

# *Pathwork*<sup>®</sup> Steps

## **About the Fear of Loving**

Pathwork Lecture 72

Transcript of 2009 video presentation by Jan Rigsby

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dwqS6xXEKU> 1 hr 45 minutes

Transcribed and edited by Cynthia Ann Morgan

Welcome. This is May 2, 2009 and this is Pathwork teleconference on Pathwork lecture 72 about *the Fear of Loving*.

Welcome to you all. When I work with people, I like to start with the positive. you've got a lecture title that says about the fear of loving. And it's very easy to focus on the fear, which is what we will do, because that is the problem. But before we do that, I'd like to spend a few moments to stress the positive because it can get forgotten. I don't spend a lot of time on it, but it's important to remember.

In my usual joking way, you're on this teleconference because you care about something. This lecture may not be your favorite, but you care about something. You're here for a reason you are called to explore or investigate. You're on a spiritual path. That may include some of the Pathwork lectures. You've got an interest in learning.

When I say spiritual path that encompasses every aspect of who you are. And you have an interest in life. By life, I mean that you're not satisfied with negativity in your life, whether it is a large portion and for me of us when we're in crisis, it is a large part. There are time periods where it looks like a very, very huge, deep, dark storm.

Then there are time periods where most things are good, but a few things bother us, but they're relatively minor. Either way, if you're on a spiritual path, if you're reading spiritual books and listening to spiritual tapes and doing whatever you can, there's a positive intentionality there to change. If you're in stasis, if you're stuck, there's a desire to free yourself. If you're in contraction, or feel that you're overwhelmed with negative events, you're looking for turning that around to the positive and going into some form of expansion.

I know that whenever anybody comes to me, what I find is that I hold a real solid view of the positive. I sometimes forget to communicate that. I thought I would start there.

Let's start with the positive of about the fear of loving. That is that we want to love, that we're interested in what would hold us back, even if we don't feel it in our daily lives.

I want to keep stressing this - *just because you don't feel, it doesn't mean it's not happening*. Just because it's a small part of your life, does not mean that you don't have the right to focus on that. I call it cranking down the microscope. If you've got a fairly good life and you look around, I'd say everything's good. Let's call that 10x magnification. What people do is they crank up the magnification, they look a little deeper, because they've got the time and the emotional reserves to do so.

When you crank up from 10x to 100x, you see a lot more. For a period of time, this can be overwhelming. You can really feel like you've opened the floodgates, "*oh my god, what is this?*". Simply because you've opened a level of awareness.

You've opened up two aspects of spirituality that you haven't seen before. If you haven't seen them, they're cluttered. They have cobwebs; they have dust bunnies. You've been storing things there that you didn't even know about.

There's a quality in our lives: once we do address something, we might realize that it needed more attention than we anticipated. We want to hold the positive at that point; that's simply the *overwhelm of awareness*. But without awareness, you really can't do anything.

I'm going to stress again, the importance of lecture 127, which is the four stages of evolution. And what lecture 127 talks about is that we're in a period that the Guide calls automatic reflex, which is basically being unconscious of what's going on around us.

Now, that is not your entire life. different aspects of your life are in different stages at different times. This is a fluid organic thing; it doesn't ever get stuck. In the first stage, as described, you've got automatic reflex.

The second stage is massive. It is awareness. It's not all or nothing. It's a process. There's an opening of the eyes and a realization as you look around what's going on. But at that stage, you do not have understanding.

Understanding is the third stage. Understanding starts, the moment you open your eyes. But it takes a while because you need awareness to trigger you into searching or talking or seeking or getting information.

It's like walking; there's one step and then the other and one step and the other and then you get into a cadence, where walking becomes easy. You can walk quickly or slowly, you can skip, you can run, you can jog, but there's always a one-two: *awareness which leads to understanding*

When the understanding is complete, you slip into a knowing. In that place, you may not need to work on that area for a period of time. You may never need to work on it again. For some of you, you may have slipped through some of the parts of this lecture that are discussed, you may have slipped into knowing about them. But there may be other sections that you have not. I want to stress that this is very, very fluid.

When we talk about the subject for some of you, you'll get 3% of information from this lecture for others we'll get 60% in terms of level of interest, (that's probably a silly way to describe it as percentage..., please let that go).

What I'm getting at is that even if you read a lecture, where you feel that you have knowing, a deep knowing and the lecture reflects a part of your life, that works very, very well. You may never go back to the lecture. But what's been expressed to me by people is that *it's very gratifying to read in words, what you may have known, but not have personally been able to express.*

In all four areas of the four stages of evolution, the lectures can be read, and they can be useful. Now, the funny part is, in automatic reflex, you may read it, but not get it. It's as if you're dumb as a post; you just you read it and say "*I don't get it*".

Another thing that can happen when you're on automatic reflex (what that means is you're unconscious of the connection with the lecture) you hear the words, but they're not coming in. You can read it and say, "*I simply don't understand*". You can also be reading and just realize that you're on page five and you really haven't taken it in. You start over, but it doesn't come in. At its worst, what happens is you fall asleep while reading the lecture. In the tapes of Eva giving her lectures, sometimes you can hear people snoring, because a lot of people fell asleep while she was lecturing. What the Guide said was - *let them be unless they're disturbing you, because they may need to not be conscious to hear my words.*

In other words, when the people were going into this state of unconsciousness, it wasn't really sleep. The personality got out of the way and the words could go in. But there wasn't yet a connection between the unconscious and the conscious.

When that connection happens, that's called awareness. If you read the lectures from a place of automatic reflex, you may feel a nagging sense of - "*I'm not getting it*". It is still useful to read. There's something going on, there's a connection there.

If you read it in awareness, the lecture can feel very painful. There's a joke about freshmen doctors, who are freshmen in medical school and they, as they read each disease, they start seeing the symptoms and themselves, and they think they have

tuberculosis and arthritis and all these terrible diseases because they're learning what's an ache and what's the problem.

The same thing goes with spirituality. You can read something - "*Oh my God, that's me. That's everything*". And I'm inviting you to see that that could simply be a sensitivity, because you have come into a lot of awareness about it. But you haven't quite found your feet yet. You haven't quite found a beginning of understanding yet.

Awareness is a very, very painful stage. But it's absolutely necessary to go into the next couple of steps. When I do these presentations, I know you can read the lectures, I know that you can get a percentage, I don't know how much. What I focus on is helping you connect a little bit more deeply with what the lectures mean, in terms of real life - *What does it feel like? What does it look like?*

The Guide does an extraordinary job of doing that. But there's only so much time, there's only so many words, so much paper. That's what I hope to be able to add to this. That's a summary of the four stages of evolution and how you might see where it applies to you on a given lecture.

Starting again, with the positive, that you've got a positive intentionality if you're doing anything regarding spirituality.

Secondly, there's a positive in the sense that even if you stumble, even if you fail X amount of times, even if you're not adept at this - *it's important to honor the soul movement.*

By soul movement, what I mean is you may have an Eros to learn something. And the phase of learning is very difficult. When we're learning something, we don't do it instantaneously or perfectly. My invitation is to hold yourself with love here because you may be in a new space. You may be seeing things from a perspective that you haven't seen things before. And it needs a little practice.

If you can simply rely on your positive intentionality and allow the soul movements being Eros towards something, or thoughts. Not thinking, not intellectualism, but thoughts, free flowing thoughts, and of course feelings. If you're attracted to something, if you enjoy something, see if you can honor that.

Now at the same time, we look for other things because you can enjoy something, but it's got problems or it takes you away from your work. This is the reality of everyday life. Each one of us will find a different balance with this. If we honor the positive, then we'll do what we can, as often as we can. I invite you to see where that leads you, rather than worrying about how much further you should go, or that

you don't understand certain things, it will come. That is my experience, it will come.

The third aspect of staying with the positive is that negativity ultimately is boring. It can be juicy and fun for a while because it's naughty and dangerous. Because you get reactions out of people and because it makes it negativity can make you feel powerful. It's like you punch people out with your emotions or your anger or your irritation. You fluff the featherbed, you shake the duma, you move things and that feels better than being still and stuck.

Ultimately, there's not much point to negativity. When people are in a negative phase when they're full of anger and rage, it's important to go ahead and not allow them to let it go. But to understand that there's a pent-up quality there that needs to move and the movement is positive.

The movement of negativity will ultimately run out of steam. It can't last. It's boring. The Guide says that in the lecture on the plan of salvation, he says that the *ultimate inevitability of salvation is where else you got to go*. You can only be with the devil for a while. The real work and the real excitement and the real passion and Eros comes from finding our divine center and that's not part of the negative experience.

The other thing is that *negativity tends to be stasis or contraction*. Now, there's also an expansion quality, but it's more of a forcing current quality. And only having two things to do is boring. If you're stuck, there's a positive quality to being stuck. And that is eventually you will want to move; Stuckness can be a spiritual experience. Contraction - how far are you going to contract and go into a black hole and then what do you do after that? *Whereas life is about all three*.

I described life as like breathing, you breathe in, you expand, you breathe out and your chest contracts to push the air out. And most of us have one or two places in that cycle where we pause, and that is stasis. But you can't hold stasis in your breathing and live. You cannot expand forever, and you cannot contract forever. I offer this as something that was taught to me as a very useful model to look at life with; that there will be periods of expansion and they will alternate with some contraction. There may be periods of stasis. Stasis is not quite the same as stuck unless you stay there too long.

Again, what I'm talking about is I'm talking about seeing the positive in whatever work you're doing instead of judging, or worrying or fearing that you're in the wrong place at the wrong time doing the wrong thing.

This is where the Guide says - *your life does not lie, and that the plan is perfect*. I think that is a concept that underlies this lecture. And I'll bring that up a couple of times in this. That is starting with the positive.

The Guide starts the lecture by talking about the fact that the issues about the fear of loving, emanate from the immature parts of us. By that he means that the ability to love is a sign of maturity, and vice versa. maturity allows you to love. *The dilemma with loving is that as a child, we feel that we have to have love to live*. And there's a reality in that.

*It is true that we have to have love to live as a human being*. As a child, we see other people being able to give love and we may not perceive ourselves as capable of giving; we may not have that consciousness yet. We perceive other people as able to give love, and we need love to survive. Therefore, our job becomes to get love. There's a natural evolution in a child of recognizing the positive of love and trying to gain it or magnify it. If we get a little bit, it's yummy and we will more. And if it's yummy, and we want more, we start seeing where other people seem to have the ability to take love away from us. This translates to - *Oh my God, I'm going to need to assure that I get enough of what I need*.

Remembering that we're talking about a child consciousness here, but the perfection of being a human being is we all go through that. We just don't become little Buddhists, most of us, when we're three. We're usually going along one version or another of the same levels of development. Some of us get into more trouble than others. But that's just the breadth of our experience.

As a child, we see that what we must do is we must get love, we must control it. We must grab it. We must get people to give it to us. What that generates is a sense that they have to surrender to us. If we believe that they must surrender to us so that we can get love, on an unconscious level, we may believe that for us to give love, we need to surrender. Perhaps you can see the confusion that this causes.

The getting of love, the reaching out and trying to grab it, that's a power move. Surrendering is not seen by the child as a power move. The child's experience of surrender will result in nothing.

The Guide talks about love, to some degree or another, is a matter of surrender. *Love about giving without a forcing current without a demand, without an agenda - to simply love*. In that action, we are not attempting to gain power over another. That is a surrender. Then it is very hard for the child consciousness to understand that - that's an adult thing. It's a long-term goal and children, their heads are not

designed like that. They aren't developed enough to see the long-term goals - like eat your vegetables and you'll be healthy. It just doesn't work for kids.

We want love and the human development is to learn that there's another step to that. The step one - we want love. Step two is we both want to give love and to get, you have to give. I don't know whether that's chicken and egg stuff, but there's a there's a place where some of us learn to love because we can't get away with not loving. We don't come willingly to the table, we come because that's the game and we have to play. But that's okay too. That's why the learning stage a place where you do it by rote before you do it out of your heart.

I remember as a child, my mother wanted me to write thank you notes. As a child, sometimes I just didn't know how, sometimes the gift wasn't perfect. I didn't want to - from a child's perspective *why should I thank you. I didn't like it.* From a child's perspective, I want to go play with my toy and I want to sit down and write letters to Auntie. It's important as a parent to teach your child appreciation and gratitude even though at first it will come out as - *Dear Auntie, thank you for the toy, love Me.* Better than nothing. The process of learning that builds over time. At some point, we might sit down and write a genuinely heartfelt, loving letter to someone who went out of their way, does a favor, gave us a gift or made our heart sing.

It's a process. Loving is also a protest. Alright, maybe it is a protest, I was trying to say was: *Love is a process - to learn to love is not something that comes intuitively naturally and fully in its mature state.*

In its immature state, it may need to be pulled in to loving through ritualistic thank you's and taking care-of's, rather than being a natural emanation of the heart. But that's okay.

Now, the dilemma that I face so is that people think they're supposed to grow up by the time they reach 18 or 21. While that may be true on a physical level, on a social level, you should take 5 or 10 years more time before they are well ensconced in society. On a spiritual level, it's not uncommon for it to take another 10, 20 or 30 years.

The ability to love is so massive and phenomenal and awesome, that it doesn't surprise me that it would take 50, 60 years to learn, and certainly that long to master. To master something, you have to work on it. Of course, you would start working on it from the day you were born.

What I'm speaking of here is that the *fear of loving stems from an immature place in us*, a place of child consciousness, where we perceive that we have to give to get and

we only give to get, that are giving as a control play, a power play, rather than necessarily an emanation from the heart. They're always movements of love from the heart. I'm talking about the troubled areas where we're playing a game so that we can win. What we want to win is love.

The second thing that the Guide goes into is submission. Because in this power game, some of us feel that we can stamp our foot and get what we want, even when it regards love. Okay, that's a personality type. I guess it works for some people and never has worked for me.

The majority of people, when they're seeking something as precious as love, tend to fall into submission. You can step up and demand a job, or your turn at bat, or your place at the table or your share of the pie. But commanding love doesn't work as well as perhaps we in our immaturity might like it to work. Usually what happens is we turn into a submissive game, where we're trying to con love out of the other. Anytime you are, once again, in the in the *power* deal, you're saying - *I'll give it to you, because I want you to give it to me*. But that's a straight, upfront transaction.

In submission, you're giving in order to get, but you're pretending that you're only giving. This is also an extremely immature stage that all of us go through. I think I'm sure I did it two days ago, it never quite fades away. Submission is always false. It looks unselfish because it was designed to look unselfish. It was deliberately set up to look as if we're being unselfish.

What we're asking the other to do, is make a sacrifice for us because, we're not thinking of their welfare, we're thinking of how do we get the love, and we want the love like a prize. Submission is not an equal sacrifice. We're not in surrender. We're not being open. We're certainly not giving up something that we care that much about. *Submission is a way of keeping all the things you want, and figuring out what you could offer*. The sacrifice is a petty kind of sacrifice.

It's as if you're playing a chess game, and you decide that you can give away five pawns, but you don't give them away because you don't care. You're sacrificing the pawns (which is a wonderful term- to sacrifice your pawn) in order to win the game. That's what submission really looks like.

It's a tactic where we are attempting to get; We know that if we raise our fist and stomp our feet, we won't get it. We attempt to schmooze, we attempt to convince the other person that their interests are our interests, and that we fully and completely support them. The prize is love what we want from them as love.



Now, in both of these cases, there's not a large interest here in giving love. Part of that is due to maturity. Giving love is a very mature thing to do. But part of it is due to when your focus is on getting, your focus is not on true giving. It's on sacrificial or fake giving. Giving to get. I'm going to pause here for a second ask if there's any questions.

The other aspect of the lecture focuses on defenses. Now the lecture doesn't go into defenses to too much degree. I wanted to expand that a little bit. Because defenses are easy to miss, especially in the most subtle places. I don't normally deal with people who have just robbed banks. I don't normally deal with people who have just abandoned 10 of their children, or there's a degree of being in life and doing things that doesn't lead to spiritual reflection. It's not uncommon that the people that I work with are fixated to me degree. I use that in a positive sense. They're very, very tightly focused on some pieces of negativity that don't seem like much, perhaps even to others.

The defenses I'm going to talk about are a subtle form of defense. The first one, the Guide talks about submission in the lecture and then in the following lecture, he talks about three different styles of preventing loving. I'll go there in a moment. This is all based on the triad that is formed based on lecture 43, which is the three personality types of reason, will and emotion. Just for convenience, we knocked that down to RWE. Then I tried to build charts and so forth where I'm constantly doing the R first and then the W and then the E. I tried to put the reason quality first, and the real quality second and the emotion quality third. It doesn't always work.

In this triad of personality types (the charts are on the website), there is a corresponding type of style associated with the defenses. There is a corresponding gift associated with the different types. Types are a very crude and broad way of separating styles of operating. Nobody's a type, we're all mixtures. Sometimes on the chart, if you go down and you're trying to say – “*I'm like that, but I'm like that, but I'm like that* - you can zigzag on there.

To be a human being, you've got will. Will is not an option. There isn't anybody on the planet who doesn't have will; it takes will to get born. I won't go into it but you had to ask to be here. Asking is an act of will. It takes some energy to stay on the planet. And not just lay in the street, give up and die. It takes a lot of will to build a life, to furnish a home on any degree whatever, to find a job or profession, to make friends, to stay connected, all of these - you can feel there has to be something that gets you up in the morning, something that moves you, something that makes you take the book off the shelf. Without will, you can't just say to the shelf - could you bring the book over here? We don't have those powers yet. We have to get up off the couch. We have to go over to the bookcase and find the book. I'm sure that

many of you have had the experience of not finding the book; you look at another shelf and finally, you're in the closet tearing apart cartons, saying - *I know I have that book.*

That's your willpower saying - *I want this and I will do whatever it takes to get it.* No matter how quiet and calm. I was trying to think of a word but I can't come up with anything that's serious... I come up with mousy. No matter how quiet and calm someone is, every human on the planet has will.

When we're in our defenses, the person who has a reason style of working with the world, may tend to rationalize things. That's one of their defenses. I'm not talking about being reasonable. I'm talking about rationalizing. I'm saying that the reason type will try to make the facts fit the situation. *Notice the try to make; that's the will element.* They want to list, they want an orderly set up, they want to understand and they don't want jarring bits of dissonance in the information that they're dealing with.

The will type might over or under emphasize something. The will type might use their will to say - *this is important and this is what we should be doing. Or that's not important. Stop that. That's not important.* They're using their will in trying to influence both themselves and others about what to do and when to do it. And also, what not to do.

The emotion type tends to over dramatize or over exaggerate. The emotion type tends to care a lot more; they whip up the caring. They throw a lot of emphasis into something and say - *Oh, this is so much fun. And this is so great. This makes me feel so happy. Surely this is a good thing to do.* Instead of accepting that, it may or may not. It may just have a little bit of pleasure or a little bit of fun. But I'm talking about the defense. In the defense, we use feelings. We use thought and we use our determination in order to take things in a certain direction.

We're talking about the fear of loving; we've talked about loving. Now we're talking about defenses. Next, we'll talk about fear. But I still want to talk about the defenses for a moment.

One of the set of defenses has to do with *how your personality style operates in the world.* Another defense is to compartmentalize and all three types do this. The first part was explaining how there might be three different ways but from this point on, the other three defenses that I want to speak of can work with any personality type. That's just a matter of how you display the defense rather than what the defense actually is.

In terms of compartmentalizing, what I'm referring to here, is when we feel that there's an area in us that is not well developed, we may wall it off. We may segregate it so it doesn't spill over into our life. An example would be, if we have a problem with relationship, we might choose a work environment that is not relationship oriented, where we're either working independently, or we're working more with linear matters - rules and regulations - rather than human interchange.

On the other hand, if there was a dilemma with linear thinking, we might have to do that at some point in our lives, but we might set up our lives that we have a lot more places where we are joyous and fun, having pleasure, interacting with others, that doesn't involve too much linear thought.

This is what I mean by *compartmentalizing*. What happens here, and the reason I'm calling it a defense, is that it's useful to not have your weaknesses showing up every five minutes. But when we compartmentalize, there's a tendency to either forget about that compartment or not work on it. Basically, leave it as an orphan; abandon it, ignore it. By ignoring it, it seems like 75% of our lives in good shape. Now, why would we spend our time over here with 25% that has never worked, always aggravates us and tends to result in failure. Why would we work there? We'll do that when we have to. You'll have 75% of your life in good shape. (I'm only using that percentage as an example.) The more we ignore that 25% the more toxic it becomes. And the bigger the chances that it will spill over into the rest of your life.

You cannot compartmentalize your life. *You cannot Ignore one aspect of your emotional and spiritual growth without eventually affecting the rest of your life.* This is one of the spiritual laws that we'll talk about the next teleconference.

Another defense that we use is selective memory. I've never met anybody that doesn't do this. I do it all the time. You just don't remember the embarrassing parts. You don't remember where you made mistakes; you tend to remember the happy times; you tend to remember the positive times depending on your personality. Another person might choose to remember nothing but the negatives. When we have selective memory, it depends on what you're trying to do as to how you selected. I started off saying that somebody might only choose pleasant memories to remember. Well, that doesn't work, because now you're only remembering a part of an event. They may be doing that because they can't handle the negative events or the confusing events.

It's similar to compartmentalizing, it's just a little bit different. In compartmentalizing, you might wall off your job, or you might wall off your taxes, but it's a whole category. In selective memory, we're going around pruning. We're

taking two pieces of this event and three pieces of that event, and four pieces of that event, that we manage not to remember.

There's a pattern to that. Selective memory tends to fall down a pattern. I do tend to only remember the good parts or the bad parts. Now, why would you only remember the bad parts? That goes back to overdramatizing, over exaggerating. There's a place where you can exaggerate your faults so much that everybody says, *it's not that bad, leave it alone*. And that's what we're after. It's as if we're begging for validation that we can put it down.

Whereas, we remember the happy parts that might make us more welcome to a crowd of people and more enjoyable to be around. The more that happens, the more we're not going to be encouraged to bring up the distressing memories, the awkward memories.

A lot of family stories revolve around the reality that, in many families, meals are meant to be happy times. But there are problems in families. When you have a free flowing, open discussion around the dinner table, you're going to get a mixture of the good stuff and the bad stuff. In a family where you're not allowed to talk about problems, the good stuff is no longer natural and spontaneous. It's all there is. It tends to inherit a forcing current; it's all we can talk about. If we want to talk at the table, we need to come up with something positive, or we have to put a positive spin on something. Whereas normally, our balance might be that there's some good and bad to it. But we've been restricted from talking about the negative.

In other families, the only thing people want to do is carp and complain and gossip. That feels juicy and interesting to them. They don't want to talk about positive events or positive situations. It can go either way. I'm talking about selective memory, and how we will prune and adjust our memories depending on a lot of different circumstances.

Now, why are these defenses? Because once you do that, you may actually lose track of some of this. When you *compartmentalize* your life, you may conveniently forget about that until you were face to face with at one time. When you use *selective memory*, you may not be able to recall the entire event easily because you haven't repeated it as you tell the story. The fewer and fewer times you tell the events that you want to ignore, the dimmer your recollection of them could become.

This is a place where we can train ourselves not to remember, literally train ourselves not to know. If you're not thinking about these things, it prevents awareness. *This is a place where we can create lack of awareness, simply by setting up patterns of behavior.*

The last one I want to talk about is something that I use a lot, which I tend to get excited about some particular kinds of defenses and human behaviors. This is one that I get excited about. What I tease about is, I know when I'm being very grabby and enthusiastic and where I have a lot of energy and passion. I call it being on my soapbox. I identify that. Once I identify it, I tend to not be as preachy, as perhaps I would be. Other people understand - *she's on her soapbox, just give her a minute or two, she'll get off*. This is a soapbox for me. It's a process that I have termed baselining, simply because it's handy to have a name. The process is that we pick up the story from a convenient starting point. That does not allow us to include the entire reality. When I'm working with people, very often they'll start from the crisis. *"I got home and I opened the letter and he left me"*. That is the place they want to work from - how they felt. what happened, the argument, the next day.

In baselining, I just notice that that does not happen out of the blue. And *what I'm trying to track back to is a place where they can have an awareness of choice that they made* that led, it wasn't totally responsible, but it led to this moment.

There's a place where we may have chosen to focus on our job to the detriment of our relationship. Three days later, probably not; three months later, maybe not. But three years later, or 30 years later, we may have gone down a road that partially excludes our partners to the point where they're not feeling engaged with us. One of the things people do when they don't feel engaged as they go find someplace to engage themselves in. Now, you can imagine (let's use a figure of five years) if that took five years; if you go back six months at a time, you can still find what the other person might be acting out. The linear story might make them look like they're doing something wrong. But the Guide lectures talk about the fact that we are 50% responsible in a relationship. I'm looking back and back and back saying - *where was your part in this?*

Sometimes we can find a place where a decision was made, from which the result that we're looking at, the crisis that we're looking at, had some level of inevitability because we never went back and looked at that decision. We didn't have awareness of that decision after that point. When I talk about baselining, *I'm talking about going back farther from the story where we can take responsibility*.

Now, on a spiritual level, it's one of the reasons I love Pathwork. Because Pathwork takes the baseline back beyond conception. It takes baselining back beyond our conscious memory. I like that, because I accept the fact that life is so complicated, that it may well have invisible factors that we can't know, in the way that we know what grandmothers said to us three years ago.

We may not know our karmic balance on the spiritual level. We may not realize that we're dealing with a lot of negativity. For instance, to make up for having taken advantage of people in a previous life, we can't know this. Knowing that there are *invisible factors*, allows some personally to accept that life can be a little un-linear, irrational, confusing, because I don't have all the facts. *That doesn't absolve me from responsibility*. It means I can only go back so far.

There are some people who can go back to age two in their childhood and remember things; I can't. If you go back to age two, and you remember a lot of details about your family dynamics, it's easier to work out how you became the person you are. For other people who don't have a lot of memory before the age of seven or eight. They have to rely upon family stories, of course, being told by other people who may be using compartmentalization, selective memory, or over dramatization or any of these other things in telling the story.

If you don't have a distinct memory of something and you're relying on someone else, there's a place where we need to hold that very, very softly because it may have a grain of truth in it. It may have a lot of truth in it, and it may have the other person's perception. What I'm talking about here is in *baselining*, what I try to do is go back to that person's conscious memory from which events tumble forward from that point on.

I speak of this in terms of how we defend from loving. This is part two, by the way, about the fear of loving - Pathwork, lecture 72. It's the first time in a long time when I haven't actually got to the body of the lecture until the second half. I realized that when I was making notes, because it was important to explore loving. It was important to explore the different types of defense before we put that together with fear and threaded the whole thing together.

The quality of fear, in terms of loving, begins with what are discussed initially about an *immature sense that loving is going to cost us*. We don't know what it's going to cost us. There's a little reservation about total surrender. In that little bit of reservation, we are not totally open, we're not totally free and we're not giving. If like attracts like, if we're going into a loving situation, and it does not matter whether this is a friendship, or a business partnership, or a personal relationship, or even spiritual work. If we enter into a relationship with a withholding inside us, we're probably not going to get the full value of that relationship because we're cloaked.

We're walled off from some of the aspects of that relationship. Now there's a quality where people would say - *yes, isn't that sensible?* Well, we're not talking about sensible here. We're talking about a spiritual quality of love. The spiritual quality of love and the spiritual quality of surrender does not mean you do everything you're

told. That's submission. The spiritual quality of love does not mean you don't get anything. That's sacrifice. It's usually a sacrifice to get you do without because you're trying to get. It's not real.

*When we enter into a spiritual place of loving, if we've never been there before, we may be afraid of the unknown.* That's really what the core of the lecture is about, we are terrified of loving, because most of us have never sustained a loving relationship that was truly open and flowing, knowing that we're human, and it's never like that. But if it's Swiss cheese, it's pretty good. There's a lot of flow and a lot of opening and not areas poked off.

Most of us have never experienced a deep and loving relationship as adults, as conscious beings. We may have experienced it as a child, but that only adds the desire to have it again. But you can't go back to that intimate relationship with your mother or caretaker; that's over. That was an artificial time of life where you had to have that to survive. It was given to you out of necessity as much as it was given to you out of love. Then when your mother could walk off, could leave you alone for a while, could leave you in the care of others, or could let you go to school and play with other children, so she could do other things in her life. Then she's progressing to the point where she's not holding on to you and spending all her time holding you 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It's a natural progression. That's what happens.

As we lose this deep loving relationship that we thought was all love, and no necessity, (I'm bringing in the fact that it's a necessity for human infant to be loved like that), as we go out into the world - we find people aren't quite as willing to give to us. That experience is somewhat unique. A mother might give to her child absolutely and completely for a period of time. But ultimately, the child grows and finds other needs and the mother also grows and finds other needs or has other responsibilities.

When we meet up other people, they're not going to care for us the way our mother did. In the sense of wanting that deep and complete love with actually seeing the other person give, or all we did was behave naturally. Then at seven, or 15, or 20, or 25, our behaving naturally may not attract the other person to that level of giving. That's where it starts, *where we feel that we gave, and we got taken advantage of because the balance wasn't something that we appreciated or understood.*

The truth is, if you over-give, the other person may over-give; but neither one of you can keep that up for a sustained period of time. Someone's going to retract first, trying to retract to a normal and organic level of giving for that but it first It feels like he got everything and now you're not getting everything. *Give me more.* This is not love. This is the beginning of a power struggle.

What I'm speaking of here is what the lecture says about the fear of loving. We are afraid of love, because we really want to get something that we had experienced or imagined. *We may not have experienced or truly imagined what it was like to give that freely.*

I came across some information that I added to the materials that are on the web. It was a short message from Emmanuel. Emmanuel uses as a medium, a woman, Pathwork helper named Pat Rodegast. I've always been very fond of Emmanuel. His message is tender and loving. He has an extraordinary quality of making you see fear as something else (of feeling fear as this thing, instead of you).

Emmanuel's words speak to me extent he speaks to you as if you were a child, but he's speaking to the undeveloped child in you, saying – *it's okay. It's all right.* He is a beautiful voice that I admire very much.

Pat Rodegast is now in a nursing home and has been diagnosed with dementia. Now, if you want, you can weep and moan about that and get all upset. It just is. The message she posted on her website is about the fact that she has come to peace with it; that she hasn't sink completely into dementia. And Emmanuel is still operating verbally. She has sound recordings on her website. And she's saying - *it's not so bad. It's not so bad to be at peace. My doctor said I couldn't drive and I've gotten used to that. And I have my place and I have my window.* She even says *there's these cute guys in the nursing home.* But that she is following the teachings that Emmanuel has been giving all these years of trying to find a place of not having fear about what has been offered to her. I use those terms, because a lot of life is seen as being put upon us. But the Pathwork lectures are very, very clear that nothing is put upon us.

*Everything we deal with in life is meant to draw out the best of us.* Sometimes, it involves a lot of crisis and strain. It's a beautiful message if you'd like to download the document again, I put it on as the last page. It's a beautiful message and it has a link to the website of this delicious woman in her 80s saying - *here I am. And it's another chapter in my life.*

I speak of that, because *fear itself is overrated.* That is ultimately the message that Emmanuel has for us. Here's a way of trying to understand that. Emmanuel speaks of *being in the now.* In the now, truly in the now, truly as I speak the words to you. I'm not in the past, setting up the event and making the phone calls, worried; I'm not with all that stuff. In this moment of now, I'm simply trying to impart information. There may have been some stress in the past, but the majority of fear is in projecting forward. *What if I hiccup? What if I need a glass of water? What if the power goes*



out? All this what-if stuff is about the future. Now, if you say - *well, aren't you worried about the power going out now?* The reality is it's not out now. It just isn't. It may go out in a few minutes, but if it does, it's not much I can do about it. You work with it. But the fear that that will happen, can disrupt your ability to be in the now. If I'm a nervous wreck now, because what I imagined might happen in 30 minutes or three days, then I'm not fully present now.

Fear has two elements that I'm describing to you. One is that *it works in the future*. Or *a what-if in the past that will extend into the future*. Because we can't know the future. It's playing a game with us. You know that thing you did three days ago? I'll bet you, it'll come back at you next week. Well, that's future. It's bouncing off the past, but it's actually prediction of what will happen in the future. You don't know that. It may be rational, it may be logical, but it's in the future. The future is something that we can impact. We can affect the future. We cannot necessarily affect the past. We can soften it, we can understand it, we can be at peace with it. But we don't change what happened in the past. The future has simply not happened.

In the fear of loving, it's about what will happen. On the premise that if you love, you will be powerless. How do you disprove that? Fear wins. *When fear works in the future, fear always wins. Because you cannot disprove the future.* But what you can do is be in the now, be in the moment and say - *that's not what exists now. Whatever comes at me, I will attempt to deal with an open heart. Yes, I may get hurt. But I may also find a closer bond with someone if I am not in defense.*

This is the core of this lecture. *By whipping up fear about what might happen, we prevent love from happening.* Because we go in halfhearted, we go into defended, and we go in with a belief (whether conscious or unconscious), that it won't work. But to get love, we have to submit; we have to overpower someone; we have to manipulate a situation. These are defenses.

One of the questions people ask is, *how do you know?* Well, that's where I do my Chicken Little imitation of the sky is falling, the sky is falling. What do you do with the phrase like that? What do you do with a phrase like, he'll take advantage of you? She just wants your money. He doesn't love you as much. *What do you do with that?*

If you react to the fear, and start your defenses, again, you will assure that you will not be open as open as you might be to the situation, and you might not be able to hear the truth. It is possible that the other person does not have a strong sense of ethics. Let me rephrase that. It may be true, that the other person does not hold your ethical standards. But the only way to find that out, is to be in connection with that person. The other truth is they may want to hold a stronger ethical connection, but

that could be an error that they're working on. A person is not an incident. They are a hologram. They are divine being. They are huge. They are complex. They are magnificent. We all have flaws. It is possible that you are attracting this person into your life because you hold the key to ethical behavior and that's an area they want to work on. In generosity, you could look at *where do I not fulfill my own expectations where they do...look at that there's a balance*. It's a yin yang. They could use help here and I could use help there. That's the basis for a relationship. Not that you must lock into that. But the essence of a relationship is that you have interests to share back and forth with each other. Sometimes those interests are the areas where you need support and help.

Think of it like a friendship. You are friends with somebody who is just exactly like you. You may have such a friendship, because you feel validated; because it makes you feel worthy; because you feel stronger about yourself. You may also have a friendship with someone who is antithetical to everything you are because it allows you to go into areas you've never explored before. It allows you to hear things you've never heard before. Their critiques are something that you may not have been aware of. And vice versa, you are showing them something.

It's not that there is one way to do a relationship. If you're attracted to someone, if you wish to engage in relationship, by understanding that your fear may come from an immature place. Your fear may be pandering to the lowest, least mature part of you – saying - *take care, take care, let's not give everything away*. That's not a loving statement. It may exist in you. You may have the feelings, but we don't have to act upon every feeling we've got. We don't have to honor every piece of consciousness that comes from us. Because some of the things that come out of us are in distortion.

Our job as adults, and especially as spiritual adults, is *to notice that not everything we say is true*. Not everything we say is spiritually mature. Not everything we say is worthy or worthwhile. sometimes we babble. There's nothing wrong with babbling, identified as babbling and say they're just nervous. They just need to talk for a while and then they'll get serious. Well, some of our immaturity is can be like that. To some extent, you can say to yourself - *I'm being a little bit immature. I notice it there. I want to do something about it. I'm going to observe and hold back a little bit on that partly, I'm not going to act it out. I'm not going to give permission to run my life. I will notice; it could a grain of truth in it*. The child part of us can be intuitively aware of distortions in other people, yet interpret based on a child consciousness that we aren't aware of.

There's a television series on right now called *Lie to Me*. It's based on the work of Paul Ekman. I read about Paul Ekman, about three years ago. He worked with the

Dalai Lama and wrote a fascinating book about one of the Dalai Lama's conferences. I got involved and read a lot about it. This series is based on that. What I find interesting is, besides being somewhat educational in its dramatic format, about *how you can tell what someone is truly feeling, versus what they say they're feeling*. They're constantly giving an admonition and that is - we know they're lying, but we don't know why. The fact that someone is lying does not mean they're lying, for instance, because they're guilty. It simply means they're lying. You have one piece of information, but you want to be very careful about loading it with interpretation. I find it interesting because it's a very important factor to consider the information only as far as it goes, and to not allow it to expand based on prejudice or the desire to be expedient, or a fixed belief you might have about why somebody is behaving in a certain way.

Same thing goes for opening your heart and loving. If you see something that strikes you as odd or wrong or difficult, don't throw the noticing away. Don't throw the intuition away. But consider that part of being in a relationship is learn to communicate on a very sensitive and deep level with the other person. To attempt to find out what is this about, instead of judging (which is a defense), and deciding without talking to them what it's about, which is disrespectful of their process.

What I've been speaking of here is the fact that fear happens by projecting into the future where you cannot know whether it's right or wrong. It can impact what you do now, and what you do in the future based on evidence that isn't fair or real, and could come out of distortion.

In the lecture about the fear of loving, *the fear may be false*. The loving may be real and important and the fears of way of keeping us from loving. Whereas we may think that fear is helping us by keeping us safe. This is the one of the messages that fear whispers. Again, this is why Emanuel talks about fear a lot. *That fear whispers in your ear*. If fear whispers in your ear, and you act accordingly, you have given fear control of your life. If you let fear control your life: *how will you ever learn to deal with difficult situations? How will you learn to grow? Fear can always tell you - you won't grow, you won't be good enough*. Well, how do you ever overcome that if you don't move ahead. Now you can respect fear and say - *Yeah, I know I have a problem with reading. This job involves a lot of reading. I'll need to be careful here needs some support. I might need some tutoring. I might have to admit to my boss that periodically I'll need more time than they think is reasonable to accomplish an assignment. I don't think that disqualifies me from taking on the task because it's something I've dreamed of and I want*.

What I'm trying to show here is just listening to fear will invalidate your sense of what you want to do. It will prevent you from entering situations that have risk.

Growth and learning always involves risk. Entering into a loving relationship is perhaps the riskiest thing we do. Because truly getting to know someone means that we are open. When we are open, change is probable. *Fear is most afraid of change.* Fear wants to keep us small. Fear wants to keep you in one place so that it in its smallness, knows what's going on. All that means is that you lose out on opportunity. Again, speaking of the portion about fear in this lecture...are there any questions? I'm happy to answer. Or sharing?

There are two other sections that I wanted to talk about. One was *empowerment*. The other was the second lecture that I put in the materials, which is called the *three aspects that prevent loving*, which is just an extension of this.

I'm talking about empowerment. The Guide always has very simple and direct explanations. The Guide always has simple, straightforward suggestions for how to deal with issues. They are so simple that sometimes, we pass right by them, because they're almost vague in their simplicity. How do you do that? In this one, what the *Guide says - is when things go wrong, test your emotions*. When things go wrong, test your emotions. What that would mean is that if you've entered into a loving relationship and I want to stress over and over again, I call them big art and little art. There's the big intimate relationship with capital R that is very powerful and passionate. But every relationship you have with every other person on the planet is also a relationship. You can be in relationship to community. You can be in relationship with your profession. You can be in relationship with your home. It takes perhaps a little bit more imagination to see it that way, but you can practice relationship anywhere.

When things go wrong, test your emotions. If a situation becomes negative, or feels like it is destructive, or it's raising a lot of fear, a lot of anxiety, what the Guide says is, *sit down, relax, clear your mind for just a moment and notice*. Specifically, what he says is to notice the forcing currents.

In this particular lecture, what particular forcing currents can include feeling like you need to earn love. *If you need to earn love, then you're not being open to the loving that may be available to you.* You're trying to boost it up. Make it feel stronger. Make yourself feel more worthy of it, so that the experience is more intense. It's a form of barter. *Are you trying to buy love? Are you giving and doing in order to get?*

Now that's a very subtle feeling. If you're honest with yourself, if you sit down and *ask what am I've been doing? Where are the forcing currents?* I act out in my body, that's just who I am. I notice feelings and I follow with my hands. I do a lot of gesturing as you probably have noticed. I do that to emphasize for myself and for

others to dramatize the sense of emotion. If you feel like you're reaching out to somebody and wanting to grab that that's not necessarily loving now it's loving it. They're about to fall over cliff and you're pulling them back that's loving. But if you're trying to reach out and grab so you can get them closer to you, so you can feel better. *Is that loving of them?* On a deeper level, *is that loving of yourself? Do you really need to do that?*

A question you might ask is, am I constantly under estimating my values so that I'm always trying to look bigger and more important and more worthy than I feel that I am? The Guide goes into quite a bit of detail about this. That is our lack of confidence that we deserve love that makes us submit and try to power our way into loving relationships. if you're trying to earn love, or buy love, or command love. When the Guide says test your emotions, a good question is - *Is that a loving thing to do?* I have found that particular question extremely powerful. Not is that love, because love can be defined in many ways. But is that a loving thing to do?

When I feel a demand, and I ask, *is that loving*, and again, I've taken my hand and I've made a claw out of it. Is that loving? I don't think so. Okay, it doesn't, it really doesn't feel loving. It feels grabby, it feels full of fear. It feels manipulative. None of those qualities have anything to do with loving.

A lot of this work is totally and completely dependent on your ability and your willingness to be honest about what your feelings are. One of the things I do when I work with people, is I catch a feeling. Let's say that I asked the question, the person answers and it sounds rhythmic, like 1-2-3-4-5. And they want to stick with 3-4-5. I noticed 1-2. I noticed that for a moment the feelings went someplace else, but the mind, just as an example, hijacks those feelings. It says - *No, no, don't go over there. Come over here.* Well, the whole truth involves those initial feelings. It doesn't matter whether they're positive or negative. Your first feeling can be fear. Then you AHA, *I figured it out. I understand now.* That's how you behave in the world. But what about those first few moments when you were frightened? If you're grabbing hold of the situation, based upon fear, then the grab is going to be stronger. It's not going to be natural. It's not going to be organic. It's actually based on fear. It's important to notice those few moments of fear even if nanoseconds.

When the Guide says test your emotions; this is not a small thing. Testing your emotions can last the rest of your life, no matter how good you are at it; you just work on a finer and finer level. Spiritual growth: there's no end to spiritual growth. There's no prize, you're not going to finish it in this lifetime. But you can get good at it. Most people who are good at things, spend a lot of time. Now does this mean that you have to spend 24 hours a day doing this? No, it doesn't. You will be stunned at how good you can become at this. If you focused on it for half an hour to an hour a

day. Now you can start with a half an hour of meditation, you can start anywhere you want. At some point, what I find is most effective is when we have learned to do this, moments at a time. I want to call it in real-time.

When you go to the shop and you are transacting and the clerk forgets to ring up an orange you could let it go; it's only an orange. They'll never miss it. That may be true but from a spiritual perspective, to some degree, it's a stolen orange, and you know it. As small as that is, if it's a one-time deal, nobody's ever going to know or care. But you know whether it's a one-time thing, or whether you're saying – *good, I got an advantage in the store because I feel that they've overcharged me in the past and now I got a free orange.* That's not loving to society. That's not loving to the store. That's not loving to the inventory clerk who's got to figure out the shortfall. That's not loving on any level whatever. That's a power grab. Noticing that bit of glee, when you get the orange, is very, very important whether or not you identify it to the clerk at the time.

From my experience, I must admit that I used to let people over-give me change. I used to let them skip things and think that I was balancing some kind of scale. Sorry about that, but that's who I was. Then I went through a period of time remembering the four stages of evolution, where I became aware of what I was doing, very keenly aware. I started asking questions. I really asked myself, *what was that about? Do I really think I'm going to redress the world's problems by getting an extra orange in my pocket?*

I got to the place where it was personal decision where I knew it was wrong. I knew I wanted to do something about it. I remember the day that I picked up some dry cleaning that had some alteration. When we're looking at the bill (It had been written a little sloppy), she couldn't figure it out. Instead of charging me, she was afraid of overcharging me. She only charged me X amount of money. I took the dress home; it had been altered in a few places. I looked at the slip and I suddenly got it that I had asked for two alterations, and she only charged me for one. The difference was \$17.58, it wasn't just cents. I went back to the store a few days later, and I walked up to the cashier. I had exact change and I said, *I owe you \$17.58 cents.* She looked at me like I was crazy. *I owe you \$17.58.* She called her boss who happened to own the store. He comes over and I'm in a singsong place now. I just want to give them the money and go home. I owe you \$17.58, and I explained the whole thing and I showed them the ticket. I said *"I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cheat, but I did. It's a nice alteration. I appreciate so I owe you \$17.58."* The man looked at me and shook his head and says, *"No, that's okay. You keep it, very few people come back"*. I wouldn't have minded it a bit, giving him the money. It was a transaction, and I owed that money. Having been a business owner myself, I thought I understood where he was coming from. It's not the cheating that anyone

minds. It's that sense of grabbing and trying to get away with. A simple mistake happens sometimes. When we notice it and try to redress it, it's not important that you would redress it. He rather liked the idea that somebody had turned themselves in. I was willing to pay the money. He was glad to let go.

What I'm expressing here is in that tiny, mundane example. Was there a part of me that said, *well, that's their problem?* Of course, there was. I'm no more mature than anyone else is. I may handle it differently. But I've still got those thoughts coming up. For a moment, I thought, *good, I'm \$17 ahead.* Then I thought - *this is a small business and they did a good job and they took care of me. I don't want to cheat them.* In this mundane example of opening my heart and saying, *I want to be in balance, I want to be fair. I want to be right. I want to honor what you did for me; I want to pay my bill.* I went back and the man wouldn't take my money. What I'm trying to express is that you'd be surprised - people aren't necessarily out to get you. He could have taken the money and it wouldn't have changed the thing, because I'd already decided I owed it. I found it interesting that he doubled me up. I went away feeling like I've been given a present by not paying my bill, instead of staying home and feeling like a thief because I hadn't admitted it.

That's what happens when you open your heart and you attempt to be in relationship with someone without determining in advance who's right, who's wrong with the history...all this nonsense. Simply trying to say *I think I owe you* and the other person says *you may*, but let it go anyway. It's a very soft and loving thing. It was a beautiful example of not being fearful and feeling that I had somehow made people happy by trying to go back and pay my bill. I hope that's expression we're working on and when things go wrong, *test your emotions.*

The second thing that the Guide says is, *you do not see because you do not want to see.* In the first place we're talking about it takes some time to sort through all these emotions and figure out what you really feel. In the second case, it takes perhaps even more time to realize you don't want to look. You do not see because you do not want to see - is one of the reasons you can't figure out what's gone wrong or what to do about it. It requires a positive intention to see.

You have the power to see; everyone has the power to see. But they may lack the intention of doing so. They may feel that if they see, terrible things will happen. But again, you can see where that's fear saying - *Don't go there. Don't go there at all. All hell will break loose. The sky will fall. They'll take advantage of you.* Well, that's in the future. There is no way you can know that.

The first step is going to be to see what's going on. You have the power to see. Now what people will tell me is - *I'm just not sensitive. I've just not been able to pick up*

*vibes. I'm not able to see the vibration of people. I'm not able to see their reactions. I don't understand their reactions. Then start.*

I have mentioned Paul Ekman before. He has a video program on CD disk that he used to sell, now online, where you can go through and you can test your ability to discern whether somebody is lying, or whether you can detect the real feelings that somebody has versus the false thing like a real smile. This is not a real smile; it's a grin to no purpose. There are some muscles that don't move when you fake a smile. But you can smile almost without moving a muscle. Now a lot of you have noticed this, that the eyes crinkle a little bit. This is the quality of smile in the face, on a very, very subtle level. The big broad smiles can be false and the tiniest quiver of the lip could be a real smile. Anyway, he has you go through this and test yourself. If you score high, then you already have the ability to discern that level of human interactive behavior. If you score low, you have something to learn.

What I'm suggesting is that if you do not see something, it's time to do something about it. And things can be done. You can become better at discerning how people feel or react. You can become better at figuring out what the human interaction process - what's going on. You can become better at asking questions; you can become better at thousand things. The only element you need is the positive intention to do so. You do not see because you do not want to see. The key in that is not seeing; seeing is not the problem. *The issue is wanting to see.* In many of the lectures, the Guide lists a prayer and the prayer is a statement - *I want to see.* He doesn't say I want to do it; I want to accomplish it. He is saying only to say to yourself: *I want to see, I want to know, I want to understand.* What this does is draw forward your positive intentionality from your divine nature. You are already empowered. You may need to activate this empowerment.

The third thing the Guide talks about is not trusting others. And what he says here is that *one of the reasons we don't trust others is we don't trust ourselves.* You can deal with a liar and a cheat. You may know they're a liar and a cheat. You have to ask yourself why you're doing it. But you can deal with that person. You may need to know that you can cease the interaction if it's not going to be constructive. In other words, a liar and a cheat can still be useful in other areas. They can still contribute something, but you need to be aware of where they do lie or where they do cheat. But if you decide to interact with them, you may need to stop at some point or renegotiate or be honest about it. Trusting someone is not a matter of blind trust. The Guide is saying is that not trusting others comes from knowing that you don't trust yourself. You may not trust yourself to have the ability to say *stop, I don't want to go any further.*



I put this all under empowerment. If you want to do something, you're going to need to test your emotions, you need to look at what you do not want to see and look at where you may not trust others (with the presumption that it may come from a deeper place in you - where you do not trust yourself).

Now, the last little bit I did was I thought it would be useful we think it's useful to include two lectures (not quite sure why). I included lecture 107, which has three aspects that prevent loving and when I looked at it, it boiled down to three points. I'm hoping to just kind of run through this very quickly. They are personality based; they are based on the same thing, versions of reasonable and emotion defenses.

Of the three aspects that prevent loving, the first is the fear of being dominated. Once again, fear in the future, based on the stakes you may have made in the past, that you may or may not make in the future. Fear says - *Don't go there. This will happen*. Fear does not give you credit for your history. Fear does not give you credit for having been in a situation that was painful or difficult and having learned from it. Fear always presumes that you're seven years old, or 14 or 21. It says - *don't trust yourself in the situation, simply don't go there*. That will prevent you from loving. The fear of being dominated also is the fear of giving in which impacts surrendering and surrendering the total opening of the heart is what ultimately makes for a loving relationship. Fear of being dominated will ultimately keep you from opening your heart. Even if there's a grain of truth in that - the other person may be somewhat domineering. That doesn't mean that you will be dominated. It may mean that you need to learn negotiation in relationship. So that their distortion about domination does not trigger a reaction on your part about trying to submit or dominating on your own part.

Another aspect of the fear of being dominated can come from the fear of not being able to say no. If you can't say no and you can only say yes then you need to always be in a position where you can control the yes and the no. This is fear of being dominated.

The second is a falling into a duality, where you segregate people and yourself into superior or inferior. In this, what you're saying is, to some extent, you're choosing who you are. This is where the conscious choice is actually active, that you are deciding that you are either superior and the other person is inferior to you, or that you are inferior, and the other person is superior.

Once you make that decision, once you enter into that false duality about human beings, yourself and others, the net result can only be more duality, because you've entered into a premise that's not true. *No one is inferior in their totality from you, and you are not inferior in your totality from anyone else.*

Although, in a given situation under given circumstances, (I don't want to call them judgments), but such evaluations may be made. It doesn't mean they're true. It just means that there's an aspect that has Grand truth in it. *But that's another aspect that keeps you from loving.* Because if you think you're inferior, you're begging. If you think you're superior, you presume they're begging. Because if you're superior, they don't serve your best efforts. You may be magnanimous about it, but they don't deserve it.

The third aspect that prevent loving is giving out of fear. Now, that comes out of a *lack of belief in oneself*; it normally comes from sensing that you're inferior. You're not truly giving; you're giving because you think you have to.

Of course, number three, giving out of fear is the direct opposite of fear of being dominated. You've got a link here of distortions that prevent loving. It addresses some concrete aspects that impact the fear of loving, and that's why I included it.

Are there any questions or suggestions or Hi, how are you? Well, first I'm worried because I know I want to impart a lot of information. I need to tell you that in the beginning people asked more questions and I liked it. I've been trying to figure out different ways I can involve people and perhaps this form does not do that as well as it might.

If in future, anybody does want to ask or swing the discussion, or presentation in a certain way, I'm not only open to it, I actively enjoy it. This work is not an intellectual exercise. It's very personal. There's a place where we can ask personal questions without revealing ourselves to a group of strangers, where we can mention something because it concerns us. I find that when one person does that, it strikes a chord of universality with everyone else. I do enjoy questions. I do enjoy working with people in an actual group. And this may be a lesser substitution. It works but it is limited. I invite you to consider working with people because the work comes very alive when we are personally involved, and our personal issues are addressed directly.

Thank you very much for being with me. In two weeks, I'm going to take another stab at spiritual law because I like it. I hope you'll join me for that one. Thank you very much. Take care. Goodbye.

Transcribed by <https://otter.ai> edited by Cynthia Morgan  
Guide Quotes © The Pathwork Foundation 1999

Full text of this plus all other lectures may be downloaded from [www.pathwork.org](http://www.pathwork.org)