got some energetic competitiveness between us. We're both authors. We're both writing in similar topics. So we externalize it. We play with it instead of making it disappear.

If you remember, by the way, there was a famous story in Illinois, for those of you who know a little American history. Those who are not from America, it's American history time. There was a dude who was a store clerk in Illinois. And there was a bunch of teenage thugs who were terrorizing – mid-19th century, remember this story? – terrorizing all the stores. So one storekeeper – and if you

didn't pay the tribute, your store got ransacked. So one storekeeper said, "I'll make a wager that my store clerk can beat, in straight out fist fight, the gang leader."

So the store clerk's name was Abe Lincoln. Famous story. Went and had this eight hour just killing each other fight with the gang leader. At some point, Lincoln says, the store clerk, "Let's call it a draw." They called it a draw. A few years later, there was the black hawk militia that they formed in Illinois. It was the big important "war of the time." The gang members were, of course, the key militia men. They elected Lincoln to be their captain. And that group of gang leaders were loyal to him for 30 years, the people by his side until he became president. That's a line story.

In other words, in its aggression, you fight. What often happens is that – let's say the lines are boys – boys fight on the playground and they're friends afterwards. There's a fight and they're friends. When you look at all the studies of the difference today between how boys fight and girls fight – and let's look at that on the playground, because that's usually where line/circle is most identified. Boys and girls, as it gets older, it shifts. It's just lines and circles.

So what happens is, when girls fight in the playground, you almost can't tell a fight's happening. The social veneer of intimacy is maintained. And the girl doesn't have to have done anything wrong. Usually, the intense fights are triggered by envy, jealousy. Then what happens is, all of a sudden, that girl is ostracized.

Jill comes home and says to her parents, "All the girls hate me. I've got to switch schools." Listen to her. She's probably right. "What happened?" "I went to the horseback riding the other day. I walked in. I saw all the girls hated me." "How did you know?" "When I walked in, they all stopped talking." Mother says, "Maybe it was because of something else." Girl rolls her eyes. Idiot. "Of course it wasn't something else. I saw Laura in the hall. She just walked by me like she didn't even know me. And Laura wouldn't even have any friends without me. I want to switch schools. Next day, I don't want to horseback ride anymore." You should listen to that girl. Because mean girls is a big deal. And it's something we didn't understand before.

What happens is, though, the meanness of the feminine hides under the guise of intimacy. It's not externalized, but it's a quiet aggression until the girl is then thrown out, essentially. She's completely shunned and it's forever. It's not like, "I hate you now." "I hate you forever." So it's a different quality of aggression.

[00:25:00]

It doesn't break the surface often and it's behind the scenes. There's a big difference between boy bullies and girl bullies. Boy bullies are usually slight misfits who are bullying someone in order to have more power. The girl bully – and again, there's enormous literature on this. And not one or two, there's 50 studies on this in different ways. The girl bully is usually a very well-socialized

girl who's very talented and socially adroit. And you can't even catch the fact that she's bullying. But another girl gets wiped out.

So intimacy is both a sacred and sacred quality – intimacy and communion of the feminine – but it also hides its shadow component, which is the utter exclusion, the utter destruction of intimacy. As opposed to – so it's a different quality and it's good to know how it works. So let's hold here for a second. Let's take a look. So let's summarize and let's go into our metrics.

Summarize. So what's the positive quality of intimacy? Obviously, that one's not hard, right? Intimacy means I draw close. I create authentic relationship. I have honest communication. I'm interested in connecting. I'm transcending my ego to create deep communion. So the positive of intimacy, communion, I think is clear to all of us, right? Good? Everybody good? Good.

The shadow – let's just repeat the shadow in a quick second. What's the shadow? The shadow would be – what did we have? One, groupthink. In other words, I give up my integrity. I give up my autonomy for the sake of intimacy. I give up something – not something small. I give up something essential to my core identity as a Unique Self for the sake of intimacy. So I'm giving that up, which, in the large form, it's a cult. But actually, there's mini cults that happen all over the place. Where I actually give up something essential to my core identity for the sake of the intimacy. That's the core shadow.

We said another couple of shadows. What else? What other shadows did we have? Gossip, smothering. Gossip is pseudo-intimacy. I place someone outside in order to create the illusion of being inside the circle. Smothering, I hold too close which means I'm violating the other person's freedom. So that's the quality. Yes?

Speaker: What about over-reliance on others for your view of yourself?

Marc: Right, which someone said a little bit earlier – codependency. Codependency would be a form of shadow of intimacy, absolutely. Who said codependency before? Somebody said it here some place. Thank you, Jill. Codependency would actually be a shadow of intimacy. Meaning it's not actual intimacy. Again, it's a pseudo-form of intimacy, which is to cover up an anterior lack of fullness. Fantastic. Fantastic. Again, let's take a look. Let's take a minute and let's write part one. Where does the light quality of intimacy show up in my life in its most powerful form? Then where does the shadow quality of intimacy, or one of the shadow qualities, show up in my life?

So talking – the whole communication, talking, conversation – is connected to intimacy. We have a whole set of jokes around women talking. I don't know. The guy that comes before the judge and he's accused, "You haven't talked to your wife for two years. Sir, why did you do that?" "I didn't want to interrupt her." Sorry, I don't write this shit. There's this sense that the feminine is talking, and the

masculine doesn't know what to do with the talking, but that whole genre of jokes is connected to this intimacy issue. It's connected to this intimacy issue.

Now, the whole conversation we had yesterday about the circle wanting to talk and the line offering a solution, again, connected to this intimacy issue. It's all a function of this issue. I want to talk. Talk's a form of intimacy. Talk's to make contact. Talk's not for a solution. The line says, I'm goal-oriented. Talk is for a solution. It's a different way of interpreting reality at its core.

Now it might be fair to say the following. And I'm talking about this archetypally, kind of in the ideal form. You might say that the line has an insatiable desire for variety. That's a line. The line always wants more. The line doesn't naturally say, "I've had one sexual experience with one person. It's 1967 and Playboy just started and I saw Miss July. I'm going to hang out for the next 40 years with Miss July. Because me and Miss July, we like each other."

[00:30:00]

No. Playboy makes money because Miss July becomes Miss August. Miss August becomes Miss September. The point is, there's this desire for variety that takes place in the line world. The line world can be gay or straight, which is why pornographic magazines have never succeeded other than for the male world. In the male world, it might be men naked or woman naked – it depends on who's looking or what they're wanting to look at – but it's always through the visual perceptual apparatus of men. Because the male visual is different than the female visual. Which is why, again, pornographic magazines featuring Playgirl never made it.

And as Christie Hefner reported, the only people that bought Playgirl were who? Men. That's who bought Playgirl. So pornography geared towards women doesn't work. Now, you occasionally have Chippendales happening. Just to make everyone feel better. Chippendales is really where men are doing their strip thing, or Magic Mike, but that actually doesn't sustain itself in culture. Economy never lies. Those are interesting cultural aberrations, which is what makes them fascinating. But actually, culture doesn't lie.

Economics is the truest barometer of actually what's happening. And the largest industry in the world today is pornography geared for the visual apparatus of men. So that's a powerful thing. There's almost an insatiable drive in the line for variety. Now, that doesn't mean that the line should fulfill that insatiable drive. That's nature.

Remember we talked about the distinction yesterday between nature and second nature. Remember that? Nature just means, where we start. But what you have to do is you have to recognize nature. Circles don't like that part of line nature. They wish it wasn't true. And because they wish it wasn't true, what they do is they demonize it. Circles demonize that dimension of line nature. That's actually part of line nature. Now again, that doesn't mean that that's how the line should play. It

means you've got to recognize that nature – that's first nature. Just like not being toilet trained is first nature. It doesn't mean that's what you do.

What it means is that you've got to reach for your deeper nature. And, of course, lines have a deeper nature, which wants love and wants transformation and wants depth and wants everything else. But to work between those is hard. Because what we think is, we think that the more intimacy you have, the more erotic excitement you're going to have. That's what we think. The more intimacy, the more erotic excitement. But of course, the opposite's true.

This is the unspoken truth you're not allowed to say. The more intimate you are with someone, the more used you are to being around them, the less polarity there is, the less erotic excitement, unless you actually intended the excitement. The solution to it is, you create time. You create atmosphere. You actually have to actually take responsibility for your arousal. Because when you're actually doing the variety game – if you're a man and you're gay, a new male ass might do it. If you're a heterosexual, a new pair of breast might do it. Meaning, you don't have to do any work.

Just the novelty replaces depth. Novelty is a counterfeit pleasure. It replaces depth. But actually, if you want to actually have, within the context of intimacy, you also want to have polarity and Eros, then you have to plan it. Then you've got to work. That's where it begins. That's where the game begins. So the fact that the line quality has an insatiable desire for variety, which needs to be, in some way, worked with, which is the essence of what culture and men are trying to figure out how to do.

Circles have also an insatiable desire. Which is for what? For intimacy. There's an insatiable desire. You will never find a circle that said, "You know, we just spend too much time just walking the beach and talking. We're just doing too much of that shit, man. I just don't like doing that shit anymore." Unless that circle's line is actually getting very strong. But a circle – whether a man or a woman – if a person's a circle, they're going to have an insatiable desire for intimacy. And just like you can never fill, ever, the insatiable line desire for variety – so you've got to work with it – you can never fill the insatiable circle desire for intimacy. It's not fillable. It's insatiable. Which is beautiful. So then, you've got to work with it.

[00:35:00]

Meaning, the circle has to develop her/his own line. Which means, not just intimacy – autonomy. And the line has to develop, not just their line quality, which is driving forward – next one, next, one, next one – it has to develop their circle quality. Which is, the circle goes around and comes home.

That's relationship happens in hieros gamos. You see that? It's in the hieros gamos, meaning the line and the circle, but before you get to the hieros gamos what you can't do is the bypass. The bypass means, we pretend like things aren't the way they are. We demonize men and pathologize them. And for couple

thousand years, we actually demonized women. Why did we demonize women? Because they can't actually handle the real world. They're just always wanting to do intimacy, and always wanting to talk, and always wanting to process and always wanting to – right? And we're actually trying to get shit done in the world. It's a loose summation of 2000 years of culture.

So what you actually have to do is, you've got to actually work with line/circle. Lines need to develop their circle qualities without losing their line. Circles need to develop their autonomy and independence, their line quality, without losing their circle. That's the game. And we're now just at the moment in history – just at the moment – where this hieros gamos is beginning to become possible. Because as circles have actually developed independence, but then they lost a lot of their circle quality, they're now learning how to actually be lines, and act in the world, without losing the circle quality.

And as lines actually developed lots of their circle qualities, but they lost some of the hardness of their line, they're now learning how to actually be circles, yet not lose that core polarity of being a line. So we're just literally at the place in history where those two are coming together. We've always had archetypes for them.

Who's sent me an email? Where's Aleta? A biblical email. We'll get to the emergence from Judah. Who is the classical hieros gamos, liberated line figure in the bible? David. King David. David is the source of everything. David's the father of Solomon, who we mentioned. He's the descendant of Judah. Who's David? Anyone remember anything about him? Just from your general Sunday school, or a friend who went to Sunday school. Maybe you were taking your bible course, maybe a little bible as literature.

David's not doing big in this room. So David has got two things going on which you might remember. First off, he slayed Goliath. Anyone remember that? The old Goliath story? So that's David as the warrior. David's a warrior. The second that you might remember, just from literature, is – because there's lots of bars in Greenwich Village which have that name – David's harp. Remember David's harp? David has a harp. And David's actually a complete circle and a complete line.

When you actually look at, and you actually read the entire text, David is the messianic figure because he is the best merger of circle and line in the literature. He's epitomized is by a sword and a harp. The sword/harp is exactly, at that moment in history, the best expression of circle and line. So David, therefore, becomes, in the mystical literature, the progenitor of Messiah, Messiah's liberated consciousness, which is what? Circle and line, which merged together. Cool, right? You got it? Good. Last one.

Susan: I'm curious about the word "variety." If you've got 50 women in your harem, you might want the 51st. So I'm wondering if newness could be replacing variety.

Marc: Novelty.

Susan: Well, novelty, but just like the whole line thing of like, "Well, what's out there in the edge?" So there's a newness, not more to choose from.

Marc: That's a good point. I completely agree with you, Susan. Forget about those 50. Give me a new one. I'm with you on that. I got it. It's true. 51. And I think it's actually a good point. In other words, what happens is, anything that I already have I'm not thrusting forward in order to get. I already have it. So for the 50, even though there are 50, there's lots of variety, I'm looking for 51. Last one, then we've got to go.

Susan: But unless they're more into their circle, and then wanted a connection.

[Laughter]

Marc: Totally, absolutely. You are absolutely right. That's exactly correct. Let's hold here for a second. So we just wrote down – everyone wrote down – we've already done the first part of the metrics, which was to write down the light expression of that quality in your life, and the shadow quality. We've all done that, right? How much are you focused on this? Or to what extent is this just showing – is it important, does it play in your life? 1 to 10. How much are you focused? To what extent does this play in your life, one to ten?

[00:40:00]

Doug: I'm used to communion and intimacy. Is it how much intimacy you already have? Or a desire for how much intimacy you would like?

Marc: First of all, we haven't gotten to that question yet, which is, how you're deploying this quality in your life. What we just asked right now – I don't know if you remember from this morning – what we just asked right now was, not how you're doing with it. The second question is just, is this issue important in your life? Are you focused on it or not? That's all this question is. But the question we're about to get to, Doug, addresses what you just said. So I'm going to answer the question by saying that wasn't this question. Third question. Tom, we got a formulation?

Tom: We do. The question is, how strong or weak is the light quality? Am I deploying this light quality?

Marc: So it's the positive, the light quality, of intimacy/communion – how strong or weak is that in your life? How strong or weak is this quality of intimacy/communion in your life? That's three. And that's just a number. And four is, how much or how little – and this is a really important one. This particularly around intimacy. You've got to really think about this one. How much or how little of the shadow quality of intimacy plays in your life? Which would mean

something like – just an example of that would mean something like, what are the places in my life, or are there a lot of places in my life, or significant places, where I'm actually giving up my actual integrity for the sake of intimacy? That's a big question.

If you want to say, what are the really important questions to look at? This is a really important one. Where in my life am I giving up my integrity for the sake of intimacy? Is that happening a lot in my life? Is that only occasionally? 1 to 10. Everyone got it? Where, in my life, am I falling into groupthink? Etc. All the qualities that we mentioned before. Everyone got it? 1 to 10. Just a 1 to 10. You're not writing out. It's 1 to 10.

How much or how little of the shadow quality is playing in my life? In the first question we asked for specifics. It was like, where does this actually play in my life in light side? Where does it play in the shadow side? Now it's just a number. Okay, good. Got it, everybody? Awesome.

21-SATURDAY AFTERNOON PART 3 - CIRCLE 2 – CONTAINER

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Carol

Lerid

Chahat

Jeff

Cerridwen

Part 3

Circle 2 – Container

Track: 21-Saturday Afternoon Part 3 - Circle 2 – Container

TRT: 22:00

[00:00:00]

Marc: Quality to a circle is, circle creates container. And now, it's a quality of the circle. Just like intimacy is a quality of the circle. It's not a line, which is autonomy/independent, going its own way. It's a circle, which is the first quality of intimacy. The second quality is, the circle actually creates a container. That's what it does. And that's a big deal. Circle creates a container

Circles are vessels. They create an inside. They create a container. They create a holding container. What Winnicott called a "holding container" or a "holding environment." It's a big deal. So who was it – where's Carol? Not that Carol. Carol 2. So Carol, one of the thing that I think I said about yesterday, one of the

really beautiful, positive comments that were made about family yesterday was your description of your family. Can you say it again?

Carol: It was very safe. It was a safe place to be.

Marc: Right, that's it. That's it. It was a safe place to be. That's quality of container. And my guess is that not everyone in the room can say that about their family. That might even be an understatement. It was a safe place to be. That's the quality of a family system. And that gives you something. That gives you something. And I can almost immediately – not always – but almost immediately tell, when I meet someone, if they received that quality. Because there's something that it gives you that you just don't get any other way. There's a sense of at home-ness in the world that you get from that which is very powerful. It's a big deal.

It's not filled with anxiety. It's a safe place to be. And that's a gift of the circle. It's the container. It's the vessel. The circle is the vessel. It holds. Which is why the name of the divine, in much mystical literature – and we mentioned this yesterday – is "The Place." "The Place." "HaMakom," "The Place." God's name is "The Place."

And the way that it's set is, usually, [*Foreign Language*] "She is the place of the world, and the world's not the place of her." In other words, the sense of being held in the divine womb – and in that literature, it's not a line God who creates the world outside of the line. There's a line God, and the God then creates the world over there. But the circle God creates the world in the circle. So everyone get that difference? Let me say it again. It's a huge deal.

In the world, there's basically two images of divinity. One's a line, the other's a circle. Let's say the line God is like an X. Line God. Then the line God creates a world which is over here. Here's the world. Here's the divine. There's a line between them which means you've got to try and create communication between those two places. So the line God externalizes the world. Does everyone get that? Clear? So far so good? Anyone miss what I'm saying? Totally clear, right?

Circle God. Circle God. So you've got a circle, then the world's a triangle in the circle. So the world's in – the divine is "The Place" of the world. That's a completely different mystical understanding of reality. So "HaMakom," it's "The Place." Okay?

And not by accident. In Hebrew literature, the yoni is called "*Oto HaMakom*", "The Place." "The Place." And "The Place" means that I'm held in that place. So there's this experience where the line is held in that place. And it becomes a place of safety, and a place of home.

Now, the shadow – what would the shadow be? The shadow would be similar in intimacy? The shadow would be where that place closes in on you. It would be

when the container shuts the lid. That would be one shadow. And another shadow would be when the container doesn't release what's inside of it.

Robin Norwood, *Women Who Love Too Much*. Actually, I'm a container. I'm always containing. But I actually sometimes need to open the container and let something go. I need to let people out of the family system. I need to step out of the family system myself. Or I become a container, but I'm so busy containing that I never actually locate myself.

[00:05:00]

I'm so absorbed in containing – and that was, of course, the classical image, in Yiddish literature, of the Jewish mother.

The Jewish mother spends all her time taking care of everyone. And it's a beautiful way to be. But at some point, she hits a point where she kind of like, "And who am I? Do I exist independently of being the mother of, and the wife of, and the parent of?" There's a moment where I've got to actually locate myself. And I can locate myself in part in being a container, but I can't locate myself exclusively in being a container.

So that would be the shadow of container. Now the quality of container is nourishment. The positive, light quite of – that's the quality of feminine nurturing. I'm being nurtured. I'm being held. It's the womb. It's the safe home. It's the Shalom Mountain. It's the place I can go and be held. It's the place I can go and be nurtured. It's the inner circle of the Center for Integral Wisdom. That's our home. We live in that home. It's a place we can be nurtured, we're taken care of. It holds us. So that's a core and critical quality of the feminine. Now stay with me one more point.

What does this quality do? It nurtures. What else does it do? What else does it do? It nurtures. And it protects. Now how does it protect? It protects by actually creating this very deep and profound warm inside. As opposed to the line, who draws a line and stops the enemy from invading. So the line protect from that which is outside. But the line often won't create anything. The line says, "I'm paying the rent, I'm paying the mortgage. What else do you want from me? I'm actually keeping everybody safe here."

But then the circle comes and actually creates the home. The circle creates the home. The circle actually creates the interior of the home. And that's very, very powerful. The line and circle both protect, but the line protects against that which is outside, and the circle creates the inside. See the difference? Beautiful, right?

Now what else would be a shadow of the circle? So I think we see the positive the circle pretty clearly. You're creating that space of warmth, of safety. Of relationship, of growth. Go ahead, Lerid.

Lerid: Marc, can you help clarify something for me? Earlier, you were talking about mean girls. And they're making a circle for themselves and using the circle as an exclusion.

Marc: Right, right. That would be a shadow. That's a shadow of intimacy. It means, that's what we would call pseudo-intimacy. Meaning, I create a circle by placing someone outside the circle. Because when I'm really in a circle, I don't need to place someone outside because I'm actually in. When I'm not really in, it's by placing someone outside that I create the illusion of being in. Yes? Awesome. Fantastic. Yeah?

Speaker: So the pseudo-intimacy of a parent that lives their life –

Marc: Container. Just use the word container. We're in container.

Speaker: The parent living their life vicariously through the child. So rather than nurturing, sucking.

Marc: So one form is the parent is, what we talked about earlier, exclusively a container, and doesn't actually locate some dimension of them beyond containing. Beautiful. Where else does it play in culture? Where else do you have this sense of a container which can get shadowy? Go ahead.

Speaker: When you're part of a group or community that doesn't have any way to leave. You can't actually graduate or go onto something else without being ostracized.

Marc: Right. A community that creates this beautiful container – and I always say to anyone on our inner circle – you know, we have a commitment kind of – I would say we have, what we would call, a "forever commitment." But anyone can always leave. It's a paradox. The commitment's forever, but there's no punishment for leaving.

Now the punishment is not a punishment. You lose the circle. But there's no punishment. And the way you tell the difference between a powerful spiritual community, which is level three, and a cult that's level one is their vicious punishment for leaving. To leave a cult's a horror. And the horror stories abound. So we hold that paradox of forever commitment. Because watch this for a second, okay. This is so beautiful to see. And Vyana kind of points us there. Whenever you get to true intimacy, true love, the word "forever" begins to come into play. Not by accident.

[00:10:00]

When you fall into a certain place of loving, you start using the word forever. "I'm going to love you forever." And it's real. Because true intimacy invites eternity. The Mormons take it all the way literally in saying, "You're married to that person forever." That's what the celestial marriage in the Mormon Church is. If it's true

intimacy, it can't be just for this lifetime. So for all eternity with that person. So think carefully before you get married in the Mormon Church. It's a big deal.

But what they're saying is – maybe an extreme version of it is – it's forever. It's a forever quality. So that's the one hand, intimacy. You create a container. But paradoxically, you've got to hold the line quality which is, you're allowed to leave. Ten seconds, we'll get first to Chahat, and then Jeff. But I just want you to see that, because I want to keep pointing to the hieros gamos. Because the hieros gamos – stay with you for a second. We haven't quite – so I'm going to just get to it.

The hieros gamos is always in paradox. You're marrying two qualities. We're beginning to see it now. We have enough information to see it. So on the one hand, we have total intimacy, which is forever. We've got this container. We are totally safe. On the other hand, you get to leave. You have autonomy. Now, that's paradoxical. You get the paradox? And it's paradoxical because you're forever. So of course, you can't leave. But of course, you can leave. That's the paradox.

Hieros gamos, what allows you to hold that? Laughter. You begin to see it now? How many people just caught that from yesterday? Laughter holds the paradox. That's why we started with a joke in the beginning. We said that every wedding – remember, we said in the beginning? Every wedding requires a jester. Because a wedding is bringing a line and circle together. So when you do intermarriage, the pieces begin to come together. So catch this. Does everyone catch the paradox of hieros gamos? It need laughter to hold it. Because it's not logical.

You're totally and forever. You can leave at any time. But that's the truth of it. It's just so stunning. Chahat, then Jeff, and then we'll go on.

Chahat: Well, it was a big learning force in the community, like the 20 people who started it. They were committed forever. But after 7 years, like 12 left. We could only leave fighting. We could only part fighting, so that was the whole process to learn to help, to love each other in leaving.

Marc: Right. Beautiful. Thank you. Jeff. We're just following the order. Go head.

Jeff: I'm just feeling into the promise of the container. And is there some piece of a shadow? Which is, the container that promises forever, but doesn't follow through. So the shadow piece of, "Come rest in me forever, but next week I'm actually not here for you."

Marc: Right. So let's be real careful with it. Come rest in me forever. So yes and no. Of course, paradox. Here's the yes. Come rest in me forever, and I'm not going to be always available to you. So in other words, what does, "Rest me forever," mean? So you've got to be clear about what that means. Does that mean I'm going to be available to take calls all the time? Maybe not. But I'm always going to be here.

So the contract's got to be really clear about what, "Rest in me forever," means. Okay, I just want to go in order. Cerridwen.

Cerridwen: So I'm a little confused. I understand how the, "It's okay to leave," is very important –

Marc: Line quality.

Cerridwen: – in a community. But in a relationship, I don't... I'm not –

Marc: Right. So tow quick –

Cerridwen: Even if you ultimately work it out, it's incredibly painful.

Marc: Right, right. So two quick things. Great, Cerridwen. That's fantastic. So just a quick thing back to Jeff, and then back to you. So the paradox holds. So if, in fact, I say, "You can rest in me forever," and then I'm emotionally unavailable. And when I say I'm available you've got to be careful on the time thing. But if you close down, that's the violation, which is what you were referring to. Just to clarify that. Okay.

So now, in a relationship. So I just did a wedding, performed a wedding, a couple years ago where the rings were exchanged, and the words exchanged with the rings were, "With this ring, I set you free. With this ring, I set you free." Like, wow. Now, of course, in a relationship, there's got to be a commitment that you're going to stay, even on the hard days. For sure. And yet, the fact that you could leave if the violation got so intense actually is what makes you free. And at the same time, it can't be like, "We're just having a hard week." In other words, there's got to be a core sense of, "We're in this forever." And forever's got to be absolute and clear.

[00:15:00]

It's total forever, no matter what, and you're not trapped. That's exactly the play. It's just like, "If it's working will be here," that's not it. That's like scary. Because there's no container. There's no circle. It's just a line contract. So there's got to be a forever dimension for there to be intimacy, and for there be a circle dimension. And yet, you've got to hold the hieros gamos. That paradox there. On last person. You had something to say? And then we're done.

Speaker: There's always the piece where you actually use a threat to leave in order to get what you want.

Marc: Right, right. Which would be a violation, as well. Would be a shadow dimensions, as well. Fantastic. So what do we have here? We have the light quality of container is creating home. Creating that sense of home. In a relationship. In community. By the way, a country can have the same thing. Nationalism. And then the betrayal. It's always the same game.

So the light quality always is true container. True holding. Creating that sense that Carol described to us of radical safety, radical love. And it's more than that. Let's just add one piece to it. A true container is committed to your transformation. So a true container's a place that not just creates goodness on the inside – it creates goodness, which is the ground of your growth. It's the ground of your transformation. It's not a system that suffocates you. It's a system from which you grow. That's a true container. And that's an enormously important distinction. It creates the nourishing soil from which you emerge, from which you grow.

The shadow would be suffocation. The shadow would be, you can't leave. The shadow would be, what else? Throwing someone else out in order to get an illusion of being in. What else? What other shadows are there? Engulfing. What else?

Speaker: Emotionally unavailable.

Marc: Right, right. So you make a forever promise, a container promise, but then you break the promise. What else?

Speaker: Conditions.

Marc: Well, I don't know. There can be conditions. A container does –

Speaker: Unexpressed conditions. So you're going to be –

Marc: All right. Conditions you don't know about, maybe. But containers don't need to be unconditional. That's a different conversation. But I'm in big favor of conditional love. I like conditional love. I don't like unconditional love. But I get what you mean. It's unvoiced, hidden conditions you don't know about. Fantastic, awesome.

Let's take a look now. Let's find a place in my life, and let's do, as Vyana suggested, let's just take a second just to interact for a second. Turn to the person next to you, before you write – we're just going to try a little experiment. Create a little dyad. A little family. Turn to the person next to you and just share – before we go, what are we going to do? We're just going to share what we're about to write. So we take people out of their individual experience and share, "Where's a place in your life in which you had an experience of the light version of this quality? And where's a place where you had a shadow version?" And then after you've each shared, write it. And we're going to be back together in five minutes. So share each one for a minute, and then write.

First part of the metrics. Where the light played in my life, where the shadow did. It's what we just talked about. Okay, take it away. Number two. Rate, 1 to 10, just how focused am I on this quality in my life? Does this show up in my life? And

not how strong or weak it is. Just, does it show up? Is this an issue in my life? How focused am I on this? Just 1 to 10. Just give it a number. This container quality. You gave it a number?

Number three. How strong or weak is the positive version, the light version, of this container quality of the circle in my life? How strong or weak is my deployment, my enactment, of the container quality of the circle in my life, in its light, in its positive version? Number 1 to 10. And again, as Jeff pointed out yesterday, that might be different in my professional, different in my psychological/spiritual, and different in my relational, or it might be the same in all of them. Yes.

Speaker: You know what's also fun is I'm realizing, for me, it's very different in terms of, to what degree do I provide this, as opposed to, what degree am I willing to enter it?

Speaker: Yeah, that's very different.

Marc: Good. Good distinction. Great distinction. To what degree am I giving this quality of container?

[00:20:00]

And to what degree am I willing to receive this quality of container? Great distinction. Awesome. Good distinction to make. Great distinction. So you might be able to give that, each one of those, a different number you might want to give that. And kind of jot down that question. This particular one. Fantastic.

And finally, the shadow expression right of container. The shadow expression. That's exclusionary of other people. That is a form of groupthink. That is, doesn't let you leave. That violates my integrity in some way. Etc. etc. To what extent does the shadow version of container play in my life? How much or how little of that shadow version plays in my life, 1 to 10. How much or how little of that shadow version plays in my life, 1 to 10. Yes.

Speaker: This has a very similar dimension to what Jeff mentioned, as well. So for example, I have experienced ostracization from a container. So that's one dimension. And it's an important one. That's one dimension of it. ____ 21:26 have I participated in ostracizing?

Marc: Either ostracizing or smothering, or one of the versions of the shadow. Good. Good. Great. To what extent has it happened to me? Have I suffered from the shadow version of that? But in the core of the question – and I'd say this to both Tom and Jeff – the core the question still is, to what extent am I deploying, am I acting out, the shadow? But the distinction's great. The distinction's great. But the core question is, to what extent am I acting out the shadow?

22-SATURDAY AFTERNOON PART 4 - CIRCLE 3 – INCLUSION

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Susan

Part 4

Circle 3 – Inclusion

Track: 22-Saturday Afternoon Part 4 - Circle 3 – Inclusion

TRT: 17:30

[00:00:00]

Marc: Third quality. The third quality of the circle is inclusion. Inclusion. Everybody's got a place in the circle. The circle, as opposed to the line, which is about competition, the circle is always face to face. Everyone's always sitting face to face in the circle. That's its natural condition. And everyone's got a place. It's always, every point in the circle's equidistant from the center. It's the complete opposite of a line.

So that's that sense of inclusion. Now, is that important? Well, it's really important. The circle includes. The circle includes blacks, and the circle includes Jews, and the circle includes gays, and the circle – it begins to include. So one of the big movements in consciousness in the last 50 years is to include so much that was excluded. Did everyone get that? That's a huge circle movement. Balancing this rigid line. That's one.

It means, everyone's got a seat around the table. Everyone gets a seat around the table. It means all systems of thought, all great religions, all schools of psychology. No one's smart enough to be entirely wrong. So it means everyone's true, but partial. It's true, but partial. One of our core dharmas. So no one's excluded. So that notion of, everyone gets a place around the table, and that you can't make your truth, which is a part into a whole, but true, but partial. Which we've spent hours talking about that. It's in our dharma. That's a circle quality. Everyone's got a place around the circle. Now we make a distinction. A line distinction. It's not all true. We distinct from the part that is and the part that's extra.

Now, that's egalitarian. We mentioned earlier the word "igul." "Igul" in Hebrew, circle, egalitarian. Everyone has a place. No one's extra. No one's outside the circle. The precise contra in the hieros gamos, it's a hierarchy. It's the hierarchy status notion. So it's not hierarchy status, it's not line higher or lower. It's everyone has a place, everyone's equidistant from the center. Beautiful.

Are you with me? Okay. Now what happens? What would the shadow of that be?

Speaker: Losing the differences?

Marc: Losing the differences. Meaning, I lose the ability to make distinctions. Everything's in. Everything's in. Even before consensus, everything's in. And there's no longer – stay with this, it's really important – a hierarchy to discern qualities of information. So you go online. You see it. But online is the democratization of information. It's a circle. There's no more experts. The idea of an expert is a line quality. Who said the word earlier? Eric, sitting next to Doug? Mastery is a line quality.

But now, you can put a piece of art that an artist has worked on for 40-50 years online, and then people have no idea what's going on, offer every comment in the world, and it's their opinion. And they offer it as like, "Wow." But actually, you have no idea how art works. You have no idea how the lights playing in this place. You don't know idea what you're talking about. Just shut up. But you don't because you have a right to speak because you're a circle, and your opinion counts.

Well, sort of. Maybe. You get it? And there's this notion, it's this group process where everybody gets to speak for as long as they want. As you sit around the circle, that goes intermittently, forever and ever and ever, and no decision ever gets made. So that cohousing would be an expression of the circle quality, and the shadow of cohousing. Cohousing, by itself, is a beautiful expression of the circle quality. But the shadow is the inability to make decisions. And anyone who's ever been in that kind of context knows that there's a kind of paralyzing circle because there's no discernment. Everyone gets to talk for as long as they want. There's no sense of expertise. There's no distinction. You get that? So that would be a shadow. Susan?

Susan: Declaration of Independence. All men are created equal. It sounds like everyone's in the circle, but the assumption was white men, and not women, and not black men. So is there a shadow of like, you don't know what you don't know?

Marc: Totally.

Susan: I don't know how to articulate that.

Marc: That would be just actually, it would be a circle, which is limited. It's a circle which excludes a lot of people.

[00:05:00]

Susan: But it says – when you're in the circle, you're thinking everyone's included. Maybe it's just a lower level of –

Marc: I would say that narcissism is when you believe your people are everyone. That's what narcissism is. My people are all people, and everyone else, as you say, is an externality. So anyone I'm not thinking about – so I'm not hungry. So I'm fed. So

I'm taken care of. So instead of focusing my energy and actually taking care of the rest of the world that's actually suffering, I'm going to focus my energy on revisiting my wounds again. Because everyone who's not actually in my circle – in other words, there's all sorts of forms of narcissism. Narcissism just means that me and my peeps are the center of reality. And if we're taken care of, everybody's taken care of. And that, of course, would be a false expression of everyone being in the circle. A thousand percent.

So for example, an ethnocentric conscience says, "Everyone's in the circle," which means, "all my people." Exactly right. So that's this conscience. What else? What would be a light version of it? What's a light version of, "Everyone's in the circle?" So the light version is inclusion. What we talked with. All the people that were wrongly excluded get included. That's great. What else would it be, besides people? What else is a light version of the circle? What else? Not just people that were excluded get included, but what else?

Ideas. Ideas that were excluded get included. What else? Beliefs. What else? Environment gets included. Right, the externalities. What else? Something very critical. And, Susan, we said everyone's going to realize, of course. Just what else? What else?

The parts of ourselves that we excluded from the circle. And it's, we actually excluded – in other words, we began as this full, large 360-degree circle. And then, someone came in and they didn't like some part of us, so we shut that room off. And then we had the rest of the mansion. And then someone else came, then they got a little disapproval for some other part of us, so we shut that room off. And then a couple of years later, we had another teacher, or another bunch of girls or boys in school who didn't like something, we shut that room off. And pretty soon, we're 45 years old, living in a two-room flat in a bad neighborhood. When we were born in this awesome mansion.

So we actually narrow our own identity. We exclude from our own identity. So we begin with this whole person. We're both a body, we're embodied, we have a heart, we have all sorts of ranges of qualities. And at some point, the most desiccated version is, we're a mind with only good thoughts. You get it? No body, no bad thoughts, no shadow. That's all outside the circle. So the beginning of re-inclusion, the circle consciousness, is it begins to do shadow work, for example. So it means we actually work with that which we had placed outside the circle. Yes?

Speaker: So like embodiment and grounded-ness would fall in this?

Marc: Yeah, embodiment means, I'm bringing the body into the circle. And the body affects ideas and it affects thoughts. The body was pretty much – at best, the body was a container to hold that which was real. But now, in other words, the body itself needs to be brought into the circle. The body itself has wisdom. The body

itself is a source of gnosis. Wow. All of a sudden, for the first time, the body's in the circle. So in the whole conversation of good and evil – I jotted it down so I would get it right, right before, just a second before we started.

One of my favorite quotes from Nietzsche. Where he writes, "Our greatest moment comes when we find the courage to rechristen our evil as the best within us." Nietzsche at his best. Yes. To rechristen. You thought it was about you, huh?

[Laughter]

Absolutely. But of course, what he means is – he doesn't mean to go be evil. I mean, that's clear to everyone, right? What he means is to access the energy of shadow, bring it back in the circle, and make it a source of transformation. So the old vision would be Ecclesiastes, for example, Chapter 2 Verse 7. *[Foreign language]* "Greater is light than darkness." That would be the line version. The line version would be a split. "Greater is light than darkness." There's light and there's darkness.

The circle version would be, "Greater is light –" and if you translate the Hebrew carefully, "Greater is light that comes from the darkness." So all of a sudden, it's the light that comes from the darkness, the darkness now re-included in the circle. That's circle. So circle's very powerful.

[00:10:00]

Circle's a very powerful consciousness. Circle re-includes. It re-enfranchises. Franchises means "friendship." That which we had lost friend – we have to make friends with the shadow. We have to make friend with the other. Circle is the re-enfranchisement, the expansion of my reality. Circle is absolutely critical.

The shadow is, *Good Morning Vietnam*, lack of discernment. It's lack of discernment. It's like everything's in. And I lose the ability to discern what's constructive shadow, what's just not constructive shadow? What do I need to re-include in my story, and where am I getting stuck? I lose a sense of hierarchy. I lose a sense of making distinctions. In my rush to include everything, I even lose the ability to evaluate literature.

So anyone who knows anything about literature knows – anyone who knows anything about art knows – or music knows – not all music's the same. It's just not true. You listen to a great piece by Beethoven. And you really listen. It gets better and richer and more subtle. It's stunning. Now, you can tell me that's just taste. And your average pop song's really just as good. But you're an idiot if you say that.

[Laughter]

And I don't care if it's your taste, you're an idiot. Because a pop song is not going to get better every listening. It actually gets worse every listening. Because it doesn't have the subtlety and the depth and the inner penetration in the play. Now, if you just want a quick hit – if I want a quick hit of just kind of boom, I'll put on a pop song. I won't put on Beethoven. Because it just gives me a quick high. And I happen to love sappy love songs. It's great. But it's not going to take me home and transform me. There's an enormous distinction.

So, in other words, not all art's the same. And one of the things that's happened in the circle consciousness is there's been an undermining of the cannon. The notion that there's a cannon, meaning that there's a hierarchy, that some things are better than other things. Now, in some sense, that was good. The undermining of the cannon was partially good, because as the early feminist correctly said, the cannon all happened to be white dead men. That's seemed to be pretty limited. Why are only white dead men in the cannon? Really good point.

So that was the cannon, which was a line, kept lots of people out. And the circle movement of the feminine said, "No, let's expand the cannon." That was awesome. Does everyone get that? That's the old line, circle movement. But then what happens is, the shadow of the circle is just everything gets dumped in, and we lose the ability to evaluate and to actually discern. And discernments are actually possible. And not all music is the same, and not all literature is the same. And not all art is the same. And when you lose greatness in music and art and literature, you lose something essential, which inspires and animates human beings.

So you see a precise movement of line, the old cannon – get what I mean by the word cannon now? The old cannon of the white dead males. The circle conscious which says, "That's too exclusionary. That's wrong. We need to expand the cannon." That's a beautiful circle of consciousness. And then, you see the shadow of the circle, but it loses the quality of discernment about actually a kind of hierarchy. And you lose actually – the actual notion of greatness gets lost. You get that? It's a very precise play of how this works.

Okay, end of that quality. So now, let's just take a look. So this one, we're not going to do in dyad because we're about to dance to some of these qualities. But let's just take a look for a second at, where does the light quality of inclusion play in my life? And where does the shadow quality – where I'm including, but I'm actually losing discernment, and I'm losing judgment, and I'm losing distinction – play in my life? I can answer that one for you, Pauline. I just saw you thinking there. That's great for you, as a person who runs a community. This is actually all about exactly what you do. Pauline and Chahat together hold the community, the residential community in Venwoude.

This is exactly in your wheelhouse, as we would say in English. Let's write that. Just write, where does the light version show up? Where does the shadow version of this circle quality show up? Okay.

Now, let's take a quick little check here. Ready? What's all this sign language happening here? Here we go. So now evaluate, 1 to 10, to what extent does this show up in your life? Not how strong or weak it is.

[00:15:00]

But how focused are you on this particular quality in your life? The quality of inclusion. Everything has a place in the circle, that quality. To what extent does it show up in your life? Are you focused on it, or it's not much of an issue in your life? That's two. Okay. Just a number.

Three. Number 1 to 10, do I have a strong deployment of the light quality of this circle, the circle quality? This particular – do I have a strong deployment of the light version of the circle quality? Or do I have a weak deployment of this circle quality? The light version of it. The positive expression of it. Is it strong or weak in my life? Scale of 1 to 10.

Four. Four, which is – anyone know what four is? 1 to 10, how much or how little of the shadow version of this quality do you have? And what would the shadow version be of this quality? What would it be? Remember? You lose discernment. Everything's inside, but you actually lose discernment. And I have actually, by the way, seen one or two people in this room – I'm thinking about one in particular, so I'm going to keep my eyes shut so my eyes don't drift in that direction – but one person who came in with an enormous inclusion quality, which I critiqued very gently a couple of times. And this particular person, I've actually watched them in the last couple of Wisdom Schools actually evolve, which shows their greatness, and actually get this distinction. And their circle quality remains, but it's far more nuanced. And I've actually watched evolve and transform. And I'm not going to look in any direction now. And I won't even spell her name.

[Laughter]

Okay, here we go. Which is awesome. Just to see that development is actually completely, totally awesome. That's actually transformation. And transformation, by the way, the only litmus test for greatness is transformation. If you walk and already transformed, whatever. Constantly transforming is the litmus test for greatness. There's no other litmus test. Okay, so that's four.

23-SATURDAY AFTERNOON PART 5 - CIRCLE 4 - LISHMA FOR ITS OWN SAKE

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Susan

Steve

Jeff

Part 5

Circle 4 – Lishma for Its Own Sake

Track: 23-Saturday Afternoon Part 5 - Circle 4 - Lishma For its own sake

TRT: 17:07

[00:00:00]

Marc: The next quality. Quality number four is – quality number four of what, Doug? What are we talking about here? We're talking about hieros gamos. The divine marriage, the intermarriage, lines and circles. And we're in the circle part of hieros gamos. What are these qualities? They're qualities of the circle, which I am trying to figure out what they are. What are these qualities? How much do they play in my life? And how do they match with, how do they integrate in, my Unique Self with my line qualities? That is where we are.

And we are actually articulating a new vision of enlightenment – the enlightenment of beyond Venus and Mars, of hieros gamos, of lines and circles coming together. And these are qualities. This is the fourth quality of the circle. And the fourth quality of the circle is – it's called L-I-S-H-M-A. L-I-S-H-M-A which means, literally, Lishma. We should talk about this quality. This is a five-hour conversation. We're going to do it in about seven minutes. But it's a fantastic conversation.

Lishma means – and for those of you who read *Mystery of Love*, the original books, there's a chapter in *Mystery of Love* on this quality. Our very first gathering at Dawn Manor, I actually remember very, very clearly our first gathering at Dawn Manor which was, how long ago? Oh my God. Six years ago? Decades ago. More – seven years ago. But the first gathering at Dawn Manor, when I came in and my intention was to teach *Mystery of Love*. We went around the first circle and everyone said, "Yeah, we read the *Mystery of Love*, the whole thing backwards and forwards. We know the whole thing. What else do you have to say?" Great.

[Laughter]

But that was actually our first – and we actually met because, actually, Lawrence had listened to *The Erotic and Holy* tapes. Which are kind of that version of *Mystery of Love*. We actually met through this conversation, originally.

So in that early material *Mystery of Love*, there's a chapter called Lishma. And Lishma means "for its own sake." It's a circle quality. The line is trying to get somewhere. It's goal-oriented. One of the shadows of being goal-oriented is that you become instrumental. You instrumentalize people. You instrumentalize situations. It's a means to an end. You're trying to get someplace. Which means, when you're trying to get someplace you can actually never be there. When you're always trying to get someplace, you're actually never here. Because you're always trying to get some place. So you never get to rest in where you are. So there's a quality of the circle – it's the fourth quality of the circle – which is, I'm just here to be here. It's for its own sake. And it's one of the most beautiful qualities of the circle.

Where do you see it in the world? Where is a place that you see it? Where does that quality show up in the room? Where?

Speaker: Gratitude.

Marc: Gratitude. Gratitude. Yes. I am grateful for its own sake. That's true. That's true. I'm grateful for its own sake. Good, good. But gratitude could also be instrumental. I'm, "Hey, thanks a lot." And of course, if I don't say thank you, I'm not going to get another favor from you. So authentic gratitude might be for its own sake, but gratitude by itself could be a line quality or a circle quality. Does that make sense? Authentic gratitude, of course, wouldn't be. But it shows up in really one really clear place. One of the clearest places. Go Susan.

Susan: A mother reading the same story to her child 35 times.

Marc: But that's only because she's afraid she'll kill the child, otherwise.

Susan: Like the presence at that moment. That can show up –

Marc: So in the best moments of mothering, mothering can be for its own sake. And it's got definitely that quality. Mothering definitely has a "for its own sake" quality. Absolutely true. But of course, mothering can also be – not as much as gratitude – but someone instrumental. But that's absolutely right. True, but partial. Absolutely. There's a place it shows up that's so clear. Where else does it show up? Steve.

Steve: When someone does find and actualize their unique purpose.

Marc: Well, when you actualize your unique purpose, that's definitely an example of "for its own sake," but you're far too sophisticated for me, with all your Unique

Self stuff. I'm just a simple guy. I'm just looking for a simple – you're way ahead of me. A really simple place, and I'm going to give it to you. Children at play.

Audience: Play.

Marc: Play. Play. Children in playing. Children delighted in playing. When children are delighted in playing, they're not playing to network anything. They're not trying to get something. They're just lost. They're just lost in the utter delight of the play. And that's called "*ta'anug*" or "*oneg*" in mysticism. O-N-E-G. Oneg is the delight of play. It's the delight of play. And I'm playing in order to play. That's why I'm playing. It's utterly non-instrumental. And it's just gorgeous. That's a quality of circle.

So what we've done is, we've actually made this sharp distinction in culture between means and ends.

[00:05:00]

We've got this sharp distinction. There's means and there's ends. And you're supposed to know the distinction between them, and part of being a mature adult is actually knowing that distinction.

So in mysticism, there's an idea which is called "the taste of the fruit and the taste of the bark are the same." We've mentioned that in passing in a couple of Wisdom Schools. What it means is – and because the hour is late, I won't go through the entire mystical text – but in a word, in the book of Genesis, you've got this beautiful text which says that the bark of the tree has taste, and the fruit has taste, and they're the same. Now, what does that mean? That's the first text in Genesis.

Then a text a little bit later in Genesis that says, "The bark of the fruit doesn't have taste, and only the fruit has taste." What's the description? That in the original world, the bark, which is the means – the container, as it were – and the fruit, which is the end, both have taste. There's no distinction between them. But then, when the world falls in the "fallen world," there's this split between means and ends. And then people will spend their entire life instrumentalizing everyone and everything. But the future world is the return to Eden where the fruit and the bark tastes the same.

Another way of saying that is that in a true spiritual path, the path and the destination are the same. It's all different ways of saying the same thing. As long as the path is, you're trying to get to the destination, you're not in a spiritual path. You're actually lost in one of the shadows of the line – which someone mentioned to me earlier; I don't remember who it was – which is, you're always seeking. Who said that to me? Someone said that to me, and I asked them to send that to me. Did you send that to me? You might have. You did, actually.

You're always seeking. This notion of the line is that you're always seeking. You're always trying to move forward. You're always trying to get there. But you

never get there. But actually, in a true spiritual path, the path and the destination are the same. Same thing. You've already arrived. You've already arrived. Even before you began, you've already arrived. So that idea being able to drop in.

Now, of course, one of the reasons we get so angry, culturally – and ultimately, it's a misplaced anger – but the source of the anger, when we get angry about sex for hire in culture – and again, there's a level one version of sex for hire. There's a level three version. But the level one version is, we say that sex should be for its own sake. That's where it comes from in culture. That's the one area we say, that's supposed to not to be instrumentalized.

It's why we get upset at the artist who we think is not a true artist, but is just trying to make money. Because art is supposed to be for its own sake. But when the artist is really just hustling to make a living we're like, "What do you mean?" We don't have any trouble with the businessman or with a businesswoman hustling to make a living. But the artist is supposed to be about the art. So there's these areas where we think it's supposed to be for its own sake. That's very, very powerful.

So the quality of *Lishma* which means literally "for its own sake," non-instrumental – music, art, sexuality, play – these are all circle qualities. And they're critical circle qualities. The path and the destination are the same.

Now, what would the shadow be? Anyone? The shadow would be escape – okay, moving in that direction. Christian, this is what you talked about earlier, holy brother. What would the shadow be, anyone? The shadow would be addiction. And it's something which actually is self-validating – you just keep doing it for its own sake. So if you get a hit of dopamine from – now the difference is, great art, great sex, great play, great music requires an actual investment of self. But what you want to do is, you want to get the hit of self-evident delight without the investment of self. That's called a bypass. That's a bypass.

So instead of doing great art, great sex, great music, great play, you do crack. You do some addictive version. You do alcohol inappropriately. And addiction basically means, I want a quick hit of dopamine. Why? Because normal life has proved to be too painful for me. And normal pleasure doesn't actually get me there anymore. I'm unable to get pleasure from normal life activity.

[00:10:00]

If someone remembers from the Pleasure School, that was our definition of addiction then. Addiction is when you're unable to get pleasure from normal life activity, so then you need to actually find an addictive hit which will give you a surge of dopamine. Then you get addicted to it.

Then what happens is, the first surge is insufficient because the pleasure pointing your brain is reset. The hedonic set point of the brain is reset. And that hit of

dopamine level X won't do it for you anymore because now it becomes normal. It becomes regular. So you need a higher hit, etc. And we're off to the races.

But the point is that, actually, addiction is the shadow of this circle quality. When you get that, actually, "Wow. That's nice." The problem with addiction is only that you're not actually doing the work to earn it, and you're ignoring the side effects of it. But the idea of addiction is absolutely right. And it's, you want the world to be self-evidently pleasurable. Okay, you get that?

Now the enlightened person gets self-evident pleasure from ordinary life activity. Enlightenment means, Japanese tea ceremony. What am I doing? Drinking tea. What else am I doing? Nothing. No, I must be doing something else. No, no, you're just drinking tea. Really, you're ecstatic in drinking tea? What's wrong with you? That's enlightenment. Enlightenment and addiction are precise opposites. Enlightenment is the ability to get full pleasure from ordinary life activity. Addiction is the inability to get pleasure from ordinary life activity. And it's really clarifying.

I got a beautiful email from... I can't remember their names. Beautiful, beautiful people who've been to Shalom, they have that cabin out where I think Alister [11:53] is, like on their someplace.

Speaker: Pam and Peter.

Marc: Right, Pam and Peter. I got a beautiful note from them after that pleasure seminar that it really clarified for them addiction. And he's been working in the field for years. Actually, "Wow. Okay, that's how it works" They're powerful definitions. They're really powerful. So that's the shadow of this quality.

Here we go. Metrics one. We'll do it in dyads. In dyads. First we'll share, then we'll write. And the question is, where does the light version – what do I do for its own sake in my life – where does that play? And where does the potential shadow version of this circle quality play in my life? Get the core of it. We're writing up where the light version of "for its own sake," that circle quality, shows up in our life, and where the shadow version might show up in the form of addiction, for example.

The other place that it might you up is in the form of not being goal-oriented. And it's, I'm not goal oriented. I'm doing all things for their own sake, but I'm lost in my overarching sense of goals. And I'm actually not moving forward. So I'm doing all these things for their own sake, but I'm actually not creating a) a hierarchy of values – what's more important than other things to do? So I don't have an appropriate hierarchy in my life. I'm not moving forward and I'm not penetrating. And in that sense, I'm actually lost in my independence because I'm a slave to everything I'm doing. Because everything's for its own sake. So in other

words, there's lots of shadow versions of this. So that's powerful. That's powerful. So write that up in its light and shadow version. Thank you very, very, very much.

Then, we're about to do our little – take one more minute. Part two. Rate, on a scale of 1 to 10, to what extent this shows up in your life? Not how strong or weak you are at it. Just, to what extent this is an issue for you. To what extent you focus on this in your life.

Number three. Rate, from 1 to 10, to what extent you're able to effectively deploy in your life the light version, the positive version, of this quality of "for its own sake."

I'll just give you an example of that to make that clear. So for its own sake is one of the things that makes life worth living. When you're able to find those places that you're doing things for their own sake, that's actually where life just becomes alive. And when you're able to deploy that effectively, and that begins to animate the rest of your life, that's really effective deployment of that.

If you just do the things that are for their own sake, but they don't actually suffuse the rest of your life, and you're lost the rest of your life in – the idea is that you actually deploy it effectively. So it actually gives you a sense of, "This life is good. It's worthy.

[00:15:00]

It's self-evidently valuable." The image I sometimes use just, to get the point across, is sexuality is one of the examples. I've never heard of a person who's at the highest moment of sexuality, the most exciting moment of sexuality in their entire life, and they're right at the peak of their arousal and they never, at that moment, say, "What is the meaning of life?" This never happens. "I wonder what the meaning of life is. I really feel like I'm in angst. I'm extensionally bereft and morose and I'm feeling depressed." It doesn't happen. Because that moment is self-evidently valuable. That's the point.

In other words, it's not that you've answered the question of meaning. The question disappears. There's no answer. The same thing's true when you're listening to a gorgeous piece of music. You're on the inside of the music. Then you're just like, "Ahh." You're just gone. You listen to a beautiful Bach piece. So you're gone. There's nothing else. You're just there. And the same thing's true with art. The same thing is true with an awesome conversation. That profound depth conversation, you're just on the inside loving each other.

It's like, there it is. You're in the middle of dharma, in the sangha. There you are on the inside, and we're in this transformation. We're bringing dharma in. We're together. We're at our café together. We're here. We're not trying to say, "When are we going to finish?" No one's saying that kind of shit. We're here. I'm fully present. I'm fully available. I'm in the experience. And time disappears. It's 7:15,

becomes 10:15. Crazy shit happens. But not tonight. So we got it. Have we done with all four, Jeff? Did we do all four?

Jeff: No.

Marc: Where did we stop?

Jeff: Shadow.

Marc: Okay. Last one is, where does – scale of 1 to 10, rating it – where does the shadow version of this one show up in your life? Got that down? It's just a number. Put a number down there. You're not writing an essay, just one number. It should take you a little longer if it's a 10 because it's a 1 and a 0. Everyone else, it's pretty short. Okay? Good.

24-SATURDAY AFTERNOON PART 6 - CIRCLE 5 - CIRCULAR

Part 6

Circle 5 – Circular

Track: 24-Saturday Afternoon Part 6 - Circle 5 - Circular

TRT: 20:39

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Victoria

[00:00:00]

Marc: The fifth quality of a circle is that it is circular. Yes! Here we go. Here we go. Ready? Let's take it away. What does that mean? That means, so the line is history. His story. The line is moving forward. It's making progress. But there's another notion in the world which Eliade, the anthropologist, called "the myth of eternal return." The cycle. The wheels on the bus go round and round, round and round, round and round. They just go round and round. There's that notion of, that which goes, it's round and round.

What's that quality? What's the quality? The quality is I'm on the wheel. I'm not getting off. I'm in the cycle of life. Now being in the cycle of life is the place that I actually find, if I can get in there deeply, and if you have a sense of Shamanism, and you have a sense of the neo-pagan traditions, it's actually about being in the wheel of life. I'm in. I'm part of the wheel of life. I step out of the narrowness of my line ego looking for something and I locate myself in the larger movement of reality. And I stop trying to get some place all of the time. You get it? I actually

locate myself in the eternal return, and I actually locate myself in the fact that the sun rises and sets every day, and the seasons go round and round.

That's the Chapin song that we sometimes get back to – "All My Life's A Circle." Sunrise and sundown, the moon moves through to the mountain and the day break rolls around. That sense of the circular motion. And there's a part of me that wants to get off of it, which is part of that Chapin song. But there's a part of me that actually realizes, no, this is the cycle of life. It's birth and death, and birth and death, and that's creation and destruction. And I'm able to locate myself, to some deep and profound extent, in the circle.

So for example, the last scene in *Gone with the Wind* when she realizes – Scarlett O'Hara – that Rhett is finally really gone. Rhett Butler. Scarlet Wind – no, Scarlet O'Hara. *Gone with the Wind*. Scarlet Wind was her sister. So what happens there? Anyone remember the last scene? The last scene is she picks up the earth of Tara, and she says, "At least I have Tara." Everyone get that? That's the earth.

The environmental movement in America is very much connected to this circle quality. This circle quality is Mother Earth, and her cycles and respecting her cycles and being located in her. And not seeing myself as always acquiring, and trying to move beyond her. And actually experiencing myself as part of that great cycle. So the Gaia movement – that environment movement – is to access this quality of circle consciousness. So that's a beautiful expression of circle consciousness. And it's powerful in the pagan world.

Wicca and neo-paganism and environmentalism have actually, from different angles, come and brought some of that back to us. And that's a welcome addition. A society that was about progress. Saying, whoa, stop. Let's actually locate ourselves in the rhythms of the seasons, in the rhythms of time.

So that's that energy. Now that energy also appears – that circle energy, the circle is circular. Meaning, it comes back again. It also appears in relationship. So as we said before when we were comparing this morning, or yesterday, circle and line, the line moves past a situation. The circle keeps coming back to it. You keep coming back to the situation time and time again. Now when you come back to it, it has shadow because you can't move beyond it, but it also has the ability to heal it.

For example, one of the things that I've talked about a number of times from a line perspective is, move beyond your wounds. But from a circle perspective, don't get stuck in them, but keep healing them at a higher and higher level. You hear that? That's now a different energy that I brought to it from the line perspective. And it's, come back to it and heal it a higher level.

So it becomes, not quite a circle, but a spiral. The line and the circle come together and you keep spiraling up and you keep healing deeper and deeper. That's not the being stuck idea.

[00:05:00]

It's the, kind of, you keep healing that same original wound again and again. And to some profound extent, we die with our original wounds.

One of the things I've shared – some of us have talked about in the Holy of Holies. And we've also talked about it, at least once, in public space is that beautiful scene from that movie *A Beautiful Mind*. Where we're taken into the psychosis of that beautiful Nobel mathematician, and the three figures that appear in his mind we think are real because the moviemakers take us into a psychosis. So those three figures that appear, we're convinced are real people. So we go with him into a psychosis. And then we're shocked when those people actually aren't real.

I remember watching those people aren't real, and he finally does this enormous work to get out of this psychosis and to get a sense, a grip on, as it were, the real world. And he finally wins a whole series of prizes. I don't remember which prizes, what's at the end of the movie. And he's at an auditorium in Princeton sitting with his wife, and the whole screen he's being honored. And as they walk out of the auditorium, you see, standing in a row, those three people. It's a powerful scene. It's a powerful scene. The point of – and I get choked up of it, also, whenever I think about it. The point of the scene is that they're never gone. You think you're going to do the work and they're going to be gone. They're never gone. But you create some distance from them. They're not running – they're not in the driver's seat. They're not you anymore.

Whenever I hear of a spiritual teacher or at a system of healing that says, "You will transform and it will be gone," I know they're lying. It's never true. It's never true. Whatever your original wound is, you're going to die with it. But you're going to be in relationship to it. It's not going to own you. See the difference? It's the whole difference. It's not going to own you. You're going to transform it a piece at a time. You're going to evolve it. And that relationship's going to evolve and deepen. And in the end, you're actually going to be able to transform the wound into a gift.

That doesn't mean it won't be a wound, but the wound will also be a gift. And you're going to hold it both as a wound and as a gift. So that ability of the circle to actually say, "I'm not going to move past it," – I'm talking about the same thing I talked about this morning, but from the circle perspective. "I'm not going to move past it. But I'm actually going to go deeper and deeper into it, bravely and courageously, not to wallow in it, not to avoid moving forward in other parts of my life, but actually deepen and profoundly transform." That's hieros gamos.

You're both moving forward towards your Unique Self and pulled forward by your Unique Self. And you're doing this ever deeper work in this circle spiraling ever deeper. Now if you hold those two in paradoxical relationship, you're in hieros gamos. Remember, hieros gamos always happens in the paradox. It's always where it happens.

Again, it's a different energy. And those of you who are tracking this particular issue – I know there's four or five people who are tracking, in the room, this particular issue very closely – there's also a different quality in my voice now. So this morning, it was a quality of provocation. Something like, "Get out of it." Now there's a quality of compassion. And they're both true. You get that? You can hold that, right? They're both true. They're both holy. They're both beautiful.

What's the shadow of this quality? What's the shadow of this quality? Getting stuck. The shadow of this quality is absolutely getting stuck. It means you can't get off the wheel. You don't know how to get off the wheel. You're on the treadmill, or you can't get out of the pattern. You keep repeating the same pattern.

I know just any number of friends – and I'm sure you all know – but there's one particular gentleman in my life who comes to mind who I've known for 25 years. He's an old, old close friend from my Aramaic study days. He's never been married and he always calls me and says, "I just found a new person." And he starts to describe them. He said, "They're totally different," and they're always the exact same person. And I'm always shocked. This guy's a brilliant scholar of Aramaic texts, and wildly perceptive in so many areas of life. He's just completely blind. And all of us in our inner circle, where we're always like, "Okay, he's doing it again." And he's like, "Wow, this new person. This is it!" Same patterns, same story, again and again.

And actually, we have some *skaras*, as we say in Hinduism. We have emotional structural karmic blueprints in our life, and there are cycles in them. And I, with my friend Sally Kempton, I've – a number of times – looked at who are the core people in my inner circle? The ten people in my inner circle? And I came to a very, very clear realization about five years ago that the same core ten people are in my inner circle, always. For the last 50 years. Now, I was able to identify at least five of them clearly. Five of the archetypes, very clearly.

[00:10:00]

And they keep literally replaying. So it's the same person at a higher level. That's fascinating. When you realize that circle, you get to a fixing. So to do a fixing, you don't need to break the pattern. You need to become awake to the pattern. And then you can fix.

That's the gorgeousness of the circle. You get to go around again and encounter that same reality. Now actually, the mystical idea, which is called "Teshuvah" – and Teshuvah in English means, it's weirdly translated as repentance. A bad translation which, who would want to do that? But the word in Hebrew means

"*T'shuva*" 10:41, "You return and complete the circle." What does that mean? It means you're in a situation, in a particular place, with a particular person, with a particular dynamic, in a particular energy and you act way X. And that way X is not in alignment with your highest self.

So the mystical structure of reality is, that situation's going to reappear again. You're going to meet that same – it might not be the same name, but that same person, and the same dynamic, and the same structure's going to reappear again. And that is an expression of an outrageously loving cosmos. Because what that means is that's circular, so within the cosmos, there's a hieros gamos itself.

We're going to stop relatively on time, but we're actually just in the meat of it now. Just feeling it. There's an actual line and circle in the cosmos. On the one hand, the line is moving forward. History is progressing. That's evolution. That's newness. So the great traditions refuse to see newness. They refuse to see there were new ideas. Buddha had to have known everything.

That's a violation of the line. Actually, Buddha knew nothing about democracy. Buddha knew nothing about feminism. Buddha knew nothing about more evolved versions of sexuality. He just didn't know anything about that shit. Because we've evolved. There's a line. There's new ideas. That's a big realization.

At the same time, there's another structure on the cosmos. Which is, it goes round and round. Same shits happening again and again and again. Yes, Victoria?

Victoria: I was just going to say that I think the hieros gamos of that is the spiral. Because it goes around, but it also has direction.

Marc: Right. I totally hear that. I hear that. And yesterday, somebody mentioned hieros gamos as the spiral. And yes, I'm going to say yes, yes, yes and a maybe with it, and I'll tell you why. Yes, for sure. So big yes. And the maybe is, there's also something about just holding the line and the circle. In other words, we'd like to resolve it into a spiral. In some sense, it's too neat of a resolution. It's more of a meandering. It's more of a dialectic. It moves between them. It's a line and it's a circle. And they're actually, in a certain sense, they don't merge together as neatly as that. It's not that they actually become a spiral. Actually, there's a line direction, which is a real line direction, and then there's a circle pattern, which is a circle pattern. And actually, they don't quite collapse into a spiral. You follow what I'm saying?

History's moving forward, and then there's this circle pattern that keeps happening. And if you just check your own life – and here's how we're going to do this particular checking. So now, we're going to now check in your own life, what's the circle pattern that appears in your life? What's the circle pattern that appears in your life? So to find access, the light version of this, where you access the circle quality in your life, which is the pattern that comes round and round that

you're able to recognize and therefore take it higher – that's one example of the light version of the circle quality.

The second that you might want to jot down is the light version of the circle quality is, where you're able to rest in knowing that you're part of the overarching pattern of time. The creation and destruction. You're part of the ecological cycle. Some people can access that. Other people can't. You might be stronger in the first one or on the second one. Whichever one works for you.

But locate yourself in the circle. Because when you can see the circle of your life, the same people keep coming up, you actually realize that you're addressed. That the universe is intimate. That there's an actual intelligence and pattern at play in your life. It's very, very powerful. The more you get it, the more precise it gets, by the way. The more you go deeply into your life, the more you're going to realize the same people keep reappearing. Always.

The same set of people. It doesn't mean, again, that your beloved's going to reappear. But it means the basic – your inner core, if you will, in some sense or another reappears.

[00:15:00]

Which means the world is love, and you get to do it again. It's not over when it's over. You get to fix it. You get to heal it. You get to evolve it.

Then look for the shadow in your life. Where am I unable to get off the wheel? Where am I stuck in the pattern? You get that? Where am I stuck in the pattern? Where am I stuck in the pattern? Where am I trapped? When you're finding that place where you feel trapped is important, because that's the beginning of liberation of it. But we all have places that we feel trapped. I'm stuck in the pattern. I'm stuck on the wheel. I can't get off the treadmill. You can win the rat race, but you're still a rat. And you're in the race. I can't get out of the race. So you got a sense of it? Of the light and the shadow in some instance or some dimension of your life.

Just on a scale of 1 to 10, how much does this circular quality, how much do you pay attention to in your life? How much does it show up in your life? Is it something you focus on? Now, it could be it's not something you focus on. It's something you should focus on. You're just noticing, have you put attention here? Is this showing up for you? It's just a number.

Three. Scale of 1 to 10, how strongly or weakly do you deploy the light version of this circle quality? And the light version of the circle quality would be one of two things. Either you're able to rest in the circular quality of your life. You're able to rest it. You rest in the cycles of the seasons, in Gaia holding you, in a larger ecosystem in which you live.

To what extent does that circular quality, that cyclical quality, give you rest? And to what extent are you resting in the natural patterns of your life, realizing that, actually, you're in a cycle, you're in a circle, and the same stuff keeps reemerging? To what extent are you able to rest in your circle? Whether it's your patterns or the larger cycles of nature. Which is one of the qualities of the circle. Which is really part of feeling at home. What really the rating is, to what extent do you feel at home in the world? That's really what it's about. It's the sense of being at home. That's important. Really captures what this is.

Then number four. Number four. To what extent, how much or how little of the shadow version of this circle quality appears in your life? Meaning, to what extent do I feel stuck, trapped, can't get off the treadmill, dominated by patterns that I can't get out of? I keep finding myself in the same situation again and again and can't get off the treadmill. Okay, awesome.

We're about to finish, and we're going into a dance that's going to hold the energy. So I'm going to ask everyone to sit up, just energetically, "Ahh." Just this awesome sitting up. We've got a big night ahead of us. Let every conversation be tonight, everyone just join us. We've got a couple of themes tonight. And we're going to finish here with one energetic piece. Then we're going to go into with Vyana and Christian, we're going to dance with them. We're going to go into dinner. There's a couple of themes running through the evening.

One is, "You love me." Staying in the practice. If you miss all the dharma this weekend, and you stay in that practice consistently the whole weekend, it'll be the best weekend of your life. But really stay in it. Meaning, don't turn it into cute. There's a temptation, you turn it into cute. When you turn it into cute it means you can't hold the practice. That's all it means. That's where laughter's a way of not holding the practice. Actually hold the practice. It doesn't mean you've got to hold it with a weird solemnness. But you've got to hold the practice. And everyone knows the distinction between them. When you go too to the cute side, you lost the practice.

Second, [*Foreign Language*] "And if you ask, you must surely need." So we're in those two practices. That's what's holding the context, the weave of where we're going. So as you go through the evening. Third, we're in the circle so we don't need gossip. So we're holding that holy structure that we do, which is, we're not chatting about other people.

[00:20:00]

We're actually in the circle. We're in essence. We're playing. So we're holding the sacredness and the infinite beauty and gorgeousness of everyone in the circle.

Fourth, we're moving towards a wedding tomorrow morning. Towards actually really getting this deep, clear sense of the unique interpenetration of the lines and circles that is me. And how these lines and circle qualities actually show up in my life uniquely, unlike any other. Each with their own quality coming together in

their unique and gorgeous way, as I express this great hieros gamos, which is the divine marriage happening in me, as me and through me.

25-SUNDAY MORNING PART 1

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Part 1

Track: 25-Sunday Morning Part 1

TRT: 13:52

Marc: Good Morning. Good Morning, Vietnam. Oh my God. Oh my Goddess. We have a huge morning this morning. This is the place we've been going towards the whole time. And what we're going to do is, we've got a three part plan. We've got a plan. Here's the plan. So the plan is, we're going to complete some of the core – the two most important – qualities of the circle we haven't done. Then I really want to get to, in some sense, the most important piece, which brings it all together, which is, I want to try and offer, for the first time, what's our vision of the stages of the masculine and feminine? The stages of the new woman. And really to articulate that vision, really, for the first time. I've never articulated this vision, and so it actually kept me up last night trying to put together different pieces from different places into, what's the next step?

And I went back to an old conversation I had with a friend of mine, David, who, as I mentioned, teaches on sexuality. We met, I don't know, a decade ago. I sat for about five hours in a hotel room in New York and went over an old three stage model I had and old three stage model he had. Tried to put them together but didn't succeed. And I was lacking information. I didn't have it. And I've been trying for a while just to work with this. And one of my intentions for the weekend was to try and ask Her Grace to crack this open.

And there's a certain grace – it's a particular and unique grace. That grace is over at 12:30. There may be another grace there may not be. But we're in a grace now. You can feel her dancing in the room. She's dancing with us. And there's ways that you can feel her dance. Jeff and Shelly and I were talking last night about one of those moments. Of all the Wisdom Schools that I've ever been at – and we've had 11, 12, something like that; we're somewhere around 11 or 12 – the session before last yesterday afternoon was the only session I've actually ever been at where every single comment made was dead on.

In other words, usually all the comments are lovely and beautiful, because that's what you're supposed to say. And some are on and some are off and some are accurate. And the people are all beautiful. The people are awesome. But it almost

never happens that actually every single perception, addition, comment, and it was true almost to that extent for the last session. Not quite, but almost. But in that session before, every single comment was dead on. Billion percent. Added something significant. Moved something in the room. Everyone fit together. There wasn't one extra word in the room. Which just never happens. So that's her dancing. That's how you know.

And when that happens, something opens. And she's actually been with us all weekend. And virtually everyone's been with us all weekend, and some people have had – just like in Vipassana retreat – you're supposed to. You're supposed to have different moments in the weekend. You're supposed to have places where this hurts or this hurts or this hurts. And we work it. And I made you a promise on the weekend, and I didn't fulfill it for most of you, but for a couple of you I really hope I did, that you get really annoyed or triggered at some time in the weekend. It's awesome.

And people have worked their stuff so well. So well. Such a depth of maturity and goodness and transformation in the room. And so she's dancing with us. So there's a moment that we have to bring something down, which is never going to come back. And it's cumulative. And all revelation is cumulative. Prophetic careers are accumulative. You don't just getting a hit. You're in. So we're in a prophetic career together. We're prophets together. And we want to bring something down. And our intention is to actually evolve the source code of consciousness itself.

And we are in that band of outrageous lovers, the *[Foreign Language]*, the holy _____ *[chevr]* 04:29, as they said in the Zohar, who come together. And our intention isn't, as we said it in the beginning, merely to have a great weekend, or to work an issue, or to open personally a little more. Which are all gorgeous and holy intentions. Our actual intention that we set is to participate in the evolution of consciousness. Which, on the inside of the inside, is the evolution of love. And we're doing it. And as we do it here, and it happens in strange places at every generation.

[00:05:00]

Who would have thought that in this generation it was happening near Livingston Manor on Shalom Mountain? That's where it's happening.

And it's different. And Shalom itself, rooted in the clarity and purity of its founding intention. And without the clarity and purity of that founding intention, we actually – she wouldn't dance here. And the reason I come here is because of that. I was saying to the Jeff and Shelly last night, I've got a series of people on my staff who say, whenever I come, "What the fuck are you doing?" And those are my key people. It's like, how many people come? How much money do you make? Why are we doing our Wisdom School there? Weren't you just at the Success 3.0 Summit? We just had 800 people. We did this. We brought in \$400,000. We're making a movie. Like, "Oh, you're make how much? You're making \$400,000 this weekend. That's great. 50 people are coming." Nice. Right?

[Laughter]

That's one of my key people who makes my schedule. And I said, "Well, actually, that's not why I come there. I come there because my family's there. I come there because we're in the source code there. I come there because that's where it's happening now." And at our Success 3.0 Summit we did awesome things, in terms of penetrating public culture. We didn't evolve the source code. That's something else. Something else. This is where it's happening. It's happening here. It's happening in Venwoude.

And I'm so glad that the beginning of that interpenetration that I've been talking about for two-three years is beginning to happen. And Chahat is really the first person who came here. And now Pauline and Marlene have come. And we're just such a huge welcome to you guys, to be – you're representing Venwoude, which is a parallel, a very different community, obviously. But there's a deep sisterhood between these communities. And I'm going to invite more people from Venwoude to be here. And more people from here to come over to Wisdom School when you can.

And we're now at a place – three years ago, we weren't. As a matter of fact, when we talked three years ago about mixing we said, "Let's build each one." And I think each one is strong. And I just really want to welcome everyone here to come. We just have one request. And they say the same thing at Venwoude. They said to Venwoude, "If you come to Shalom for a weekend, it can't be at the expense of a Mystery School." And same thing I say here. Our commitment here is to the integrity of this sangha. So if you come to a Mystery School – let's say the summer, July 24th to August 1st – our only caveat is, you're actually not invited if it's at the expense of a Wisdom School. So it's an extra credit, as it were.

But when you find your way over – and more people from Venwoude found their way over here – something really important is happening. Something really important is happening. And they're different. But they're of the same soul root. So just deep, deep, deep invitation in that way. And just to also bless, finally, the deep things that are happening in the room, in terms of writing and creation. You know, Maurice starting his writing, which is awesome and exciting and beautiful. Claire Molinard, her dharma name's Liraz, has just really articulated together with Sam's partner, Barbara, with Unique Self coaching. And Lynn and Adael and a whole bunch of other awesome people who have gone through Unique Self coaching is awesome. It's just an awesome nine month program where you really get trained and certified as a Unique Self coach, deep in the dharma. Which takes all the pieces of the dharma and turns it into a methodology.

Absolutely critical, by the way, that Jeff, Tom, Shelly and maybe, Jeff, you can share that committee – and Liraz have to have a deep conversation. Because Jeff's actually writing with me the Unique Self process book. What's the process? Tom

is deep into the world spirituality dharma book. Adaelie is into the Holy of Holies writing. Kristina is finally getting up this huge, gorgeous website that she does – I don't even know when. Between 2:00 and 4:00 in the morning. And she's both raised the money for it, and actually created an enormous amount of gorgeous content for The Outrageous Love Project. And we're just signing a contract on the *Outrageous Love* book and *Outrageous Love* stories.

Sam's just about to really come on board with the World Spirituality Project. He's done his first writing plan. I actually wrote you an email at about 2:00 AM yesterday morning. I wrote you a long email at 2:00 AM about all that stuff. So it's on your email. I don't know if you're checking. There's so much – John's just holding the energy here, and just moving forward and creating the recordings and everything that needs to happen. Jacques has just donated all of her paintings to the center.

[*Laughter*]

There's so much – Marlene is holding the festival. Chahatie's holding the Mystery School that's about to happen.

[00:10:00]

Pauline's holding the community, and in a deep and profound way. I mean, there's so much that's happening, in so many ways that are so important. And of course, Sean and Victoria are just holding that steady access Monday that they have since the beginning. Since that Labor Day weekend, back in the day of the Wisdom School. And I'm hoping they found a warm restaurant, first, to have lunch in. Because it's looking very, very cold out there. I don't know why anyone would even leave here.

And I'm looking forward to Steve, who's been really deeply involved for a couple years. And then he did this weird thing and moved east to hang out with Jill. We don't even know. We love Jill, but you know. We're hoping that this year he'll be able to re-involve, because we miss his energy. Deeply. And love him deeply. So there's just so much happening. And if I missed someone, I apologize. We've send Peter off to Rwanda tomorrow, so he's going to be – and Paul and Carol are just kind of like – and I'm waiting for them to really step into Unique Self relationships. Paul's just been so helpful, and just beginning to get the publishing venture going. There's just so much happening.

And I'm mentioning it, not so much to give people credit, but to actually feel the dynamism in the room. And to actually feel that there's actually so much happening. And I really just want to invite everyone to step up. Everyone. And one of things we've learned is, Center for Integral Wisdom is radically dedicated to Shalom Mountain. Not just as a tech – we're in devotion to Shalom Mountain. We're in devotion. And Shalom Mountain is radically dedicated. And there's no contradiction between the Center and Shalom.

It's taken us like five years to get that in our bodies. When you start, you always have this – you're at ego self, separate self. But now, we just know it. It's one. Meaning, it's completely separate. Autonomous. With separate integrities and separate boards and separate structures. And yet, what we're actually doing is, we're living the dharma. And so we're actually living this, not from ego separate self – and you can feel it in the space. We're living it from the place of Unique Self. So as I watch, just from afar, as Vyana and Christian unfold both their deep teaching here for so many years, and their deep teaching in their holy center across the street, I say to myself, "Wow. There's certain key areas that I haven't known where to send someone." So awesome, that that exists. And I'm delighted. That's what Unique Self means. I'm in devotion.

We get to be in devotion to each other. And what so often happens, my friends, is you've got spiritual institutions, and the veneer is very sweet, and everyone's smiling. And right beneath the veneer you have disaster. And that's the end of blessing. Blessing comes when, all the way up, all the way down, it's the same. And I'm just so proud of us. And I'm so proud of what's in this room. I'm so proud of what's being enacted here. And you know what? If there was someplace else which was a success that 4,000 people, and I could be here for this weekend, I'd choose to be here.

We're actually do something here. And it's of – literally, has world historical cosmic significance. It's our turn. The Zohar, the two bands of people that put together the Zohar, had two great gatherings. One's called "Ijuraba" 13:29, the other's called "Ijrazuta" 13:31. And Ijuraba's "The Great Gathering." And Ijrazuta's "The Small Gathering." Ijuraba had eight people. Ijrazuta had three. So we're a little over populated here. But we'll do what we can. Okay, deep bow.

26-SUNDAY MORNING PART 2 - CIRCLE 6 - RADIANCE

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Part 2

Circle 6 – Radiance

Track: 26-Sunday Morning Part 2 - Circle 6 – Radiance

TRT: 36:51

[00:0:00]

Marc: The sixth quality. The sixth quality of the circle is the quality of – the Zohar calls [*Foreign Language – ziv ha'shechina*] – "the radiance of the circle." The quality of radiance. And that quality the Kabbalists talk about a lot, the Kashmir Shaivites talk about a lot. And the quality of radiance is the quality of the circle that draws the line into the garden of life. It's that quality. In the classical man/woman

expression of it, or the man/man, or the woman/woman – I'll do the man/woman one for now – but in that classical expression, he walks in, she's sitting on the couch, her skirt's kind of slit and he catches a glance of her thigh. And he's like, "Ahh." Not, "Ahh," in the way we translate sexual desire into something somehow degraded and debased and somewhat lurid.

And the man/man, he walks in and he just catches the curve of the chest of his beloved who's sitting without a shirt, with just a little pendant. And he just looks over for a second he says, "Ahh." And the, "Ahh," it's not even a moment of sexual desire. It's before sexual desire. It's just like, "Ahh." It's like the world becomes worthwhile in that moment. It catches a glimmer of the radiance of reality itself.

Now that's the quality of radiance. It's the quality of beauty. And the circle's love radiance draws the line out of his/her goals. The circle's radiance draws the line out of its goals. And invites him to commit to full presence right now. That's what happens. There's the hieros gamos. Hieros gamos, right there. You've got the radiance of the circle. Now if the radiance of the circle lives by itself, it gets diffuse. It doesn't know where to go. But then, when it draws – the circle wants to draw the line in. The circle says, "Look at me." Not in a shadow form. She just goes, "Look at my radiance. Look at my beauty."

And beauty and radiance right have nothing to do with, what we today call, beauty. Beauty and radiance don't have anything to do with a kind of tinsel exterior form of what the culture, at a particular time, happens to call beautiful. You can have – let's say, in the circle version of woman – you can have a woman who's, by cultural standards, beautiful, but completely lacks radiance. And not only is she not attractive, she's actually, to some extent, repulsive. You're like, "Ugh." And you can have a woman or a man. A circle that has a radiance – and radiance means – we're going to talk about where radiance comes from. And you're completely attracted. You're attracted to life itself. You're attracted to existence. And that's that quality.

Now the reason we say that diamonds are a girl's best friend, and the reason we give roses to the circle is because roses and diamonds are parallel expressions of radiance. What's a rose? A rose is a rose. By any other name, it's a rose. A diamond's a diamond. But they're expressions of just the radiance. The sparkling and dazzling quality of existence. And they are what make life worth living.

For example – I want to give you a beautiful example of it. Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky. People miss-understand the story. The story's not about a cigar. It's not about some kind of little titillating sexual experience. It's about Bill being at the end of this crazy long day –

[00:05:00]

– holding an incredible amount of world complexity and tragedy, and then being a woman in his office he could sit and chat with for 20 minutes, who just received

him and just adored him, and just sparkled. That's the tragedy of what we did to that story. You see what we did to it? We didn't understand radiance. I mean, he could have hired some really safe high class massage from some friend of his and got a little quick sexual relief. That's not what it was about. She actually had radiance. And we robbed it from her. Because we didn't understand what it was.

We thought that our president, why would we give him that, at the end of the day? Really? It's such a tragic story. And they actually developed a friendship. And it was a friendship based on just this enormous sweetness. And he could actually, for a certain amount of time – it was a short time before culture's corruption actually entered it – "I can actually look forward. I'm going to have 20 minutes with Monica, just hanging out." And actually changed his day. Isn't that wild? Just changed his day. The entire world was available to him. Levels of power that were imaginable. But thinking that I've got just 20 minutes with M, it just made the day sweet. That's radiance.

And we don't understand radiance, what two does to three is, it makes three into one. Remember? Because it doesn't have any other category to interpret it. And then it becomes – our fear of radiance is so intense that we made this story an international issue, covered by more than any other issue in the world for 18 months to 2 years. It wasn't like a minor thing that happen. It was the move to destroy radiance. We didn't know what to do with it.

And so this quality of beauty radiance, which gives value to life by itself, comes together with the circle quality of radical intimacy and communion, which is an expression of circle or feminine love. But circle love – beyond the feminine. Comes together with the circular nature of the circle that always comes home. It has this profound loyalty. Comes together with the inclusionary nature of the circle which says, "There's room here for you. And there's room here for all of you." Did you hear that? There's room here for all of you.

So the radiance invites you and says, "There's room for all of you, and I'm always going to be here, and it's forever. And you can trust that." And that intimacy, and not status. Intimacy. Status isn't what brought Bill and Monica together. Obviously. You're talking about a 21-year-old intern from parents who weren't contributing much. And the President of the United State. So it wasn't a status issue. But when a world is dominated in its public culture by the issues of the hierarchy and status in their shadow form, then the entire interpretation of the relationship will be through the lens of power. Oh, it was a power dynamic. That's all the newspapers said. It was a power dynamic. Because the only available lens they had was the shadow of the hierarchy status dynamic.

So the entire critic, it was a power dynamic. Of course there was a power dynamic. There's always a power dynamic. And the shadow of it, there was a power dynamic were Clinton clearly had an advantage. And Monica had an advantage. Monica was powerful. She had her own accessibility to power. And

actually, the power was complexly distributed. And it turned out, the person who had more power was Monica. Because the higher the line figure is in the story, the farther it is to fall. And paradoxically, who had more power? Who was more vulnerable to the other, in terms of radically affecting the course of their life? Obviously, Bill was more vulnerable.

So actually, they both had an enormous amount of power, and they trust each other. But they couldn't hold the integrity of their container, particularly, she was too young. She couldn't. And we know what happened. It went to Linda Tripp, and it went to male shadow seeking other forms.

[00:10:00]

And it became the issue that it became. But actually, at the core of it was radiance. And that invitation. And the beauty of that invitation.

Now what's the shadow? What's the shadow of this quality? What's the shadow of this quality? The shadow of this quality is the communication of culture. And culture includes men and women. It's never an evil patriarchy. And if there is an evil patriarchy, it's got lots of men and women in it. So it's never men. I believe, to the best of my knowledge, there's a lovely woman who's the C.E.O. of Playboy these days. And I can go down the list. So what happens? What's the shadow of this quality of radiance?

The shadow is The Beauty Myth. The Beauty Myth. What my colleague, Naomi, called in a book of hers, The Beauty Myth. And what The Beauty Myth is – and I'll just give you a little image of it. I was sitting with a dude named David. I think his name was David Kunin. And he and his dad own a company called Supercuts. Which is a little haircut place. And we were sitting in Oxford a bunch of years ago. It was about a decade ago. And I was sitting with the woman who was in my life at that time, Carrie. And I was just completing writing in Oxford. And I remember, it was just the three of us. Because it was this little place in Oxford. I was just in and out of Oxford. Between Oxford and Israel.

It was the three of us for this little Sabbath lunch. And David says, "Man, I just took over the whole cosmetic section of the company. And I've got a \$250 million budget." And we said, "Fantastic. What are you doing?" He says, "I've got like the most brilliant ad people. And what we do, when we write ad," he says, "we convince the woman that if she doesn't buy our product, no one's going to want her." And we were just like, "Wow." It's literally like you're talking to patriarchy. It's like in the room. You never meet that person. Carrie literally almost stabbed him.

[Laughter]

I mean, it was like so close to violence. I mean, it was like, wow. And I just remember, came out of this lunch, and we just stopped, cold. Like, you don't think that actually really exists. Like, you talk about it, right? And there's this dude

running this major cosmetic company and their ad people are actually –that's what an ad is. That if you don't buy this product, you're going to be alone. You're going to be lonely. I mean, it's unbelievable.

So what we communicate, and then that the notion of sex object. We actually objectify the gorgeous subjectivity of the circle. And we say, "If you don't look a certain way, if you're not attractive a certain way, then ultimately, you're going to be by yourself. You're going to be by yourself." It's not even about whether you're in a relationship or not. You're not going to be loved by society. And it's shocking. It's shocking.

And by the way, that not only happens in the classical hetero world, from line to circle – usually from men to women – it happens, also, in the gay world. There's an enormous – particularly in the male gay world. The pressure to look a certain way is enormous. Because both worlds are determined by the male visual quality. Because worlds are actually driven by the same quality.

So the shadow is – the shadow of radiance is a kind of superficial beauty, determined by culture. Which we desperately move to get. This is not a minor issue. This dominates our whole existence. How many women in the room – I'll just go to women for a second – recognize what I'm talking about? We grew up with it. It's built into us. It's in the very structure of our DNA. And to actually realize that – that's the shadow. And it defines us in this horrific way. And so we've got to actually recognize that shadow, and make that distinction between superficial beauty and radiance.

And radiant emerges from moving beyond your separate self. You move beyond your separate self and you access a larger current of love. That's moving through reality. Radiance means, I move beyond my grasping. I move beyond my desperation. And I move from what we call "ordinary love" to "outrageously love."

[00:15:00]

Which is going to be key to what we're going to talk about this morning. And ordinary love is a strategy of the egoic separate self. Ordinary love is a strategy to get comfort. It's a strategy to get security. Love's a good strategy. I engage in – I want ordinary love. I don't call it ordinary love. And it's the reason that love's not effective anymore. We've forgotten what it means. And when it doesn't mean something, it's a strategy of the ego.

Because if I say I love you and you say you love me, that means we've got to take care of each other. That's ordinary love. And men use ordinary love to attract sex into their lives, to attract a domestic partner who will, perhaps, help raise a family in their lives. Women use ordinary love to attract success objects into their lives, to attract security into their lives.

Now again, it's shifting for men and women into lines and circles. So that line quality can exist both in men and women, and that circle quality can exist both in men and women. But what happens is, we've got this movement between sex object and success object. Those are the shadows. It's the shadow of male, or line, purpose and direction and goal oriented. What's the shadow? The shadow is that your father loses the glint in his eye.

Think about your father, everyone, for a second. Think about your father. Everyone think about your father for a second. Can you remember when your father talked about something that wasn't his work? It wasn't his work. And there was a glint in his eye. It might have been about some art. Might have been about travel. Might have been about history. It might have been about nature. Something where your father had a glint in his eye. And you just remember him being alive. How many people can access that? A lot, right?

Or find the glint in your eye. In your line quality. Especially the people who are in the room, men and women who need to be successful in order to make a living. But remember the other thing that, when you were in high school, created a glint in your eye. But you had to put that aside because, if you want to get a date when you're fifteen, stunning art's not going to do it. You actually just get a job lawn mowing, so you can make enough money to actually pay for someone's date. And going into Art History is not really going to do it for you. Because your dad's not going to be too happy, and the rest of the family's not going to be too happy. And that's really the glint in your eye. So you've got to try and find to go into something else in order to be a legitimate success object, in order to attract someone into your life. You get that?

So can everyone find that glint? How many people found the glint in their own eye, or their parent's eye? Everyone get that? It's like wild. It's like wild. So what we give up as lines to become a success object. So that natural goal-oriented, that desire to move forward, but I can't move forward where I really want to. I've got to move forward someplace else in order to be a good line, to be a good man. And the same way with the feminine. Instead of accessing my radiance, I've got to work with, and struggle always with, does my beauty fit what it's supposed to do? And what does that mean, and what doesn't it mean? It's big.

So this quality of the circle is the quality of radiance. And it's what gives life itself. It's called [*Foreign Language*]. It's the very elixir of life itself. So that's that quality. So we're going to do this again. We're going to do it very, very quick, and we're going to do it, literally, in two minutes. Fast. Don't write down the whole thing. Just write down three words that remind you of the story. And I'm going to ask you, and we're going to put up an email afterwards. Everyone's going to get an e-mail. And we're going to ask everyone in the room to really participate after. So we'll talk about this in an hour. And actually sending in the stories. And you can change your name, but write, "With name change permission." Because I'd

actually like to use some of them. To actually make these points in a powerful way.

But write down right some place in your life where the quality of radiance in its light version played, and where the quality of radiance in its shadow version played.

[00:20:00]

And remember, radiance plays for circles, whether men or women. Keep writing. Just as you're writing, I just want to give you just one more little hit of it so you can feel it. What is radiance? It's the energy and force of life itself. Hieros gamos. Watch this, Victoria. It has no goal or direction. That's exactly the point. It's the opposite of the line quality. Radiance has no goal or direction. It's an embodied celebration of life. It's the fragrance of life. It's the taste of the Garden of Eden. It's central rejuvenation.

Now, a dimension of its essence is crystallized in the wetness of the feminine, or the openness of the feminine, or the vitality of the masculine. But that's actually an expression of it. The core of it is the radiance of outrageous love that awakens in the person. And outrageous love is not ordinary love. Outrageous love is not a strategy of the ego. Now follow this for second, brothers and sisters. Outrageous love is source itself. Outrageous love is the love that, as Dante said, moves the sun and the stars. Outrageous love is the love that is not mere human sentiment. Outrageous love is the heart of existence itself. That's outrageous love. You get that distinction?

Outrageous love is the inner quality of reality itself. So when you actually move from ordinary love to outrageous love, and outrageous love awakens in you, and suffuses you, and you become an incarnational expression, you awaken as an outrageous lover – an outrageous lover is radiance. That's where outrageous love come. Ordinary love won't give you radiance. Outrageous love will. Now, outrageous love is available when you let go of the grasping after ordinary love. But you actually awaken and practice the awakening as an outrageous lover. And when you awaken as an outrageous lover, and you're accessing – and that's the huge move. We make three mistakes about love.

And as you finish writing, we'll do the little survey, three parts, in two seconds. But just track this. There are three mistakes we make about love. Mistake one. Love is a human experience. Mistake one. Mistake two. Love is a particular human experience. It's an emotion. Mistake two. Mistake three. Love is a particular emotion, which is, you have the emotion of falling in love – infatuation. Three mistakes about love. Every one of them is wrong. Love is not a human experience. I have little interest in love as a human experience. If you understand love as a fundamentally a human experience, you're talking about ordinary love. It's a strategy of the ego. That love is going to get you all of nowhere. It's confused. We don't really know what it means. It hides its true intention. It's deceptive. It's deceitful. It will not take you home. Don't walk out right now,

because we're going to get back to the human beings. We're not going to leave them ____ 23:43. I promise.

But you've got to start there. That will not take you home. Outrageous love is the quality of Eros that lives in reality and drives all of reality. I'll give you an example. So Jeff makes this beautiful piece of art. So he's creative in making it. Now, is creativity a human – is creativity –? Ordinary creativity would be Jeff saying, "Creativity's mine." But clearly, creativity's not Jeff's. Creativity is an inherent, ceaseless force moving in the cosmos. That's what Whitehead meant when he said that creativity is the creative advance of novelty, which is a property of reality that's happening in every moment. There's a ceaseless, inherent creativity that's not really outside of reality, but is the very essence moving reality itself

And if you look at Stuart Kauffman's book – an unreadable book, for the most part – most of it's physics – but there's a few pages you can vaguely discern what he's saying. It's a brilliant book. He's a cosmologist/physicist. His basic point – one of the most important figures writing in the last 25 years.

[00:25:00]

He was at the Santa Fe Institute in the mid-'80s – is about this inherent, ceaseless creativity that drives all of reality. Now that creativity, the other face, or the interface of that creativity, is Eros. When I say Eros, I don't mean sexuality. I mean Eros, I mean the erotic driving forces of reality.

Reality itself is driven by Eros. And we forget, why didn't reality stop at hydrogen and helium? Seems like enough to me. Big Bang. Hydrogen. Let's hang out. Why do anything else? Let's just stop. But it didn't. It kept moving. It kept self organizing. It kept coming together in higher and higher recognitions and inner connectivities and mutualities and unions and embraces. So what Eros is, is the movement in reality towards higher and higher levels of mutuality, recognition, union and embrace. That's Eros. And Eros is, if you will, the fifth force. There's the thermonuclear. There's the electromagnetic. There's the strong and the weak. But that's not going to produce a universe. Something's got to be driving the story

Now, what the intelligent design people said is, "There's some dude out there playing God who's driving the story." And what we now realize is that that dude hanging out out there might be have a really good time out there, but she's also inherent in everything. That it's actually an inherent process. And there's actually an interior process that moves interior inherently towards these higher and higher mutualities. And that is Eros by any other name, or love by any other name. And when quarks are hanging out on the street corner, and in Lower Manhattan, and the quarks feeling a little lonely, and the quark catches, out of the corner of his eye, "Check out that quark. She's pretty hot." And they kind of say, "Hey, baby. You want to come quark together?"

And they come together and they form an atom. And then they go to an atom bar. And there's these other atoms hanging out there, and they buy drinks. And the atoms come together and they've got this orgy happening, and they form a molecule. And then the molecules say, "Man, let's go to one of those big conventions, where Mennonites meet each other to get married." The little private things they do, kind of like the Indians and the Jews. And they get together. And the molecules get together and they say, "Man, let's form a larger union." And they form a complex molecule.

And then, all the molecules go on this ayahuasca journey together. And they wake up to this new level of life and they say, "Voila, there's a cell!" They awaken. They enliven. And it's a complete mystery. And each one of these jumps is called an emergent. And do you know what an emergent means, Lerid. An emergent means it's greater than the sum of the previous parts. I means the new whole – and we grew up with that word from General Dynamics Theory, but we didn't know what it meant. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. But what does that mean? That's emergence.

And what emergence means is that the previous set of parts coming together couldn't produce the whole. That what happens is, something new – when a cell emerges, it's not just complex molecules. It's an entire newness that's created. Emergent in reality is newness, and that's called the Creator. That's what the Creator means. The Creator's not Santa Claus. The Creator's inherent in reality itself, and has a personal face that knows your name. Is utterly and radically intelligent, and produces new emergences that are driven by love. And as that process keeps unfolding, we move up the evolutionary train drive by Eros. And each level, there are new emergence. Then plants emerge, and then more sophisticated plants. And someone talked earlier about – we were talking about what's happening earlier in the intelligence of plants. It's an entire world.

The Tree of Life, by the way – we didn't have time to talk about it yesterday – but the tree of life actually recognizes that the roots of the plant are where all the intelligences of the Tree of Life is. The roots are in Heaven, and the Tree of Life is facing down. It's the core Kabbalistic symbol, which is recognizing the intelligence of this new emergent called plants. And then early animals. And then there's a neural net. And then there's the beginning of primates walking on the savanna. And then, at some point, this thing called the neocortex. The third dimension of the brain emerges. Until about 40,000-20,000 years ago, we begin the third cycle – cultural evolution. And then we begin to emerge.

[00:30:00]

And we go from hunter-gatherers, and we go to early horticultural, farming. And then we go to later agrarian, more heavy farm instruments. But not just shifting is the way we're producing things. Interiors are shifting. Our interiors are getting more and more consciousness. As the world gets more and more complex, the instead of complexity is consciousness. So the world's getting more and more conscious, and the interior of consciousness is love. The world's getting more and

more loving. More and more inclusion. More and more recognition of other. More and more awakening. And actually, the trajectory of evolution is the evolution of Eros, the evolution of love.

Until we actually awaken from unconscious to conscious evolution. And unconscious to conscious evolution means, for the first time, we become aware that evolution's happening. We weren't aware that evolution was happening on all levels 100 years ago. Einstein thought we lived in an eternal cosmos. But we didn't know. Until the Hubble telescope, and a few other things – some were in the mid-1930s, 1964, a couple of important things happened. In the last five years, some really important things have happened. But until we actually realized, we're living in an evolving cosmos.

Darwin really pointed to the evolving biosphere. So there's cosmological evolution, there's biological evolution. First Big Bang, cosmological evolution. Second Big Bang, biological evolution. Third Big Bang, cultural evolution. And then cultural evolution goes through seven or eight structure stages of consciousness. And until it wakes up to itself – that's the fourth stage. Evolution actually wakes up to itself. And then in the fifth stage, we wake up from unconscious to conscious uniqueness. Uniqueness is not just instinctual and a given. We actually wake up and realize, we are the conscious agents of evolution. We are evolution's personhood. Evolution is awakening as me. And who am I? We begin where we began in the beginning, because the end is in the beginning, and the beginning is in the end. Who am I? Who are you? You are an irreducibly unique expression of the love intelligence, the Eros, that drove the entire evolutionary process.

And when you awaken to that consciousness, you awaken as outrageous love. That's outrageous love. That's not ordinary love. That's not a grasping egoic move to get a sense of security or sexual fulfillment, to make my pathetic and pallid life slightly more bearable. And calling an orgasm this weird seven second thing that disappears in a second. And security is ephemeral, at best, anyways. No. That's, I'm awakening as a unique expression of the love intelligence. Outrageous love awakens as me. And I access that outrageous love, and I begin to live, awaken, as an outrageous lover. And I am radiant. That's radiance. Outrageous lovers are radiant. You get that?

[Applause]

Amen. Amen. That's outrageous love. Amen. That's radiance. That's radiance. And you can feel it, right? Because when you talk about radiance, we get radiant. We get radiant when we talk about radiance. It's radiant. That's got nothing to do with an external, superficial vision of what someone called "beauty." That's outrageous love. So when you awaken as an outrageous lover, the whole game changes. Then you're able to access radiance. And we're attracted, we're allured, by radiance. Because the force of allurement in the cosmos – what does

allurement mean in the cosmos? Those of you who have backgrounds in physics, why is there allurements? What's the force of attraction? Where did that come from? We kind of take it as a given, right? Oh, there's attraction.

Well, why? What's allurements? And what science often does is, it describes the "it," but in being able to describe the "it," it thinks like, "Oh, now we're at the end of the story." No, that's not the end of the story. That's a description of the fact that there's allurements as a property in the cosmos. What's allurements? Allurements means, allurements is inseparable from radiance. I'm allured to that which is radiant.

So quarks, for whatever reason, are allured to other quarks. And they form larger unities. That's the quality of allurements. And in this room, as we're allured to each other in the sangha, to come together and form this larger whole, this sangha in this room right now is precisely that same operation of allurements. The sangha is larger than the sum of its parts. Every one of us is part of the sangha. We don't make the pathological move, which is to subsume the parts to the whole, and only the whole exists. That's the pathological move. That's the totalitarian move. That was the shadow of Marx and Engels.

There's a state, which is either fascist or communist, and the parts no longer matter. That's the pathological version. Here, we bow in devotion to every irreducibly unique expression of love intelligence that sits in this room, and yet, there's a larger space that's created.

[00:35:00]

There's a larger whole that's created. That's greater – the Wisdom School is a reality that's greater than the sum of its parts. And there's a group of people that come, and who are awesome, and they're all fantastic, but there's something called the Wisdom School. And we're in service to it. It's a new, right? It invites us.

Now, we've invested it with our love. But then it becomes something larger than us right. Shalom Mountain is a reality that's greater than the sum of its parts. Venwoude is a reality that's greater than the sum of its parts. The Center. Something happens. So that's outrageous love. So the way you get to radiance is through outrageous love.

Scale of 1 to 10. To what extent does this quality of radiance play, or not play, in your life? Show up, or not show up, in your life? In its light form. Just a number. Number three. To what extent are you able to deploy, to access, the light expression of this quality of radiance in your life? 1 to 10. Strong or weak. How strong or weak is it? Number four. How much or how little of the shadow of radiance –the search for superficial beauty – ordinary love as a strategy of the ego. Ordinary love is the shadow of radiance. How much does that show up in your life, 1 to 10?

27-SUNDAY MORNING PART 3 - CIRCLE 7&8 - RECEIVING DEPTH

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Part 3

Circle 7&8 – Receiving Depth

Track: 27-Sunday Morning Part 3 - Circle 7&8 - Receiving Depth

TRT: 26:09

[00:00:00]

Marc: The last quality we're going to talk about – which is the seventh quality. The seventh quality. The last quality we're going to talk about is the quality of *Kabala*. K-A-B-A-L-A. *Kabala*. Often that word is identified with Hebrew mysticism. Not by accident right. And *Kabala* means "receiving." Receiving. That's what word means. It's the quality of receiving.

I told you there was going to be nine qualities to each. So I'm going to do these two qualities together, for the sake of time, but it's related to a ninth quality, which is the quality of depth. The quality of depth. The ninth quality.

Audience: Seventh and eighth.

Marc: Seventh and eighth. Okay, okay. Right. That's exactly right. So this would be the seventh quality, is receiving. Thank you. And the eighth – I think so, right? Yeah? And the eighth quality is the quality that I want to call depth. And they're actually distinct qualities, but I'm going to talk about them in relationship to each other now, really, actually, just for the sake of time. So the quality of receiving and the quality of depth. So let's start with the quality of receiving

And just a little "by the way" for a second. Does everyone see how the quality of "for its own sake," that we talked about yesterday, is related to the quality of radiance? Okay, good. So what does receiving mean? So receiving means, I'm going to study Hebrew mysticism and I'm seventeen years old, and I'm in Safed. And there's an old gentleman in the little apartment in Safed, and I'm invited to this little circle of three students. And it's usually in those kind of – in their interior tradition, that's where the transmission happens. In these very small rooms.

And I walk in, and he seems like a very twinkly-eyed old man, and he offers me an apple. So I go to take the apple, and looks at me. And those of who have been with us, you remember this story. It's a key story. So I guess he doesn't want to give me the apple. Takes it back. It's get a little weird. But he gives me an apple, I go to take the apple again. And looks at me again, this time a little more intensely and disapprovingly. It's getting a little weirder. Maybe I shouldn't study *Kabala*.

Finally he says, "Take the apple," so I say, "Okay. [*Foreign Language*] If you want me to take it, I'll take it. If you don't, I won't." Thinking that might be the right riddle that gets you entry. And he looks at me, doesn't even say anything, as if what I said was just so stupid. Why would it even deserve a response?

And he does this a couple more times until I understood what he meant. So he proffers the apple, and I put out my hand to receive the apple. "Ahh." [*Foreign Language - Yafeh.*] And puts the apple in my hand. That's *Kabala*. That's receiving.

And receiving is a completely different quality. Receptive doesn't mean passive. Receptive means the quality of being able to receive from the cosmos. And it's a gorgeous quality. And that quality got confused with a passive quality. It's not passive. Receptive is actually an enormously active quality.

Now classically, when you portray the line as thrusting forward, and moving towards, and goal-oriented, and directional and then you portray the circle as receptive, the receptive quickly becomes passive. Which, of course, is a mistake. The shadow of receptive would be passive. Got that? The shadow of receptive would be passive. But it's even deeper than that.

You have to remember that when the critique of this quality of the circle came online, we were living in a world in which the world was thought to be purely understood in the shadow of the line. What I mean by that – and someone pointed to this yesterday. It was a brilliant point. And I don't remember who it was. Where's Cerridwen? It might have been Cerridwen. But it was a brilliant point yesterday, whoever said it. Which is, the shadow of the line quality in the mid-19th century is that only that which is measured is real. Remember that yesterday? It was brilliant. Absolute correct.

[00:05:00]

So if only that which is measured is real, so what exists in the world is flat land. It's a surface world. So in a surface world, what do you want to do? You want to go take what you can. And the only move available there is to move forward. Is to thrust forward. Because you've got to go and create your reality. And the ultimate gorgeous expression of that line quality in the world is Ayn Rand. Ayn Rand really captures – how many people have read a book by Ayn Rand? And you remember when you read it, you read it through – there's this experience of reading Ayn Rand.

Because she's capturing the Eros of the line. Now it's the Eros of the line, but it's not the Eros of the circle. Because in no Ayn Rand books are there any children. No children ever appear in the Ayn Rand books. Because children, who are dependent and who need nurturing, and vulnerable people in Ayn Rand books are mocked and caricatured in some way. But the people that are strong – Hank Rearden, Dagny Taggart, John Galt, Dominique Francon – these are figures who

are line figures. And they are, in her words, going and entering the world and wresting meaning out of the world, and that is their dignity.

But they're taking it. Why would you be receptive? Receptive would, by definition, be a passive quality. Because the world is inert and lifeless until we enter it, take it and transform it into technology, into meaning, using our creativity. And it's the shadow of the line expression. But actually, that's an inaccurate view of the world. The world has exteriors and the world as interiors. And actually, that which is driving creativity isn't a mid-19th century view. It's actually the actual creative impulse itself. That's what Stuart Kauffman's talking about in **Fic** 07:04. It's actually the movement towards, what my good friend Alan Turing – and my favorite essay in the world – Sean and I have talked about it – is *Morphogenesis*. It's like one of the most important things. You read that, you're just like blown – and I don't understand all the math, but enough I can follow. It just blows me out of my mind every time.

And the whole vision of an inherently, ceaselessly emergent creative cosmos, which is self-organizing and emerges from Turing really laid the ground in that essay. But that's not this inert, separate self, desiccated Gaia committee sculptor human trying to create something. No. It's the creative force of the cosmos rising in the human being. That's actually what's moving the line. But on a larger frame, if you really realize and think and feel, if you falsely realize and think and feel that the world's flat land, then the receptive move doesn't make sense.

But if you actually understand that reality is dancing was Shakti, it is love – particles of love intelligence inherent in every drop of reality, which is animated by outrageous love, and that the universe has not just exteriors, but interiors. And actually, from the moment of the Big Bang – Whitehead called it "prehension" – every event in reality has an inherent and exterior. No event that doesn't. All the way up, all the way down. We'll talk about that for a long time. But just, let's put it in the space now.

There's always interiors and exteriors. Dopamine released in the brain, an expression of an interior experience of love. Love's not dopamine. That's an exterior expression of an interior experience. So the second I realize I'm living in a world of interiors, I realized there's depth. There's enormous depth here. So what do I want to do? I want to receive the depth. And the capacity to receive the depth makes me a hero. So in the old world of the knight, who was the line figure, sitting around the Round Table, saving the damsel in distress, that's what the knight did. So there was a line.

The circle was dependent on the line for the line to thrust the lance into the enemy, who was the other. And then something happens. Something happens when culture evolves, when consciousness evolves, Julie, it always shows up in a movie. We know that, right? Unconsciously, perhaps. So there's a Jedi Knight.

And we've mentioned our friend before. And who's our favorite, most powerful, Jedi Knight. What's his name? The most powerful one. Yoda.

Yoda means "yada." Yada means "knowing." Yoda is "to know." It's to sensually know. We have scripture on this. [*Foreign Language*]

[00:10:00]

And man knew, sensually – carnal knowledge – his wife, Eve. So "yada Yoda" means "true knowing."

So where does true knowing come from Yoda? Yoda has a sword. Just like the old knights did. But what is it? It's a light saber sword. And a light saber sword, when lines and circles merge is when light and love come together. Light and love merge in hieros gamos when, actually, you don't become the old knight who's just thrusting forward based on the particular strength of my separate self. And I pray to the external Christ, God, to maybe help my fragile separate self not sleep with Guinevere. And have my lance be steady as I'm trying to thrust through the other person. And either Christ helps or doesn't, in the externalized version of Christ.

No, there's this other vision. Where I actually am a Jedi Knight, and I actually train myself to become a circle. And a circle receives the force of the universe. The circle is the quality of Kabala. It's the quality of receiving. And when I receive the force of the universe, what happens? Watch. Line image. You get it? And it's, the lightsaber doesn't exist, then I receive the force of the universe, and then the lightsaber goes *shshshshsh*.

You don't need to be too more descriptive to understand that that's a phallic image.

[*Laughter*]

You know, on a good day, with drugs. But you get the point, right? So that phallic image doesn't come from an interior superficial arousal of ordinary love. That arousal of that phallic quality has got nothing to do with man or woman. You can be born without a phallus and have that arousal. It's not about sexuality. That's, again, the Tantra's a trickster. It's all about sex, and it's not about sex at all. You get it? It's got nothing to do with sex. Sex models Eros. The whole thing's about Eros. That's the whole story.

I'm receiving. I'm a circle, I'm receiving. And my quality of power emerges from my ability to receive. And I'm actually in the deep Kashmir Shaivite understanding of the quality of power. Power's not a line quality. Power is a circle quality. Power resides in the circle. And the circle receives the power of the force, as it were – that is to say, infinite essence, outrageous love, by any other name. And then that causes the hardening and power of the phallus to explode, which then dances and creates universes. That's the quality of Kabala. Stunning.

So we've now evolved the very image of what the night is. The night is the one who receives the force. Now, in our world of human beings, the circle is that which receives all of me. Wendy can receive all of Peter Pan. And Peter Pan's looking for his shadow. Because aren't we all trying to work with our shadow? And he can't find his shadow. And he's darting about the room. Remember that scene? He's darting about there, he's looking for his shadow. And there's Wendy, the Goddess. Wendy's the goddess. But of course. And she sews the shadow onto Peter Pan. It's like *[gasp]*.

The line, who's the old version of the line – the desiccated line – goes to slay the dragon. Saint George with the external Christ God goes to slay the dragon. The old riddle. I've asked you this before, a few Wisdom Schools ago. A riddle. What does man say to the snake in the Garden of Eden? And the answer is, nothing. Because men don't talk to snakes. Because the snake is the dragon. It's the same image in myth. The snake's the dragon. And what do men do with snakes? They kill them. Or ignore them. That's what a man does. There's a snake. Get the man to kill the snake. Same thing.

You slay the dragon. But then there's this other subversive circle image, which is the beauty and the beast. And the beauty and the beast, she kisses the frog into a prince. It's a completely different quality that's happening. And how does she kiss the frog into a prince? And how do you break the spell of the prince who's the beast? The beauty says, "I'm going to love you forever." That's how it works. I'm going to stay with you forever. That's outrageous love. It's this commitment to forever.

[00:15:00]

It's this commitment that I'm going to receive your beast, and in receiving you – in receiving your shadow – in outrageous love, we create space for transformation.

And it's not that love, by itself, affects all the transformation. It's that love creates the context for transformation. Because who can you trust to transform you? Someone who radically, wildly, outrageously loves you. Because you can't trust anyone else because that's an ego move. There's a whole egoic conversation happening. But when you actually create a radical space of outrageous love – when the beauty actually says, "I'm committed to the beast," and the princess says, "I'm going to kiss the frog," then transformation happens.

From that place of radical outrageous love, you create a space which is a space for transformation. So just to feel this. We'll kind of feel this. And just feel it playing. This is this quality of Kabala. And I want to give you just one last image of the goddess, and we'll finish this quality. The last image of the goddess, and it's a story that Erickson writes right in his diary. The famous Milton Erickson. The famous psychologist. He was very, very sick his entire life. I don't know how many of you know his life story. He was sick and stricken, physically, his entire life. And he was one of the most creative transformers. And wildly original. And

he was really, to my mind, he was the first Unique Self, although he never uses the word. He has a sense of Unique Self. He's got a sense of it.

In an old book I wrote, *Soul Prints*, I called him a "soul print therapist." He's got a sense of this. And he tells a story of when he's ten years old in Wisconsin. And a couple of you may remember it. And it just blew me away when I read it in the Erickson notes. And there's this dude named Joe. He's like 23 years old and he's the ultimate delinquent in the town. He beat his father up when we was 13. He goes to reform school. And reform school is the most extreme isolation reform school, and he's in it because he's beating people up and he's doing bad shit all over. He gets released at 15, back in reform school two weeks later, released again at 18. And by the time he's 23 and he's gotten out of reform school, he's been there like for the last ten years. He's the most hardened expression of a system gone wrong.

And whenever he gets out of prison, he always comes back to the little Wisconsin town, he fights with someone, he's steals something, he wrecks something. Everyone knows the cycle in the town. And he goes back to prison. That's what happens.

So he's now coming to town, everyone knows that Joe's around. He's walking down the street. And there's a very wealthy farmer who lives in the area. And he has a daughter who's, by that point, 26. And she's the goddess. She's the most beautiful one. All the young farmers want to dance with her. She doesn't want to dance with them. They all go out with her. They go, it's called, "sparking." You go out in the carriage together. And she's just not interested.

And so Joe's Joe – mean Joe – walking down the wooden planks. And she's in town just to buy supplies for her dad. She works with her dad. And Joe blocks her way. And Erickson is there and he's watching it from a short distance. He blocks her way, and in the most shadow line way looks her up and down. And she looks at him and he say, "Hey. Go to dance with me Saturday night?" And she looks at him. And Erickson, he tells it, there's just silence. And she looks at him and she says, "You know, I will, if you're a gentleman."

He walks on, she walks on. And here's what happened. He just kept walking. And he walks nine miles to her father's farm and he says, "I'm looking for a job as a farm hand." And her father's like, "Joe?" He says, "Okay." He says, "It's a hard job. It's morning to night." Gives him a job. And it's like, you sleep in the barn in that little corner. And Joes works there for a month, and for two months, and for four months and becomes the best farm hand. And then becomes the supervisor of a group. Once he becomes the supervisor of a group, he's seen driving in the buggy "sparking" with the daughter. And they ultimate get married. He takes over the farm, turns the farm into a place in Wisconsin to work with the most hardened convicts in Wisconsin.

Never had any therapy. Never received any dharma. Never did a mat trip. Just a few words. Just a few. Which they were, "I will, if you're a gentleman."

[00:20:00]

That's the goddess. That's the goddess. It's radical receiving. That's radical love, which creates the space for transformation. I mean, she looks at him and she sees him like no one's ever seen him. And he feels it. And all of a sudden, he's seen anew, for the first time, to be a lover is to see with God's eyes. And he's seen. And the whole transformation begins to happen. That's Kabala. That's Kabala. That's the quality of the goddess.

And I'm so in love with the quality, I don't even want to mention the shadow. But here we are. So the shadow of this quality, of course, would be – and again, watch the hieros gamos – would be a lack of hieros gamos. Meaning, a complete lack of discernment. I receive everything. I can't create a hierarchy. I don't know how to discern. And here's a big sentence. Unique Self people. I can only access the capacity of discernment if I'm in Unique Self.

The ego never can have discernment. It doesn't have that capacity. It can't do it. Because the ego's grasping. So it's unable to distinguish and discern. The Unique Self, when you're in the place of your Unique Self, what happens is, your capacity for discernment comes back online. In a completely different way. That's why Unique Self is the matrix of this entire conversation, is Unique Self right.

But when you're in your ego place, you just receive everything, and receiving becomes the whole story. And it's what, Steve, you pointed to earlier when you asked about therapy. Therapy which is circle therapy is radically receiving. And all of therapy comes about, I was holding space. Well, I'm glad you were holding space. But nothing happened. And nothing happened is because a) usually the therapist hasn't realized Unique Self. So the therapist is in egoic place. Number one. But two is, there's no hieros gamos. You're receiving without discernment – discernment/division; a quality of the line – and without a goal orientation, and without penetration.

Now if you're just penetrating, just goal oriented, and you're not accessing the quality of circle – which is that radical space, "I will, if you're a gentleman" – then transformation can't happen. Transformation happens from hieros gamos. Why? Because transformation is the creation of something new. And when the line enters the circle, my friends, on all levels of reality, something new is created. That's how reality works. And the phallic line entering the embodied yoni is but the physical expression of the line entering circle – sperm fertilizing egg.

But we actually live in a universe that has telos. Not external telos – an interior telos. And a universe that Eros. So we live layered in a telo-erotic universe. The universe is a telo-erotic universe. And the universe is having supra-sex all the time. Supra-sex. My friend Barbara Marx Hubbard, my outrageous beloved, who wrote me last night about this. Supra-sex is happening all the time. Lines and

circles are emerging all the time. Hieros gamoses are producing new emergence. And what is transformation, if not a new emergent? That's exactly what it is.

The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. All the psychologists think the most you could be would be, you can work all those parts out in some slightly better order, and we might make you slightly more functional. Although, it doesn't always work that way. Slightly more functional. But if, actually, you have hieros gamos at play, then you're going to birth something that's new, that's undeniably new. Than ever was before. That's historic. That's a new emergent. And that new emergent is you. It's the emergence of your Unique Self.

And unique selves birth into existence other unique selves. That's the point. Wow. So the shadow is when I'm accessing this circle quality from a place of ego, or of separate self, or a place of ordinary love, then the transformation can't happen.

Find a dyad partner. Someone next to you. And share with your dyad partner – whoever decides to go first, should – an experience of the light quality of Kabala, of receiving.

[00:25:00]

And then how the shadow quality of Kabala might have played in your life. We'll go for four minutes, and then all right. Then, next step, scale of 1 to 10 – it's a number – the Victoria/Tom question – how much does this particular issue – how much are you focused on it? How much does it show up in your life? 1 to 10. And then, next, how strong or weak is the light expression of this circle quality in your life? And number four, how much or how little of the shadow of this circle quality shows up in your life?

28-SUNDAY MORNING PART 4

Part 4

Track: 28-Sunday Morning Part 4

TRT: 16:42

Speaker

Marc Gafni

[00:00:00]

Marc: So now we're going to do something very radical. This has actually never been done before, what we're about to do. I've never done it, but it's actually a critical piece to do. We're going to take actually a full 15 minutes of the short time that we have left. We're going to do dyads again. Now, if you haven't been writing, I'm going to ask you to do it approximately from memory. But I'm going to give you just a quick list, everybody. Okay? Just so everyone will be in the game. What are the qualities we've talked about so far? Just so we'll have them.

On the line side we have abstraction. And if you don't know these – if you don't have them – just jot them down now, because you'll need them for what we're about to do. On the line side, you've got... We're going to try and do it in the general order we did, even not exactly. You've got hierarchy/status, number one. Autonomy/independence/freedom, number two. Penetration, number three. It's just the approximate order we did them. Living on the edge, number four. Goal-oriented action, number five. Division/ discernment, number six. Abstraction, number seven. Awareness, number eight.

And in the masculine – in the line, which is beyond the masculine – we talked about communication. For the most part, in the context of abstraction and goal-oriented, that actually masculine, or line, communication is about transmitting content. Information implies status. Looks for a solution, which is what produces testosterone. Remember that conversation weaving through? So I'm not listing that as a separate quality.

In the circle expression, we have intimacy/communion, container/nurturing, circular/cyclical, Lishma/for its own sake, everything has a place in the circle, meaning inclusion, radiance/beauty, Kabala/receptivity. Last one we have on the circle side, which we actually haven't entered really, is depth. I'm not going to do that quality now. I'm just going to say a sentence about it. We're not going to go through it, and we're not going to do the four point metrics on it, really, just because of time. But let me just take a quick second just so you know what it means.

So depth means you go to the depth of a moment. You read between the lines. Depth is reading between the lines. It is the infinite eternity that resides in the present. You're not moving forward. The shadow of the line moving forward, it's never actually here. And Ram Dass' notion, that became famous, our friend, *Be Here Now*, what was actually expressing something in all the great spiritual traditions, which is "now-ness."

I like to call it "now-ing." The practice of now-ing. And the practice of now-ing is the practice of always coming back and being fully present right here. And realizing that when you're fully present right here, everything's available. So that's trying to go to the deepest inside of the moment where you have this realization that this moment right now is the first and last moment that will ever be. That there is no other moment. We actually enter into that moment. And what the circle has the ability to do is to enter into the very depth of the moment and bring it back to the line.

Because the line missed that depth. And the circle enters the depth of the moment. Now sometimes that frustrates the line because the line wants to move on. But the circle says, "No, no. We've got to go into the depth of this moment." And because, as we said yesterday, because the circle's memory right has – we have, in terms of

neuroscience, we understand – has emotional resonance to the circle. And the circle is cyclical, keeps going round and round.

[00:05:00]

So the circle's not only in the infinite present depth of the now, but the circle is cyclical. It comes back to nows that were yesterday. And through calling up that full emotional memory, that "now" is now fully available present again, both in its shadow form – meaning, we can't move on – and its depth form, we can heal and transform and fix the moment.

So that's the quality. And the practice is now-ing. And if we had a couple hours, we'd spend a couple hours on this practice, which I wanted to get to, of now-ing. It's a practice. And now-ing is, to always come back and be in the "now." And the circle can go deep because the circle's not going anywhere. So it's not trying to get somewhere. When you're trying to get somewhere, you're just trying to get there. When you're not trying to get anywhere, and when you keep going round and round, you actually go deeper and deeper. That's that quality. And it's different than the quality of law.

Law is meta-principles. And meta-principles, by definition, have to ignore the specific nature of the situation. The specific nature of the situation is now. Solomon says, "Cut the baby in half." That's not law, that's not meta-principles – that's, in this moment, right now, my Unique Self needs the Unique Self of this moment. Because time has a Unique Self. And pregnant, in that quality of time, is a depth that's available if I'm fully here, and not trying to get someplace else. That's Solomon. That's not the division/distinction/discernment quality. And you need a hieros gamos between depth and between division/distinction, meta-principles and abstraction. That's another hieros gamos. You get that?

And that quality of now-ing, of depth, is of course a sister quality of reception. Receptivity. And just so we don't get too honest here, let's do exact what I said we were going to do. Let's do it right now. So just do a quick evaluation. Find a place where that quality of "now-ing" shows up in your life. Shows up in your life in its light form. And in its shadow form it's, you get stuck in the now. You get stuck in this eternal repetition. You can't move forward. You get that?

You drown in the depth of the now, instead of swim in the depth of the now. It's a good way to say it. You drown in the depth of the now. The water's too deep. Instead of being supported by the depth of the now. I'll give just you, as you're writing, just one example. You're writing the light expression of this in your life, and the shadow. I'll just give you a quick story.

I have a friend named – had a friend. I haven't spoken to her in many, many years. Lives in Israel. Named Hila. Who was actually close friends with my friend Gidalia. 20, 25 years ago. And Hila used to always get these awesome jobs. She'd get the jobs, I don't know, assistant to the Israel Museum, and the mayor's special envoy. I mean, she was always – we were young, and she just always landed –

you know, you're in your late 20s, 20s, mid-20s. She would land these awesome jobs. And we're like, "Wow. Just check it out, sister. How'd you do that?" And then, six months later she would always get fired. Always. I mean, three, four times.

And the story would always be pretty much the same. She'd be having an interchange with her boss, which is always, in this case, a man. And he would say something to her that she would feel was somehow disrespectful. And should would be so wounded or mad or angry or outraged by that disrespect she say, "I should quit." And we would say to her, "Just get over it. Keep the job. Like, why are you quitting? Work it out. What are you doing?"

And we would always say to her – and she would tell us what happened, and we would say, "That's not such a big deal." And we would kind of explain it. And she would refuse our counsel, and would quit. Now, we all thought she's awesome, just a little crazy. This happened at least four times. And I realized like a decade later that, although she might not have navigated the situations well, I realized actually what her goddess was saying. In other words, we were in our line mode. And we were saying, "Just move forward." And we were completely willing to interpret away whatever the insult might have been in the situation for the sake of the line quality. And she actually was experiencing, authentically, as goddess, the depth of the moment.

And as goddess, the depth of the moment said to her, "I actually can't be here." And her circle quality was, she would come back to that depth and she would re-experience it, and actually, her interpretation of the moment was actually more accurate than ours. Actually, the insult was there.

[00:10:00]

The affront was there, but we were willing to overlook it because of all the reasons lines overlook those moments. And she was saying, "No. That's actually a violation of the integrity of this moment." It's both the beauty of the goddess, and it has a shadow dimension. Because there may have been lots of important things in the tomorrows that weren't available to her.

But it's that quality of depth. It's that quality of depth. Does everyone get it? So everyone's written a moment where – try and find a moment, if you haven't yet – just one more minute – where you have the experience of the light quality of depth. And then of the circle quality of depth.

Tom: Shadow.

Marc: Of the shadow quality. Thank you, Tom. Shadow quality. Keeping us honest here. Scale of 1 to 10. And again, I know I'm not giving you quite enough time to write something out entirely, but at least refer to an incidence, and you'll be able to write it out later. And we're going to talk about what we'd like to do with this before we finish. A scale of 1 to 10, to what extent does this quality show up, or

not show up, in your life? To what extent is this an issue for you? To what extent are you focused on this issue of depth?

And the light, the sun, is coming out. Yes. Scale of 1 to 10. Number three. To what extent are you able to deploy – how strong or how weak – the light quality of this circle – the light expression of the circle quality – in your life? The quality of going to the infinite depth of the moment. It's a number. Don't think a lot. Just catch the number that comes to you. First thought, best thought. At least, in this case. Number four. How much or how little of the shadow quality, of the shadow expression, of this circle quality appears in your life? Just a number.

Now, here's the move. We need every minute here. Like literally, till 12:30, every 30 seconds counts. So here's the move. So we're going to go back into a dyad. I'm going to ask for no casual talk at all, because, energetically, we've got to hold the container. Then either – because everyone wrote down now what the qualities are – so either you have your notes, or from your general memory, try and look through your evaluations and try and look through and share – and about each person has six minutes – share a view of the your unique hieros gamos.

It's going to force you to go through your notes, and maybe it'll be seven minutes each person. We're going to take about 15 minutes for the process, to actually go through and begin to get a sense and share a little bit of the vision of your unique hieros gamos with your partner. And you can do it in one of two ways. I'm going to give you two possible ways to do it. One way to do it is – and that's what I would suggest. I would suggest, don't share actual incidents, because we've done that already, a couple of times. That will take too long. But just run through and, for the first time, get this overall view.

I'm really strong at the intimacy thing. I'm much weaker – I got a three – on the penetration thing. But then, as you do it, have a little pen and paper with you. The person who's listening, do not be a psychologist. Don't give them interpretation. Don't give them your insight. You're holding space. You're actually, in this case, the circle. You're holding space. No interpretation, no explanation, no help. You're holding space. You're the High Priestess. You're holding space. And as you share with the person this sense of your overall schema, just see what insights come up for you. What insights come up?

"Oh, isn't that interesting. I need to maybe balance those two." And then say like, "Oh, I want to maybe work on this. The one I want to really commit to working on is this one." And try and find in this, get this sense of your gestalt. You're actually getting a window into your Unique Self – which was actually unavailable before – in this very profound way, the way the Unique Self expression of circles and lines in you.

[00:15:00]

And then pick one piece that you feel is, in some sense, in need of recalibrating. And identify that piece, and just jot it down. And have that piece available for our closing circle.

So pick one piece. Now, if you weren't taking notes, or you were in and out, or you were a goddess preparing food, so then just work with your dyad partner on just the general sense you got from the whole thing. Because you've got a general sense – we're doing Unique Self, lines and circles – whatever qualities you may remember. And which particular quality would you like to either work on letting go of the shadow, or increasing your light deployment of that. And we've basically created a whole system here. It's gorgeous.

I'm asking for everyone to have available, for the closing circle, that shadow that you want to release, or that quality that you want to calibrate higher. Have that available for closing circle. Good?

So we're going to take, now – it's now 11:30. So we're going to take 20 minutes. Because it's going to take – you've got to take each person – because you've got to have time to go through. Each person should take like eight, nine minutes. Breathe for a few seconds. And then the other person. So we're going to till exactly 11:50. And this is where it happens. Don't get lazy on this thing. Don't talk about the weather. Really take the time to go through, as much as you can. And if you like – don't be embarrassed or ashamed of like, "Well, I didn't write too much, or I didn't write enough." Work with whatever you have. Whatever you have is good.

29-SUNDAY MORNING PART 5

Part 5

Track: 29-Sunday Morning Part 5

TRT:43:20

Speaker

Marc Gafni

[00:00:00]

Marc: Okay, here we go. We need every second in the next 30 minutes. We're going to do a whole new piece of dharma. We're going to do a whole closing. And this thirty minutes is beyond time. And we're going to finish on time. So we're in this other space. So here we go.

So we want to introduce this next step, this wrinkle in love, but in the best sense of a wrinkle, not the one you want to avoid. Which changes everything. Which moves everything to the next level. So we're going to put a new structure into play

here. I'm going to call it level one, level two and level three. There's a piece of this new structure we've touched, but it's going to change and morph.

So the classic structure – this classic structure of level one, level two, level three – appears in many places, but there's a particular version of it that I'm drawing on that appears in my lineage master, the Baal Shem Tov, Master of the Good Name. And he calls the first level "submission," or *Hachna'ah*. Submission. The second level he calls *Havdala*, or "separation." And you don't get extra credit for writing it in Hebrew, even though it feels good. So submission, separation. And the third level he calls *Hamtaka*. *Hamtaka*, which means "sweetness."

So if you want the Hebrew spellings, the first level is H-A-C-H-N-A'A-H. *Hachna'ah*, submission. Second level is *Havdala*, H-A-V-D-A-L-A, separation. And the third level is *Hamtaka*, sweetness. Now, what do these levels mean? And again, we've talked about this particular piece before. And we could spend literally an entire Wisdoms School – we should – just on these three levels. But simply, give you one simple expression of it is, it comes up with – let's say you fall in love, is submission. You're submitting to the experience. You're just in love. We're just totally in love. We're totally happening. We're together. The experience is moving through me. "Do you want to move, honey?" "Sure, where do you want to move?" "Anchorage, Alaska." "Sure, let's go tomorrow." Like, we're in.

"You want to see a movie, honey?" "Sure, let's see a movie." "What movie do you want to see?" "As long as we're together." How many people have experienced that kind of experience at some point in their life? Wow! It's just a moment like, wow! Then there's *Havdala*. Separation. And separation is, "Do you want to see a movie, honey?" "You bastard, you know I don't like movies. Why would you think I want to see a movie?" It shows that you're a chauvinist and you're completely disrespectful of women." And you're like, "Oh my God. Six months ago I just asked you to see a movie," and now there's separation.

Now here's the deal, though. You don't leave the relationship. You're working it. There's tension. The power struggle begins. That's where the power struggle begins. But you stay in relationship, and this is the place that you stay and you do the work. And then the third level – *Hamtaka*, sweetness – is this radical, you've just achieved something entirely different. And if we had more time, I would describe to you visions of it. But you've fallen in love again, at level three. And you're this kind of – and I'm going to avoid the temptation to describe it to you, because it would take too long, but you get what I mean. So it's a level one, level two, level three.

Now, level one and level three look the same. You're in love. But actually, you've got to go through level two, which is doing the work, to get to level three again. Now, that's one. So far so good? Two, evolution meanders. Evolution is kind of spiralic. That is to say, evolution's not linear. It's not a straight line. And in the

same way, these three levels, it's not you're kind of, "Okay, level one, did that for a year. Okay, level two. Got that one covered, too. So now I'm on level three."

There is a movement, and linear movement, like that, but there's also a kind of spiral movement, sometimes a cyclical movement, occasionally a step back, where, basically, in a period of an hour you can go through all three levels. You can have a level one kind of moment, which is awesome. Then you're lost in level two. Then you touch into level three. So that you're moving through these all the time. I call this the Three Stations of Love. That's a big world by itself. And I think Sam was with me at Integral Experience 2, where we run deep into this dharma.

Now, another way to say that – for those of you who are developmentalists – developmental psychology – you would call this "identification." You're identified with. With the other. With the family system. Then you would call it "dis-identification." I'm now dis-identified with.

[00:05:00]

I'm in separation. "Integration." I'm now integrated at a higher level. So we just borrowed one set of languages from mysticism, another set of languages from developmental psychology, that are actually describing the same reality, just in different terminologies.

One's describing the interior experience, the other's describing more the structural experience, but they're describing the same thing. Identification, dis-identification, integration. So far so good? Now, let's move.

So in relationship, in moving to beyond Venus and Mars, there are actually three levels that are at play, in some sense, in the course of our lives. And I want to try and put something together here for you. And we'll try and get this as deeply as we can. And other than about 3:00 in the morning last night sharing this with Sally Kempton – I wanted to say is once – I haven't said it out loud. So let's try and find this together.

So let's call Level One "submission." And let's call submission, "the classical dependency relationship." So it's 1950s, or it's 2001. We know the relationship from the '50s, but it actually exists in most of the world today as the dominant relationship. It's a dependency relationship. And in that dependency relationship – I don't want to caricature it. It's negatively caricatured. It's what it is. So it's a dependency relationship in which the man is being Mars, and the woman's being Venus. And they're each playing their roles. And he's a breadwinner. And she's a homemaker.

And there can be moments there where they have genuine love, and they can have a real commitment. There's a kind of negative character. No, it actually can be very beautiful. Or it can be not beautiful. It depends what's going on. But there's different expressions of it. But there's some intrinsic problems in it. And it doesn't

matter how good it is – and often, it wasn't good. Now, these classical dependency marriages were often disasters. And when we talk about how great – we talk about, we say, "Wow, monogamy's so beautiful, and polyamory is such a mess. It's just promiscuity with another name, and it's not committed."

What we're usually doing is we're comparing the best version of monogamy with the worst version of polyamory. Which is what I call a "level line fallacy." In other words, you're confusion – you're taking two different lines – one line we'll call monogamy, and the other line we'll call polyamory – but you're making a level line fallacy. You're taking the highest level of one, with the lowest level of the other, and then you're comparing the two. It's a level line fallacy. It's complete intellectual deceit.

So actually, one of things that's true is, monogamy didn't work well. There were tragedies in it, in all sorts of ways, and sometimes it worked gorgeously and beautifully. It had two different dimensions to it. But even when it worked gorgeously and beautifully, it had structural problems – the dependency, the level one dependency relationship. What were the problems? The problems is, there was no hieros gamos between freedom and commitment. Because you couldn't leave. You couldn't leave. It's what brought Andrea Dworkin – who was wrong about 98 percent of what she wrote, but that 2 percent she was dead on.

Andrea Dworkin was a very famous feminist, died. Close friends with Catharine MacKinnon. Was writing at the height of the '90s. A neurotic, confused, crazy Jewish girl. Always. But she had some really profound insights. So for example, she said, "All monogamous heterosexual sex is rape. Yeah, that's not true. But what she was saying was, there's no way out. And basically, the terms of this exchange are, I provide the home and the security, you provide the money. And we have a role mate relationship.

We're role mates. And we each have to play our roles, just like those men shooting each other in World War I had to play their roles. And they couldn't leave. So when those men couldn't leave, it gets grotesque. But actually, it gets pretty grotesque sometimes when you can't leave that place, which is not your place. Because you need to be married to that woman, and you need to be married to that man, and he gives you security. Simple financial security. You're a success object.

She gives you sex, where it's the only place it's legitimately available in society. And she takes care of your kids and she runs your home right. And actually, you can't step out of that. Because there's no legitimate way for most people to step out of it socially, psychologically, spiritually or financially. So that's why Andrea Dworkin said, "All heterosexual sex is rape." And what she meant by heterosexual sex, she meant marriage.

[00:10:00]

Now, she was wrong. Let me be clear. Or she was very partly true, but really partial. What she was pointing to was – because, of course, there were many gorgeous relationships that obviously took place. Obviously. But what she was pointing to was – kind of like Marx points to a structural problem in society – she was pointing to a structural problem that, in a dependency relationship, you're basically playing a role. And as long as you're playing a role, there's not a lot of freedom. And there's not a lot of spontaneity and there's not a lot of play. You're in a dependency relationship, and there's a structural tragedy built into it, even in the best of circumstances.

So that's a classical – we're going to call that a level one submission relationship. Because you're submitting to your role. You're submitting to the role that society has defined for you. And again, you can do it well or not well. We could do a little rating. How well are you doing in this dependency relationship? And there's going to be an enormous range, but you're still in a submission dependency relationship.

Now, watch for a second. The job of the woman in that relationship was to seduce. To seduce. You have to seduce. She had to attract the man. And there's this great movie that I occasionally see like every X amount of time – I don't remember the name of it – but it's about a young woman in Oxford or Cambridge, and she meets this guy, and it's this whole romance. But her father keeps wanting her to succeed in high school so she can go to Cambridge, or to Oxford, and in Oxford, find a guy. That's what's happening. You're trained to find a guy. That's the entire training. And you're trained to be a man who will have enough of a success object status to attract a woman. It's basically a hetero sexual world. Only the Bohemian avant garde world can touch other parts of sexuality. You're in. You're submitted to your role.

Which causes enormous pain all through the system, and creates a certain kind of stability in the system. And has certain kinds of real depth and importance. That's not to be undervalued. But it's a dependency relationship. It's based on submission all the way through. The job of the woman – and I'm doing man/woman here because that was the classical structure – is to seduce. The job of the man is to provide security. So there's an exchange of seduction and security.

And of course, what happens is, it doesn't work in the end because her seduction only lasts for so long, and then it kind of wears away. And his security becomes taken for granted. It's just what he's doing. And then you're stuck together and, where are we? So either you succeed in rediscovering each other, then – which was rare – or you create this kind of mutual respect, with an occasional flash of Eros. And occasionally, you create great love. *Braveheart*. Okay. Here we go.

Number two. Level two. So level two is, we move from dependency to mutuality. This is a move. Mutuality meaning – now watch for a second. Now we're beginning to make the move of beyond Venus and Mars. In other words, so I'm a

guy. My wife left me because we were arguing all the time, and she felt I wasn't listening to her, and I wasn't sensitive. Or my guy left me because he said I wasn't meeting his needs. Meaning, he wanted some radiance someplace else. And so we're now both left by ourselves. I'm kind of creating a story for you. We're now both left by ourselves. Peter and Janice. And so Peter's left by himself, and they were in a no dependency relationship. And Janice is left by herself. And so Peter joins a Rumi poetry reading book. And he begins to try and develop is feminine, to become sensitivity. And he takes communication skills courses, and he tries to develop himself.

And Janice tries to actually find her masculine. To get a job, and to create a way of actually never, ever being dependent again for security on a man. "I never want to be dependent for security on a man." And the extreme vision of that is, a woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle. One expression, at a particular point in time. Meaning, you can't need a man, because if you need a man you're being raped. And I want to actually develop my own feminine. I'm not going to rely on Janice, who was unreliable and lost her radiance. And I was bored and always argued.

And so each one goes, and Janice actually begins to develop her masculine in a strong way. She goes to law school and she does her thing, and her sexuality's there, but she puts it on the side because she's got to be as successful as a man.

[00:15:00]

And Peter, he's reading Rumi, and he's taking tai chi, and he's at **Lerid's** new studio and all kinds of cool shit's happening all over the place. It's all happening.

But what happens is, Peter actually loses touch with his masculine. His ability to set direction, to lead. To set a goal. His vitality, his discernment, his distinction gets blurred. And Janice loses touch with the luminous, soft, wet invitation of her feminine, because she hardens as she's accessing the power of her masculine.

Now, there's a major principle in Kabala which is called *kenegdo*. K-E-N-E-G-D-O. And it comes from Genesis 2 – we have scripture on this. Genesis 2:18. "It's not good to be lonely. I'll create, for the person, a helpmate which is *kenegdo* – against them." So in this partnership where you want to move beyond loneliness, you can only move beyond loneliness and create the power of attraction when there's *kenegdo*. *Kenegdo* is opposition. The best English word for opposition is "polarity." There's *kenegdo*. There's a *kenegdo* dimension. There's opposition. There's an oppositional dimension.

But of course, Janice and Peter have lost their *kenegdo*, they've lost their polarity, because Peter is so listening and lovely and sweet, and Janice is so strong and independent, that actually they're feminine and masculine is getting a little lost. Getting a little blurred. But they each find another person to marry. But this time, they're not doing dependency, they're doing mutuality. Each have their own bank account. They split the chores 50-50. And they're now doing partnership. Now,

stay with me closely. Not partnership as a unique we. They're just partnering in getting through life. They're sharing the babysitting, they're sharing the chores, they're both working. She's being really careful not to be totally dependent on him, because she's got her own money. He's being careful to have all his own accesses to the feminine. And they have great respect for each other. And they're really good at communication.

They read my friend John's first book, *Venus and Mars*. And so they take all the communication workshops. And their big issue becomes communication. Communication becomes the whole thing. Clearly, in the dependency relationship, communication wasn't working too well. So they're actually working really hard at learning how to listen to each other, and how to reflect things back, and she goes to a women's group and he goes to a men's group. And it's all very, very lovely, and exceedingly not sexy.

[Laughter]

Because there's no polarity. But what's happening is, they're beginning the beyond Venus and Mars. They haven't gotten to hieros gamos. Each one's trying on – the line's trying on some circle qualities, but losing his line-ness. And the circle is trying on some line qualities, but losing her circle-ness. So circle and line are still masculine and feminine, man and woman. But as you're trying on the other side, you actually don't know how to integrate them.

Now the reason is because we have no history in their integration. When I use the word hieros gamos, divine marriage, and I draw from the ancient traditions, let me be very clear, it never happens in real life. Hieros gamos was a ritualized act done in ritual space by the priest and the priestess, or the king and the queen, that had no psychological implications, had no sexual implications, had no ethical implications, had no existential implications. There wasn't an actual hieros gamos happening anywhere. Hieros gamos was a vision of a cosmic reality of oneness. And since we realized that there were these two principles – lines and circles – and we understood the world was one, we assumed there must be a hieros gamos.

And so the king and queen enacted, or the priest and priestess enacted, hieros gamos, but it didn't happen. They didn't even do it. That's what I'm saying. It's not even that it wasn't democratized. They didn't do it. They ritualized it. Occasionally. And then, generally, by the way, in most of the ceremonies either the king or the queen was killed. That was the end of the ceremony, so there was a lot of room to work it out in the following year. Because death was usually the end for either one or both of the ceremony, depending on what kind of society structure you were in.

So the notion of actually creating lines and circles living together in a person is actually new. That's new. It exists in Hasidic sources, is exist in Kashmir Shaivite sources, but nobody was doing it.

[00:20:00]

There's a big difference between it existing in a source – believe me, Abhinavagupta was not an integrated line and circle. Neither was the Baal Shem Tov. Neither was Luria. These weren't enacted qualities. These were strange attractor, subversive, evolutionary visions by the deepest hearts and minds of what was possible. But it's not what was happening. And the notion, this mythic notion, that my friend Riane likes to paint of this old society, never happened. There wasn't actual hieros gamos happening. It's not where society was.

My friend, Riane Eisler, likes to paint a retrojective notion of these old great societies. And I point out to Riyadh, in public dialogue, these retrojective societies that you're describing didn't even have a notion of self. It's completely wrong. There was no notion of a self that had dignity. You didn't have a notion of a self that had dignity till the 16th century. You had proto-visions of it, strongly, in the biblical notion. That's why the Bible's so important. [*Foreign Language*] It means, "In the image of God."

So the Bible is providing the first proto-notion of it in general society. That's why it's such an important tradition. It's got a lot of weaknesses and flaws, but its great contribution was, as John Adams wrote – the second President – it begins to introduce the notion of the irreducible dignity of the individual. But you don't have a widespread notion of an irreducible dignity of an individual until the 16th century. So why are you reretrojecting to me notions of this beautiful, gorgeous, psychological, integrated, full pleased – it just didn't happen. There was no self. You were completely defined by larger structures.

So there's no old hieros gamos was happening. So the very beginning of moving from Mars and Venus – the dependency relationship – to beyond Venus and Mars takes place in mutuality relationship. Now, they don't actually succeed, but they begin. So he takes on some feminine, she takes on to masculine, but then they each lose their other side. Because he's so busy trying to listen he has got to cloak his force. Because he got in trouble by using his force in his first relationship. In his dependency relationship he used his force, it caused an argument. And it didn't allow her to speak, and she was angry at him, and they got divorced.

So now, he's very respectful. And he knows how to communicate. "Honey, let me just reflect back what you said." Now, what does that make someone? You feel respected. You feel respected. Now let me be really clear. You can't skip that stage. You need to do communication workshops. Let me be really clear. You totally need to do that stage. You can't transcend and exclude. You need to go through level two of mutuality. Which is this place of partnership. And you've got to create this profound mutual respect, and learn how to communicate. So those are all absolutely critical. But they're not going to get you to hieros gamos. It's the beginning of moving beyond Venus and Mars.

And both of these – level one and level two – are both ego selves/separate selves, relating to each other, and they're both ordinary love. They're ordinary love relationships. So it's ordinary love. Love's a strategy of the separate self. I'm doing it the best I can. Love's a human emotion, which means falling in love. That's the general understanding. Generally, we lose it. Occasionally, we can get access to it. It's ordinary love, it's separate selves doing their best to navigate what the Buddhists call – correctly – samsara. And in the modern Buddhist adaption, there's a two word thing, samsara sucks.

Samsara's difficult, it's painful, it's horrible. But if we can actually come together and be a unit, and we can navigate it together, and we can create some joy and some mutual respect and some communication, we're doing okay. But there's not the passion of the goddess. There's not the throbbing, pulsing penetration of all of reality, which is fucking me open to God. That's not happening.

Now, look what happens. Here's step three, and here's the big shift in step three. In level three, it's not that the man awakens to his full line, and he's ravishing. And the feminine awakens to her full bloom in love, and she surrenders. That's not what happens. What happens is, we get to level three, hieros gamos happens. We actually begin to awaken as unique selves. And the full penetration of lines and circles within us begins to happen. So I actually begin to awaken. And remember, she comes in threes.

I start as masculine, 1950s. I'm Mr. Brut Masculine, tough guy. Then I get at level two, later '60s. Rumi said, right? Nice. I'm accessing my masculine, but I lose my edge. I lose what it means to live at the edge.

[00:25:00]

I lose my power, I lose my thrust, I lose the pulsating Eros of the throbbing phallus. And then when I get to level three, I reclaim my masculine. I reclaim its depth, its power, its thrusting, its goal-oriented nature, its ability to discern, its Manjushri's sword. But I reclaim that together with my ability to fully access my complete outrageous lover circle quality. So I can both ravish my partner open, and fuck him or her open to God – because it could be man or woman. And I can radically surrender and feel the full experience and penetration of their power as a line, as a man.

And then on the circle side – let's start with woman, which is the beginning of circle. We'll move beyond it. I actually emerge. I reclaim my feminine. I start as level one feminine. I'm 1950s, I'm going to Vassar and I'm vacuuming all the time, because the reason I'm going to Vassar is to become Mrs. Somebody. And I'll be a very effective Mrs. Somebody. And then I say, "Fuck this." And I discover in '65 with Betty Dodson that I have a clitoris. Isn't that exciting? Which is a miniature phallus. Exactly what it is. And it actually responds like a phallus. And Betty Dodson starts conscious raising groups all over America where all of a sudden, I'm responsible for my own pleasure. And I'm not dependent on a man for

arousal, and he wasn't doing that good in the '50s anyways. So let me take some responsibility here.

So I access my responsible masculine, and I get a job and I wear a pantsuit. And I begin to actually access that masculine that lives in me. So I go from level one feminine, I'm now accessing my masculine, but I get a little hard. I lose my access. My vibrator works really well, but I'm not actually blooming the world open with love. And I'm lost in a hard version of my power in order to make me not dependent on a man, because I want to move from dependency to mutuality. And I don't need a man anymore.

Level one, I needed a man, I need a woman. I don't need a man, but I'd like to. It'd be nice. It's preferential. Why would I want to live myself? We'll have a great 50-50 relationship, but I don't need it. But then, the feminine moves to level three, where she reclaims the full power of her feminine. She doesn't look for love. She is love. I'm lived as love. And I'm not seeking love. I'm actually incarnating love. I'm lived full open as love. And I've got a throbbing phallus that I can access, which is wildly dominating and ferocious and fierce, and I can surrender to my man, and let him bloom me open in love. Or I can take my man. And have him surrender to me.

And we're actually now awakened as outrageous lovers. We're now moved from separate self to Unique Self. And as a Unique Self, I move from separate self, I become true self. I realize we're part of the one. Both the circle and the line realize, we're not separate circle and line. We're part of the seamless code of the universe. It's all living in us and breathing as us. And then we awaken as a unique incarnation of that outrageous love intelligence, and we realize that we can live our deepest purpose and give our deepest gifts, and all of reality needs those gifts. And I'm accessing both the full quality – let's say, of a line – the full quality and full power of all the qualities of the line, and yet, I'm not stuck in them. And I can yet move from them, and then switch. I can cross-dress, as it were, in my interior. I can then access the full quality of my circle.

And the mystics called that [*Foreign Language*]. They didn't access it, they just couldn't do it. They could refer to it. They call it "the sword which is turning in circles." In Genesis, which guards the entrance to the Garden of Eden. So to get to Eden, you've got to have a sword that can turn in circles. Meaning, I've got to be able to move between my line and circle. I don't lose – there are gender differences – I don't lose my core quality, let's say, as a man, as a line, but I can fully access my circle.

So not only can I ravish my woman open, and she's this chaotic full surrender – no, that's not right. No, I can ravish my woman open, and I can let her ravish me open. I can fully surrender and I can move between them. And we now awaken in spontaneous play. Now we're playing. Now we're god and goddess playing together. Whether it's man and man, woman and woman, or man and woman, but

it's that dynamic of line and circle are now playing together, and we can laugh. We can bloom each other open and we can be fucked open. And we can fuck the other person open. Again and again. And when there's a hurt, we laugh our way through the hurt. We don't hold it as seriously. And we have all our communication tools from level two, and we use them, because we need them.

[00:30:00]

Because you never get, "I'm at level three, and I'm now a level three person. I don't need communication tools." That's dumb. You always transcend and include. And we've organized our partnership in a way that it works. And we're both absolutely committed to the end, and we're always free. "With this ring, I set you free." We're always free, and yet we're here till the end. You can know that I'm going to be here, but not because the structures of society and being role mates force me to be. We start in level one as role mates. We then move to level two and become partners. And the actual expression of soul mates only begins a level three. That's where it actually begins to happen.

We actually awaken as outrageous lovers. Where we've moved into Unique Self and we create, not a partnership of level two, but a unique we. Because the level two partnership is to navigate life as successfully as we can. A unique we is two outrageous lovers who come together to give a gift that they can't give any other way. Now that gift might be having a child. It might be raising two children together. It might be starting a movement. It might be writing something together. It might be transforming each other into fullest expression of unique selves so we can bloom open reality just by our very being. But we're committed, we're in devotion. We have shared values at level three. We have a shared vision at level three. We don't come together to survive. We don't come together just to create comfort.

So a level one man provides security. A level one woman seduces. A level two man and woman, they don't seduce or secure – they interest. They have to interest each other. They've got to provide interest. Shared interest. They've got to be able to talk about shit. Level three enchants. Enchants. It's a whole different invitation. So that this vision of level one, level two, level three. And level three is actually beyond Venus and Mars. We've each realized our hieros gamos. We're awake as god and goddess.

We're in deep devotion to the evolution of love. We're playing a larger game. We understand that we have unique gifts to give as a "we," and we're in a Unique Self relationship. That's Unique Self relationship. We're in a Unique Self relationship where we're each serving each other in full devotion. We each call forward the most epic and extraordinary version of the other. And that's why we're in this relationship. Because by you seeing – you see, in my face, the most epic and extraordinary vision of who you are.

So what you find in my face isn't just security. It's not just a great talking partner. You find, in my face, the most epic and extraordinary version of who you are.

And you can play with me the full power of your native matrix – let's say you're a line – in the full power of your circle. God and goddess have awakened. That's the evolution of love. That's never happened before in history. It's never happened before in history. Stunning. It's stunning. This is where we're going. This is the future of love. This is where we're going.

Let's just breathe that in. We're going to be finished in about four minutes, five minutes. And just, in silence of presence, just form a circle in the room. Just leave our notebooks wherever they are. Just form a circle. Just move stuff enough away to form a circle, and let's hold, beloveds, I'm just going to get everyone to really make the practice to hold the ritual space. We'll hold the silence of presence, and we'll just create a circle in the room. Thank you, thank you.

And we're going to start a chant as we organize. And we're going to start with the first chant that we started with, because this is a celebration. Does everyone feel like this is a celebration? We just landed something in reality that is literally a new emergent that never existed in history before. So we are in celebration. The earth in the sky, hieros gamos. And by the way, the earth, in some visions, is Mother Earth, and the sky is the line. But in other Egyptian versions, it's reversed. See what I mean? Don't get too closely attached. But this is what we're doing, earth and sky. It's a celebratory chant because we're in total, absolute, radical celebration.

And let's just – we need a little clapping here, a little energy. Let's celebrate together. It's not celibate, it's celebrate. Whoo! And just in. It's going to take about nine minutes. Every person has just ten seconds. Just give it to us. Give it to us. Give us one word. Just one word. Not a sentence. Just a word or two of we appreciate our space and, what is it you want to let go, either?

[00:35:00]

Shout out what you want to let go, in order to make your unique hieros gamos work. Or what's the quality that you want to amplify? So not a speech, not a conversation. Just a word of appreciation. You don't have to do both. Either what you want to let go, or what you want to amplify.

Amen. Beautiful. Mark, deep appreciation to the partnership between Shalom Mountain and the Center. And the depth of that, and the seamlessness of that, and the goodness of that. And to Nance for holding the deep integrity, to Vyana for the leading, and to everyone in the room that's just really partnered in all the ways, and at all the moments that I'm not even aware of. The kind of people act to protect the space, and to create the space.

My intention is very particular and specific. Our next Wisdom School is November 5th, next year. There's one topic – as Nance whispered in my ear – that we didn't get to, which we didn't talk about the line in the circle in sexuality. So what we're going to be doing November 5th is essentially reloaded – lines and circles reloaded – with the lines and circles in sexuality. And how they play in

sexuality. So just to get a sense. So how many people can generally intend to be here? General intention? Okay, awesome. So we'll try and get another 50 people and we'll be able to expand. So that's completely awesome.

[Chants]

My friends, it doesn't get better.

[Chants]

She dances among us.

[Chants]

Let's blow it open.

[Chants]

Find someone's eyes in the sangha.

[Chants]

It gets deeper.

[Chants]

We're just beginning.

[Chants]

Sahana, I got the name right.

[Chants]

And you own me an email, Rosemary.

[Chants]

Jessabelle

[Chants]

It gets deeper every time.

[Chants]

And Shalom and Kabala is the merger of lines and circles, of course.

[00:40:00] [Chants]

It goes deeper.

[Chants]

_____ 40:14.

[Chants]

Oh my God.

[Chants]

Wild-haired woman.

[Chants]

So awesome to see you again.

[Chants]

Judy.

[Chants]

Holy brother, Eric. Shalom, shalom.

[Chants]

To the god and goddess in the center of the circle.

[Chants]

And to anyone who's not here, but needs to be.

[Chants]

Invite them, bring them in.

[Chants]

Thank you, holy sister.

[Chants]

Four more times, and the fourth time we're done.

[Chants]

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. So it is. Amen. Deep bow to the god and goddess in the center of the circle.