

Pathwork® Steps

Self-Preservation and Procreation As Divine Attributes and in Distortion

Pathwork Lectures 85 & 86

Transcript of 2009 Audio-only Teleconference by Jan Rigsby

[Part 1 57 mins](#) [Part 2 55 mins](#)

Today is June 20 2009, and this is a teleconference on two lectures: Pathwork Lecture 85, which is Distortion of the Instincts of Self-preservation and Procreation and PL 86 The Instincts of Self-Preservation and Procreation in Conflict.

I wanted to start off by saying that the lectures are not known in terms of minor lectures and major lectures. We don't talk about the lectures like that. We don't - we try not to diminish a lecture just because it is used a lot for teaching, or it's not as well known as another lecture. Yet the truth is, about one third of the lectures are very commonly used in teaching, classes, and presentations. After two years or so of Pathwork studies, a lot of people can name up to a third of the lectures or are familiar with those titles.

Then there's a third that that are taught in secondary, or longer-term programs.

And then there's about a third of them that, to this day, if you named one, I might have to think for a second and say, Yeah, I think that's the relevant lecture. Because if I *have* ever read it, the title may not have resonated with *me*. The lecture may not contain a very clear picture of a concept for *me*, so I may not use the lecture for teaching. It could be a great lecture (all the lectures are great!). And there are about a third of them that people tend to 'find' on their own. They may love them and really resonate with them, but the rest of us have almost never heard of them! The reason I'm mentioning this, is that these two lectures happen to be my personal favorites.

Now, it is not true that you could only read these two and understand Pathwork. By the time I even got around to reading these lectures, I had done a great deal of Pathwork studies and I'd read a significant number of lectures. I think I was in my third year of Pathwork studies when I came across these. I do not remember why I read them. They certainly were not assigned for any class I ever took. However, I found them. They resonated with me more than any other lecture did.

What I'm bringing forward here is this; as minor as these lectures may be for some people, and as unknown as they may be – even to people who teach the lectures, because I've been asked, what are your favorites? What's your favorite lecture? And I've told people these lecture numbers, people who are Pathworkers, and people who are Helpers. And their reaction is that they've never heard of them. Not to say that they haven't read them, or flashed by them, but these didn't stick in their mind. And yet, to me, these are the penultimate lectures of all time [!].

Why? Because every person - being unique and individualistic, there's always a memory, or an event, or a teaching that just strikes the center of our soul. I bring this forward, because I chose to teach these lectures for two reasons.

- 1) I thought I'd have fun with them, because nobody knows about them! I think they're great.
- 2) To illustrate lectures that aren't thought of much by some; how they can have enormously wonderful concepts and presentation, can express things very, very well. They can be

extraordinarily valuable. You might never have noticed these lectures if I hadn't brought them up. I'm hoping that by hearing about these strange and mysterious two lectures, that you might not have noticed before, can be hopefully fascinating! That you might notice lectures on your own that wind up resonating for you.

Now for that to happen - unless you strike gold the first time - you may have to read a couple dozen lectures. The truth is that the lecture that winds up mattering the most to you may not be any lecture that I have ever presented. It may not be a lecture that has any worksheets or any popularity, no one may have heard of it - but you. Yet if that lecture resonates with you, then that's the place you want to go.

These are several reasons why I thought this would be fun. To bring forward my favorites, to show people how odd lectures can be very, very interesting. Plus, I really think these lectures have something important to contribute to process work in Pathwork.

One of the one of the reasons these lectures 'spoke' to me is I tend to be pragmatic, I tend to be practical. I like to ground the concepts in real life examples. I like to have metaphors. I like to have analogies. I like to be able to take a concept and flesh it out. I especially like when spiritual matters resonate in terms of biology, zoology, anthropology. If the phrase "as in heaven, so below", or "as below, so above", is a spiritual truth, truth would naturally resonate throughout every aspect of human life in different ways. If a spiritual law is true, then it would resonate into our human consciousness, and it would become a flavor in society. Now, we might distort that flavor. We might not understand fully. We might apply it incorrectly, making it almost unrecognizable. But that does not alter the fact that the concept itself was something that we intuited as truth, even though we weren't able to translate it cleanly.

When talking about the instinct of self-preservation and procreation, these instincts speak to me, I feel that I understand people's fear of death. I feel that I understand people's desire to procreate. Both, in a literal sense, in the sense that they want to have children and build families. And also on the next, and the next, and the next layer.

Examples of instincts in self-preservation

Our mission is primarily to stay safe and alive, to move, to see the next day. The Guide describes it as 'to maintain and safeguard life'. On a literal, gut, life level, we need to stay alive in order to do our work here, on the planet.

Then, we enlarge that; we add more layers to it. We not only need to be alive, we need to be to have a feeling of safety. We need to *not* feel that we're living second by second, hour by hour, or day by day. We feel a need for more visibility, so that we can really appreciate having preserved our life.

Then human beings go 'that bit' further; the instinct to promote self-preservation would lead us to create systems and mechanisms, so that we preserve life for today, so that nothing can defeat it. The instinct for self-preservation would also include building a door or a gate on the front of the cave, so the bear won't come in tomorrow. To learn the lessons about some dangers; to make plans to think, to use our incredible minds, to look forward in the future, to see if we can *assure* self-preservation – forecasting into the future. In effect, we used the ability of humans to have foresight

into tomorrow, next week, next month, next year, next decade then, just as much as our instinct for self-preservation manifests as moving out of the way of the car.

A phrase that translates something like - I know the Native American one, but I think that there are other Aboriginal and native cultures that have the same philosophy - that society should be thinking about the future to the seventh generation (and we're mixing a little bit of the element of procreation in here, but the aspect I want to focus on is self-preservation).

Human beings have the capacity to build societies, to build models of human interaction, to build machines, to build tools, to build mechanisms - that allow us some level of security, or ways for successive generations to address dangers. Think of it like the arguments about climate change. What we're dealing with, now, is that we may have to limit our ability to function today in order to assure our ability as a species as a race to live 100 years from now. We may need to bend our personal self-preservation for the self-preservation of our species. The animals' instincts - herbivorous animals and even insects - may have the instinct for that, where they do things that are best for the herd, that are best for the colony, even though they may not 'think' in those terms. Because they're working on sheer instinct, they may not envision choices, as man does. What I'm suggesting is, taking the instinct for self-preservation, and showing how enormously wide and full this instinct can be. As people, as mankind as human beings, we see beyond the limitations of food, shelter, life, death; this is who we are.

So when Pathwork speaks of self-preservation, this was the connection for me. I understand the fear of death. And I understand what lengths people go to, trying to make death – hold it at bay, or keep it away from them. to assure life. What this lecture brought to me was how we continue those instincts into our spiritual thoughts and lives and thinking patterns. So that self-preservation is not only a biological concept, it is a spiritual concept.

Examples of instincts in procreation

Let's switch to procreation. Same thing. That's why these two resonates so strongly with me. Procreation in its simplicity is the desire to have children. And that desire is so instinctual in a human being. That is one of the things that drives the sex drive. Sex is fun, but that's not why we have it. We have it because it's part of our innate need to procreate.

Now, isn't this the same as self-preservation to the next generation? Yes and No. There is a distinction, because procreation is uniquely a creative act of our own self-preservation. It *may* involve saving the village. Procreation is more intimate; procreation is saving our child, our family, our village, rather than a global village that we may not feel a part of.

One instinct speaks to the race itself, the species itself; and the other speaks to our part in it - even when our part in it is allowed to go into a larger or more intellectual or more abstract level: "I am human therefore the people on the other side of the planet are human therefore we are together and so we can procreate together". They becomes really abstract on the procreation level. But it may be very real on a self-preservation of the species level.

In procreation, you've got the desire to have our genes go forward, our *particular* genes go forward - so that we have family that is part of us.

On the next level of abstraction, procreation is about putting our unique spark of genius and creativity out into the world - and safeguarding it so it won't get wiped out. So on a primitive level, you don't want your family destroyed because then to some degree, *you* will not live into the future. *People* will live but not *you*.

But very easily we lift that into *my* oil paintings will live in the museum. *My* manuscript will live in people's mind. *My* contribution to a company, its success. The betterment of society will take part of *me* and weave it into their fabric, so that *I* exist - as we exist and go forward.

I hope you can see where that takes a very gut level primal instinct and puts a human spin on it, and brings in some of the most wonderful qualities of humanity. Our ability to see into the future, our ability for foresight, our desire to use our minds and our capacities in wildly, wonderful, creative ways - not only to preserve our culture, and our species, but also to preserve - now - some of *us*. To have an opportunity to preserve our individual *name*.

This is most common for the average person, in terms of children. I give my child my name, or as a woman, I marry into a family; (in the old days) I take on that name, it becomes me, and then my child moves it forward. Or if a woman's name goes forward, the man may feel the same way. There is an understanding that as the child grows up and goes forward, it is carrying *us* with them, some part of us.

Most people do not have the opportunity to have their own oil paintings, sculptures, or manuscripts on museum walls and in libraries. In the history of a culture, this can be a specific name; many of you have perhaps experienced relatives who become hooked on, or fans of, genealogy. They start looking backwards. How thrilling it is to find out where your ancestor was, what your ancestor was doing. Even more so than, what was my country doing? It's not that you don't care about your country, you really do! Your country's history may be very interesting to you. But there is a particular fascination with your ancestors' part in that - without knowing if your name will go forward. It is fascinating to find out how far back in history you can trace your particular family.

What I'm describing here is the instinct of procreation on a wide range of levels. But it is still the instinct for *our* individual to remain intact, and visible. That's where I resonate very strongly with the instinct of self-preservation and procreation.

Both instincts conflict and in distort

These 2 lectures track how these instincts go into distortion, and where they go into conflict with each other.

One of the things that I found curious, and perhaps one of the reasons I read the two lectures, is that the names of the lectures were so similar. The only other place that I have noticed this is in the series on the creation, which is, I think, PL 18-22. Both of those series give me a sense of a story being told in Pathwork Lectures. Also in the series of lectures on images, PL 38-42. This is the only other place (I may be missing some, but you get the idea) where it was a 'big bang' to me, a lecture mentioning these terms one way, and then mentioning them in a different sense the other way. I wondered why was this so important that you needed two lectures on these topics.

In some lectures the Guide would start talking about a topic, and then shift to another topic. So, it's really only a half a lecture on one topic and a half a lecture on other topics, or mostly questions and

answers. Yet these two lectures are long and jam-packed; the Guide never gets off the topic. I felt that there must be something really important here for the guide to spend two full lectures on these topics.

Those are the reasons I became interested, why I resonated, and why I felt that it would be a useful topic to share in a teleconference.

Some unique qualities of these lectures

Throughout this talk, I'm really going to be speaking of both the lectures, because I find it hard to differentiate between the two - because they're - all the concepts that I'm talking about are talked about in both lectures. Although you could differentiate them (and the Guide did differentiate between them, I) I'm putting them together.

There are 3 unique qualities that this lecture brings forward for me:

1) There are a number of lectures that deal with a triad based upon personality types. The personality types are named as Reason, Will, and Emotion in Pathwork Lecture 43. Prior to that, there's Pathwork Lecture 30 on Pride, Self-Will, and Fear, that also aligns with Reason, Will, and Emotion. Then there is Pathwork Lecture 84: Love, Power, and Serenity as Divine Attributes and as Distortions (there are teleconference recordings on all these lectures) that explains the defenses of submission, aggression and withdrawal. There are many charts on Reason, Will and Emotion, listing qualities that distinguish between the three different personality types.

Every time these concepts have been presented, as a general rule, the guide weighs them equally. In other words, the guide simply talks about them as a, b, and c. In this lecture - I believe it's the only time he does it - the guide distinguishes the drive for power, which is associated with the Will type, as being made up of the drive for love (identified with the Emotion type) as the primary force behind the drive for power; and the use of the intellect (i.e. the Reason type personality) as the secondary force in the drive for power. I find this to be unique, for the guide to rank the three personalities so that the Reason personality type ia reaction about the conflict that the first two create.

2) The second unique quality about this lecture is that it emphasizes the Idealized Self Image PL 83 using a point of view that made it very clear for me what the Idealized Self is, and what then creates the Idealized Self Image: that the Idealized Self Image is a direct result of the distortion of self-preservation. This ties the Idealized Self Image to a direct reaction to a primary instinct. For me, the Idealized Self Image was a little fuzzy; this clarified it for me. I'm going to be talking about that later on.

3) The third thing I found unique about this lecture is that the guide talks about distortions as being particularly self-centered.

My approach to teaching Pathwork is strongly based the 50/50 work, developed by Moira and Bert Shaw. It was also known as The Keys . Their premise is that there are three spheres of understanding, described graphically as spheres within a sphere is part of unity (= a form of sphere, encompassing all).

The starting point is the Individual Self-Sphere (ISS), which is all about *me, me, me*. When I'm in the Individual Sphere, that's all I can see and all I can understand. It's a very, very limited sphere of existence.

The second sphere, if you can imagine it, holds *all of us* in our tiny Individual Self-Sphere 'bubbles'. I always imagine it as a larger ball with a whole bunch of little tiny balls in it. There, I am me, and you're you, and that person is that person. Yet while we have aspects of us that are unique, very personal, very self centered, and self focused, we all operate within a larger sphere at the same time. When I recognize that, it's as if I enlarge from my Individual Self-Sphere (while still 'in' it). I'm still resonating with myself, but I also begin to see you *in relationship* to me. And the term used for this is the Universal Self-Sphere (USS). We are still in self, but we are seeing things from a larger, more universal frame of reference.

The third sphere is everything else; the entire Spirit Sphere (SS) or God Sphere (GS) that we are all working within.

This lecture talks about these distortions as being very specifically self-centered. When these instincts are deployed, when activated, they draw us back into the Individual Self-Sphere. Because they are instincts, they draw us back sharply and concretely; it is difficult, when you think you're in danger, to be generous!. When we are in danger, it is very hard to be spiritual and open and generous because we are instinctively drawn to self-preservation. It helps me to be able to delineate and differentiate Universal Self-Sphere and Individual Self-Sphere, in a way that made it easier for me to understand.

Those are the three things that I found unique about the lecture, the description of the reason type as secondary, the description of the Idealized Self Image, and the delineation, the difference of being completely involved in ourselves versus being in the Universal. Self-Sphere with others, and the ability to be generous.

I know that some of you have muted your phone. But I like to pause every once in a while. And if you if you have a question, you are certainly welcome to ask. I realize it's awkward. You may have to unmute, just press Star + 6. So just pausing here for a second for questions... Ok. Let's go on.

Reading the lectures as a hologram

I also found that, while it isn't unique, one of the ways that I teach is that, in my experience (I was also taught this perspective, I had good teachers, and I accept it fully) is that from a holographic - when we see the universe as a hologram, there's a technicality.

A hologram is where you see a picture, a 3D picture of an apple. If you move your head, it looks like - even though the picture itself is flat, it looks like you could see around the side of the apple. A hologram is created by the technical process by taking a kazillion little tiny pictures of an entire apple and constructing a picture with it. What our vision does - to an incredible and remarkable degree, that is beyond my personal comprehension - is, when we see 10,000 tiny pictures of an apple, our eyes pick up the apple as the picture itself. As our eyes turn, we are picking up (if this makes any sense, and I apologize if it isn't) - if you ever want to read about holograms a very good description is the book, *The Holographic Universe* by Michael Talbot. It does a very good example of describing this. As you can tell, I'm just not scientifically expert enough to explain it simply to you, I keep trying to understand it and I have a problem / I struggle to understand it

myself. Basically a hologram is made up of thousands and thousands of pictures of each individual piece for each individual piece makes the whole and yet what we see is one apple and not 10,000.

If you see the lectures as a hologram, and you look at an individual lecture, you can see in each lecture - teachings on vicious circles, Idealized Self Image, love power, serenity, the triad of personality types, daydreams, the primary concept of unity & duality and other elements of the personality problems that come with being defensive. These references may be difficult to grasp with the conscious mind.

In these two lectures PL 85 & 86, more so than other lectures I have seen, the guide moves through a very large number of major concepts and integrates them elegantly into the discussion of self-preservation and procreation. In the handouts that I posted on my website, I listed about six different major concepts the guide talks about.

For instance, in this study guide, briefly mentioned, is how equivalent of Daily Review PL 28 and the Vicious Circle of immature love PL 50, and talks about the Idealized Self Image PL 83, talks about Love, Power, and Serenity PL 84. It also mentions 'desire life', which is also addressed as fantasy and Wishful Daydreams PL 98, The Defense lecture PL 101, Unity and Duality PL 143 and even The Three Principles of Evil PL 248. I could go on, but all these concepts are in this lecture, they are identifiable and it was a delight to go through and see how clearly the guide weaves these concepts in. And for me, fleshes them out and gives yet another entire picture of these concepts.

Self-preservation and procreation - conceptually

I'm going to go through the Guide's definition of self-preservation and procreation, in terms of concepts.

Self-preservation

The function of the instinct of self-preservation is to maintain and safeguard life. Now, if you switch to the PL 101, The Defense, the guide talks about this instinct throughout the lecture. How the human mind jumps from "*the tiger is going to eat me!*" to "*the leader of the clan is going to humiliate me!*". The human mind sees the analogy here; that if the tiger eats you, you will not physically exist. And if the leader of the clan humiliates you, for all intents and purposes, you may not exist within the clan. People see life vs, death on many, many more levels than actual life and death. The dilemma is that, once we 'leave the ground' ('grounding' as the reality of being alive vs. actual death, 'being eaten by a tiger') and start talking about life and death in terms of being a strong and effective clan member, or a woman who has power in a village, or an author who publishes and gets listened to, or a politician who gets elected or not elected, -- the definition of life/death starts getting very, very, very abstract. Once we leave the grounding of real life/death, and we go into these more abstract concepts of life/death, we start reinterpreting what danger consists of.

The guide says we start seeing ourselves threatened by not being not being admired, approved of, agreed with, as death. While this represents an emotional interpretation of death, we react to as if it *were* actual life/death. It is a form of social 'death'. What I'm describing is that once we are safe from basic, real life/death issues, and we go into *perceived* life/death issues. It's as if we lose our grounding and we can become lost. We may exaggerate what 'death' is or what 'life' is. So, in the

instinct of self-preservation, once we're into abstractions, we believe we are holding on tight to things that you can't really hold in your hand.

How do you hold on tightly to influence? How do you hold on tightly to your reputation? How do you hold on tightly to being a candidate for leadership? You can see, as we try to reach out, we may not have anything solid (like the threat of the tiger, that affects our bones, blood, and sinew) we don't have anything to solid to reach out and grab hold of.

We may tend to 'over-grip' i.e., overdramatize, and exaggerate. We may tend to overvalue what clothing we wear, because it impresses others. When we impress others we may be thought of more highly, but this can be very vague and tenuous. As we go into these abstracts, we may tend to grab and hold to concepts with ferocity, that make them seem more real – and more important. It can feel as if we are grabbing at thin air; nothing, on some level. Once we are holding on tightly, not letting go that which is obsolete, old, past its use-by date, new information cannot be received and assimilated. That's the instinct of self-preservation.

[Line interference 37:40] Request that participants mute their teleconference lines.

Let me repeat that holding on tightly -- not letting go that which is obsolete so that new material can be assimilated thoroughly -- this is the restrictive movement. To some extent, our instinct for self-preservation can kill the very thing we love. By holding on and not letting go, in effect we go into stasis. Stasis will result in death. The distortion of the instinct of self-preservation leads the soul to adopt the pseudo-solutions, false solutions intended to 'fix' the perceived problem.

The distortion of the instinct of self-preservation leads the soul to adopt pseudo-solution, such as a quest for power. Imagine that we're reaching out, trying to hold on to life and do away with the threat of death. By reaching out and holding on, we're going to create a form of stasis, we're going to freeze things. This will lead us to a quest power. Power can seem to reach out and grab things and stop them from happening, or move them towards a new way of happening. Pseudo-solutions include aggressiveness, hostility, a power drive; a need to triumph over others, competitiveness and excessive demands. The Guide shows us how the instinct of self-preservation can lead to the pseudo-solution, or false solution / conclusion, that power can keep us alive.

Now, in terms of what does that do... [Line interference]

This is how the distortion of the instinct of self-preservation can lead a quest for power, that naturally leads to a dualistic thought pattern. A quest for power is activated by self-will, which sees everything in terms of win/lose. So it is a 'straight shot' from 1) activating the instinct of self-preservation, 2) reaching out and trying to use power as a solution, to 3) finding yourself in dualistic thought patterns of win/lose. This is how the concept of Unity and Duality PL 143 can help to understand this lecture.

Procreation [41:00]

The guide ties together the distorted instinct of procreation, Reason, and the quest for love. How does that work?

The desire to procreate - whether it is sexually creating children and family, creating manuscripts, or building buildings – both contains and brings pleasure.

We yearn for 'pleasure supreme' on all levels of our being. The instinct to procreate is tied directly to the pleasure drive. The idea that you would not be able to procreate, technically or abstractly, is a direct threat to your ability to have pleasure.

If you can't have, attain, or experience pleasure, you're going to try to figure out, "*How can I get some pleasure?*" If you don't turn to power, you may turn to submissiveness compliance, appeasement, a quest for pleasure/love/approval -- pseudo-solutions designed to get you what you want.

Now, is Will involved? Absolutely. Self-will sees anything that threatens its power as an issue of self-preservation. The ability to enjoy pleasure is an aspect of personal power. When the desire for procreation shifts from defending one's children or one's tribe from extinction, it becomes about gaining pleasure; pleasure/un-pleasure becomes the same as life/death. Living without pleasure may technically be life on many levels, but it can feel threatening to think '*I won't ever feel pleasure again*'. I can feel like a form of living death.

Someone who values pleasure may not going to be willing to put their life at risk, because that that makes no sense; I cannot have pleasure if I am dead! Yet if their sense of self-preservation becomes activated or engaged at the idea of losing any hope for pleasure in live, then both self-preservation and the desire for procreation may become aligned, and they will fight for this expanded level of survival.

So even the instinct of procreation becomes dualistic, and triggers the will's desire to win at all costs; because if you do not get pleasure, if can feel like your soul is starving / stagnating.

The guide says pleasure is our divine birthright. It's not something that feels optional for us. That doesn't mean that you need to feel pleasure every hour of every day. But pleasure is a significant part of the human experience. It's a significant part of our spiritual experience. So, to not have pleasure can also feel like a form of spiritual death.

Anytime you get into either a real or an imaginary life/death situation. there is a tendency to drop into dualistic thinking. On the one hand, you have real life/death, or reputational life/death. But in terms of procreation, what you have is pleasure, no pleasure. Within pleasure lies life; no pleasure is death. So, for the same reason, when you're looking at pleasure/no pleasure. you simply cannot accept no pleasure. You will immediately be drawn into dualistic thinking. You will say "*I must do something about this!*". And "*I must do something that moves me along the path to pleasure!*" And that's how, oddly enough, the desire of the will to procreate will lead to submissiveness.

Now, why wouldn't it go towards taking a club and bashing your opponent over the head, so you can grab the pleasure? Because the kind of pleasure we're talking about must be given. When pleasure is not a primary element, you can just grab what you want or need, and then you have it. But in procreation, pleasure is the whole point. So if your 'win' does not include pleasure, you've lost. That's the distinction between the two instincts.

To procreate is to allow your creative spark to move and manifest in the universe. To manifest means it must be represented in some form; you It's must be received, be validated. You may feel the need for it to be received by someone who may not *want* to receive it. This is what triggers the dynamics of submission, appeasement, coercion, which are forms of manipulating others.

In effect, on some level of your being you are being forced to beg. You're saying *"You must receive this from me and reflect it back to me. You must make me feel good about myself. And you must make me feel good about you doing this!"*

Can you see/feel where all of forms of procreation require another person? Whereas self-preservation does not necessarily require another person.

So in procreation; somebody who writes or creates a work of art - because humans can think abstractly, and because we have foresight, we can believe that a manuscript that we hide under our bed might be dragged out from under the bed and seen by others and appreciated; we can go there as human beings, we can see our procreation in our imaginations. Even when ideas take a while to hatch, we want them to hatch. And the one thing that will really upset us, in that scenario, would be watching our manuscript burn. Because then there's no chance of that particular manuscript being shared, reflected, inspiring other people, and getting us the feedback - even if after we're dead! - of being appreciated by other human beings.

I am going on about this at length, because it's important to understand because of what the guide talks about later on, about where these two distortions go.

Reason, Will, and Emotion traits PL 43

The Guide talks about three primary personality types. You have the Will personality type, and the Emotion personality type - that means a person who is focused upon connection and feeling. And rather than use the word feeling, which is used differently in the lecture, the term used is emotion. The third type is the Reason type.

The Guide says, in your pseudo-solutions, your search to resolve the conflicts in life, the false solution is the quest for power. That would that would be part of the Will personality. The Will personality uses power to get what they want and need. If the pseudo-solution is a quest for power, then your reactions to weakness will be extreme humiliation, that has to be hidden at whatever cost. This is where the life/death duality comes in. In the quest for power, if you're defeated, this feels like death. And even if you're defeated, one of the ways you want to counteract that defeat / escape death is to pretend it didn't happen; or hide that it did happen. That process of concealment sucks up your life energy. It consumes your being. Because you simply can't say *"I failed, I was defeated. I didn't win this time, I guess I'll fight harder to win next time."* When you're wrapped up in this, you feel that defeat destroys, it brings you to a form of death. You can't let it go. If you truly believe that that defeat signals some form of death - in distortion - your instinct cannot relax, let it go. You have to reverse the 'disease', or you have to mask it, or hide it.

The second pseudo solution is the quest for love. And this would be from the personality type known as the Emotion type. The Emotion type seeks love as interaction with others, connection, the pleasure supreme of being part of the whole. If the pseudo-solution is the quest for love, and you are the submissive type, you will try to turn to deceit as a way of connecting.

You may aggrandize the defeat. "If your pseudo-solution is the quest for "love" and you are the submissive type, you will aggrandize the defeat. You will dramatize it out of all proportion. It then becomes a means of forcing others to protect and love you." PL 85.

In other words, if I don't get love, I don't get pleasure. One of the ways for me to resolve that, to get at least some form what I want, is to start crying and wringing my hands and bawling and saying “*oh my goodness*”, dramatizing and over exaggerating. This often brings people closer to us! And if they don't say, “*Oh, poor thing!*” they may at least ask what's going on. For a person who wants love, connection of any type holds the potential for love. In other words, if you're the emotion type, you're on a quest for love. You're in a defeated situation when you're not getting the pleasure and you're not getting the love. If you somehow get connection of any kind, then you still have the potential later to get love. But if you lose connection, that can feel like death, like there's no hope.

Here's where the guide talks about the quest for serenity, which is mentioned in the triad in the Personality Type lectures. Yet here, he talks about it as secondary to the solution. I'm going to read a section from PL 85: “*If your pseudo-solution is the quest for "serenity," you will deny the very existence of defeat as long as possible. This is dangerous because of the self-deception; the unawareness of what you really feel; the lack of awareness of why you act in certain ways as a result of this self-deception.*”

In other words, you're going to come up with a reason why that was not a defeat, instead of trying to hide it or claim that it doesn't exist. That would be engage your intellect. Your rationalizations, coming up with whatever reason you can manage, for instance, to challenge or change the way the rules work.

A rationalization of a defeat would be, “*I didn't lose - because I never really entered the game! I didn't lose the election, because even though my name was in the was on the ballot, I really didn't want it any way, and I wasn't trying hard enough!. So I technically lost the election, but I didn't really get defeated, because if I really tried to win, I would have!*” That isn't trying to deny the defeat itself; It's a claim that *wasn't* a defeat, by changing the rules of how defeat is defined via rationalizing.

This is a form of the defense of withdrawal, this is the full form of pulling the plug. We do not wish to be engaged, we do not wish to be in the win/lose fight because we think we will be mocked. We don't want to be in the quest for love because we think we would lose that also. In this quest for serenity is a quest for saying “*Everything's fine. There's no problem*”.

If we're using this as a solution to our sense of personal trauma and tragedy, this is a way of withdrawing from the situation. The guide also says that this is a secondary pseudo-solution, that it's actually the result of one of the other pseudo solutions

Such as: you are on a quest for power and you fail. Instead of hiding the situation, or aggressively trying to win again, you withdraw and claim that you didn't lose the race “*because it was not a race*”.

If you're on a quest for love, and you feel a lack of connection – such as, if you're rejected by your beloved, as an example, then you withdraw and claim the same thing; “*I didn't like her anyway, I didn't like him anyway. I wasn't really dating. I just I just wanted to 'go out'. I wasn't serious about the situation.*” On a different level, you might start saying they weren't worthy (anyway). I.e., the race could never have been won - it was always rigged; the person wasn't really worth my time. What the Reason type does is rationalize, rewrite the rules, so that they ‘win’ in some way. More importantly, we are trying to get away from any sense of defeat.

That's how the reason will and emotion triads wind up in this lecture. But interestingly, with the reason type being described as a secondary sort of solution, a secondary reaction to either power or love, quest for power or love.

I'm going to pause for a second because it's been one hour, so I can find the separation point in the recording and split it to fit onto CDs.

Part 2

This is part two of a dual lecture / dual presentation on June 20 2009 on PL 85, the Distortions of the Instincts of Self-Preservation and Procreation; and PL 86, Self-Preservation and Procreation as Instincts in Conflict.

The Idealized Self Image (ISI) PL 83

The other concept that's gone into extensively in these two lectures in a place is the discussion of the Idealized Self Image. In this sense, the guide is talking about the Idealized Self Image is a direct result of the distortion of self-preservation. Let me say this again; the Idealized Self Image results directly and immediately from the distortion of self-preservation.

In effect, the Idealized Self Image is a reaction to defeat. And it's specifically a reaction to a power defeat. The Guide also says –

By the way, that even though we talked about three personality types, everyone has sections of these in their personality there is no clean cut division here. So, there is no singular Reason type, there is no Will Type, there is no Emotion type. These 'types' are ways of differentiating qualities of our personalities and our reactions with others, so that we can see them more clearly. But an actual human being is a conglomerate of these three. One person can be a Will type, or predominantly Will type, at work; predominantly an Emotion type at home, predominantly a Reason type when it comes to philosophy or research or medical studies. What I'm inviting is that we not be simplistic about identifying "I am this type". It is more useful to understand, in a given situation, I am exhibiting these qualities. That's a more useful way to look at these at these divisions.

The Idealized Self Image is a result of having suffered defeat in a quest for power. And since everybody has a Will component, we all seek power or control at some point. And when we feel that defeat, basically, what we're looking for is, "*What would protect us? How could we be/become so that we would never feel this humiliation or defeat again?*" That's where the concept, that's where the creation of the Idealized Self Image comes in.

The Idealized Self Image is exactly what it says. It's an image of how we should be NOW. We must be, in order to avoid defeat in future. Plus - it is idealized. So it's not based on what we are capable of doing or being.

And that's where it turns deadly. This ideal may require us to be bigger, stronger, have more character, have more self control, more everything than we actually have. Depending on our family, our circumstances, our culture, our Idealized Self Images may be similar within a family, or a village, or a country. When you've got an Idealized Self Image within a larger environment,

even if you might have developed in a different slightly different way, it's almost magnetic; it sweeps you up in it, so that you become involved with the Idealized Self Image of your community.

With ideals, how can you possibly argue against them? *"Self-honesty isn't necessary"*. Of course, honesty is necessary. Almost every culture says honesty is important. Even cultures that condone some lies, some stealing and some cheating have rules about where you don't lie, steal and cheat. Rules always allow for latitude in specific situations. Every culture, every civilization has ideals. And they have their own rules about how those ideals are supposed to be used.

With the Idealized Self Image, you can imagine yourself saying, *"I need to be honest, I need to be employed. I need to be hardworking."* Well, that's lovely. But what if you're actually an artist; and while you may be hard working, it doesn't show up the same way as it does in others. Yet you're setting your ideals up to match others in your community. In other words, if you look at a family of manual laborers, who go out every day and work off a hard sweat, and you say, *"That's the ideal, that's what I should be; somebody who physically throws themselves into an activity and sees it all the way through."* What if that's not who you are? And that's how an Idealized Self Image breaks down. That's where the problems begin.

It's just as easy to look at an intellectual family, and say, *"I should be smart. I should be perceptive. I should be happy with my own thoughts for hours at a time."* Well, that's, again, lovely, but what if that's not who you are? So who are you; you may be somebody who needs to see things delineated carefully, who needs to write things down, who needs a work list. That does not mean you are lesser than those people, just like not wanting to throw yourself into physicality means you're any less than the people that you're looking at, as your ideal.

So in the Idealized Self Image, we set up a straw person, we set up a concept, and we say, that's what we should be. Now if that's what we should be, we take on (at that point) the obligation of beating ourselves up every time we don't meet that ideal. You can see how this tumbles immediately into us vs, them me against myself. If I have an ideal, and I can't meet that ideal, then I am wrong. Either I am wrong, or my ideal is wrong. Can you feel the duality in that statement when we hear the words? And yet, this is internal. This is your own perception of who you are, and who you want to be - that you have frozen into a should. It's no longer *"Should I aspire to this?"* it's become *"I need to do this"*.

The healthier you are as a human being, the Guide says, the weaker is your Idealized Self Image! The healthier you are, the more happy you are in your own skin, with your own being, with your imperfections. Your Idealized Self Image is a nice plan, it's just not real NOW. But we'll kind of 'put that up on the wall', like a poster. And we'd like to be that one day, but the connection between the two is much weaker if you are willing to accept who you are in the moment. It's nice to have a goal pasted on the wall. The problem comes in when you put that on the wall, and that is now the equivalent of the Ten Commandments, that's what you must be *as fast as possible*. Plus, any deviation between the two is not acceptable. That's the distinction.

Secondly, the stronger the inner conflict, the stronger the difference between the real and the idealized self. So other words, if you put up an Idealized Self-Image, that does not truly represent who you are, then there's going to be some conflict, and the stronger that conflict is. But the reason that conflict is so strong is that your Idealized Self Image does not reflect who you are and can be.

For example, let's take bodybuilders. Let's say you aspire to be a bodybuilder, but you don't have that physique. If you're a healthy, well-adjusted person, you may say, *"I'm going to do the best I can. I'm going to work out, I'm going to get some equipment, I'm going to get some help and some training. And I'm going to try to get my body into the best shape I possibly can, within my time constrictions, within my lifestyle, but also in my physical limitations"*. But if you choose an image that is simply not attainable by your physical form, it's so far away that you're never going to attain, you're looking at that image literally saying, *"I must look like that. And I look like this."* But the difference between those two reality creates tremendous inner conflict.

If you've got all this inner conflict going on, you're spending more and more time in this internal war with yourself, rather than in communion with others getting love, or building a life, being out in the world, and creating success for yourself - which may be, you know, a way for you to develop power. So both a quest for power and a quest for love are sabotaged when you are in conflict within yourself. The Idealized Self Image becomes a tyrant

The third point that God makes is that the phrase used in this lecture, at least in the unedited version, is 'desire life'. At some point, the guide says that the 'desire life' or daydreams are always a good indication of what the Idealized Self Image is, and of the nature of the pseudo solution.

The Idealized Self Image shows up more in the desire life. What I presume the guide means by this is this: look at your fantasy, look at your dream. Do you want fame and fortune? Do you want power? Do you want control? Or rather, do you want love? Do you want connection? Do you want to belong? Do you want to feel the give and take between yourself and other people, whether individually (with a lover) or in community with a number of people, your community. Now you may see where these could mesh together.

For example: a politician who runs for office; on some level, they have a desire for power. But the actual nature of running for office, of being elected, of representing the people, means you're going to have to - if you're elected, rather than being a tyrant or selected for the job - but if you're elected, you're engaged in a process where you're going to have to go back to the population over and over and over again. If connection is not what you want, it's going to feel like you're on a treadmill, constantly having to convince and persuade people that you are the best choice, that you hear them, that you will understand them, and getting them to admire and respect you. This is going to be a constant and eternal process if you're an elected official, even though you also exercise power.

But if you are selected for power by having met certain criteria, you don't have to, in effect, re-qualify for it (except by pleasing certain people, your boss or the person who chose you in the first place). And you can hold that power differently, without having to get a plebiscite, without having to get re-affirmation from people over and over again.

This is how you can look at your fantasy. What are you after in your fantasies? What do you daydream about? It is an excellent way for you to see what is your quest.

Now, in your daydream -is very unlikely that your daydreams are going to be about withdrawal, and that's why we call as a secondary. In your daydreams, (you may go through daydreams or night dreams) you may go through a story, where you seek out a beautiful, desirable person. And then, in the dream, it doesn't go well, and that person rejects you. At that point in the dream, you may withdraw. In that point ,in fantasy, you may feel that you want to pull back from the situation. But that is secondary to having wanted to reach out in the first place - for both connection and

approval, the give and take. In your dream, you want power and you find yourself at risk. You may freeze or hide, a pullback. Again, it's a secondary reaction. What you're looking for when you're looking for your Idealized Self Image is What's your primary quest,? What is your principal drive, understanding that you will have both?.

Another point about the Idealized Self Image is that it must show in the rigid command: the should, and must; the anxiety and guilt, when the compulsion to live up to it diverges, in certain situations, from yourself, and from others. One of the hallmarks of the Idealized Self Image is a rigidity. There must be a rigidity, because if it isn't rigid, it's not an Idealized Self Image. Using all three words, it's idealized because it's not real. It's a self-image, self meaning it's about you (not about 'them' but about you). And it's an image. An image is not flesh and blood. An image doesn't take into account, *"I've had a bad day."* Image stands there and says, *"Get over the bad day, because you need to be all things to all people!"* The image is what makes the whole thing inflexible.

And funny - and lastly - that if you want to see what your (I think I'm repeating this...) - looking at your fantasies and daydreams and night dreams can give you an idea of what your primary pseudo-solution is. So now, pausing for any questions...

Q: Yes. I didn't get exactly - I mean, the message behind the daydream, if we bring something - I didn't get it.

A: I appreciate that because, heaven knows, I'm not always clear.

What the guide is saying is that as a tool, your dreams can help you see which quest is strongest in you; the quest for power, or the quest for love. To find that, look at your daydreams (I am presuming that this would also include your night dreams). I believe that this would be the distinction; when we daydream, we have more control of the situation. When we have dreams in our sleep, we sometimes dream things that we don't like, that make us uncomfortable or unhappy.

In terms of your question, the sleep dreams are not as valuable as the daydreams. Let's say that you're driving in your car, and you're daydreaming. You're imagining what's going to happen tomorrow, when you meet your friend for lunch. You imagine that, at lunch, you are received with love, and that she's very pleased to see you, and that you have a pleasurable experience. And you find yourself filled with happiness. What the Guide is suggesting is that this would be a dream where your quest is for love, where you wish to experience pleasure - rather than a quest for power, where t you do not want to experience defeat, and you want to experience some level of winning.

He is suggesting is that, in your daydreams, you can notice a pattern. You may not daydream the same thing over and over and over (although sometimes you may), but there's probably going to be some variety.

The idea is to notice where is the preponderance; where the majority of dreams / daydreams lead you. Do they lead you to connection and pleasure? Or do they lead you to glory and winnin, and away from defeat?

Does that help differentiate?

I brought in sleep dreams because they can be used. And I'm glad you asked the question. Because, like I say, with daydream, we have more control and so daydreams more accurately reflect what our day to day compulsions might be leading us towards, or might be about. A daydream may more accurately reflect what our emotional needs are, day to day. So if you if you want me to explain a little bit more..? Perhaps that was enough. I mean, mainly the daydreams are what we want. What the guide is suggesting is that you notice; does it tend to be about power and control, or love pleasure and relationship? Which one?

Now this might make it easier to segue, because the next thing I was going to do was I was going to go into how we do Pathwork process. So let me go there, specifically answering your question, without naming it.

Daily Review PL 28

The Guide does talk here about (the equivalent of) Daily Review, because what he talks about is noticing. Daily review is about noticing. It's a specific way to notice. It's a way of training ourselves to notice what we're thinking and feeling.

To your point; if you accept what the guide says, that daydreams can have some valuable information for you, then one question is, why don't I really know? I don't remember my daydreams. How can they help me if I don't remember them? By using a form of Daily Review! I'm going to keep mentioning that, because I think Daily Review is a very valuable, yet underutilized tool, because people see it as tiresome, as a chore, instead of seeing it as supportive and helpful. Daily review is only a matter of making a few notes every day.

In this case, you might sit down at the end of the day (or the beginning of the day, or during the day) and tally up. You might recall some daydreams that you had during the day.

Now a daydream can be five minutes, it can be a half an hour, it can be 30 seconds. See if you can write down your daydreams. For instance, a daydream can be when you thought about what would happen tomorrow, in varying detail. That's not just thinking, 'Oh, I have to be at lunch tomorrow at 12 ,and I have to meet Susie'. Daydreaming is imagining the lunch with Susie; daydreaming is imagining yourself walking up to the to the cafe table, and sitting down. That's a daydream. When you are imagining what something could look like, or be like, or feel like, you're daydreaming.

1) Write down what you're daydreaming about. Then notice what you're feelings are towards / about that. Are they about, '*Oh, I have to be on top of this presentation because I must win the promotion*' or '*must win the argument*' – what was it about? '*I really need to connect with Susie*' -- ?' Write down a few words to describe the daydream; '*daydreamed about daydream*', '*lunch with Susie*'.

2) Then you want to write down what you felt; '*I felt threatened*'. '*I felt frightened*', '*I felt warm and comfortable*', '*I felt accepted*', whatever.

3) Then write down what you thought. What were your thoughts about the daydream? What were you hoping for? What were you looking for?

If you write down those three things about your daydreams for two weeks, the guide is suggesting is that at the end of two weeks you try to see a larger picture: was this a quest for love? a quest for power? Was I looking for pleasure? Was I looking for control?

You will begin to see a pattern in your daydreams. And once you begin to see a pattern in your daydreams, it will help you see what form your pseudo-solutions take. In other words, how this lecture applies to you.

Now, over a particular two-week period of time, it is possible that you will be in a unique situation, handling something very specific, that only represents 'five minutes' in your overall life. You don't have to take everything very seriously. If it's a very, very focused two-week period of time, you will know if that is common, a trend, or an outlier. You will know if that's how you are most of the time. But even if you're only that way for two weeks, it will tell you something about yourself!

For instance, when I am inventing something, or when I travel on business and I'm under stress, I see things in terms of win/lose. I see it as power. But how do I know? Well, because I know myself, and I know that I took these notes while I was on a business trip, and I know I was stressed. And I know when I feel I have to meet certain goals and have to be a certain kind of person, in terms of win/lose. But I also know that *because* I remember my other daydreams. I know 'this/x' is special. I know that 'this/y' is not normal for me, i.e., to be focused on winning arguments; that normally my daydreams include other factors. They include meeting people, talking to people, imagining holidays, imagining cruises, imagining what my life is going to look like in five years, imagining what my new home will look like. These are different than the kind of daydreams I might have during a very stressful two-week period.

So when you do daily review, you want to stay aware of the context, of the larger picture; you need to know that you're on a two-week business trip, and you're under threat. Alternatively, if you're on a two-week holiday, you might have many *more* daydreams about pleasure than you're used to! But you are the one who knows what your daily life is usually about. And vacation daydreams might reflect a different aspect of you, than appears during your usual daily life.

What the guide is suggesting is that daydreams will indicate to you what your quest is.

Then, late in the lecture, the guide talks about doing the work.

The first major step in becoming aware of your emotions is an inner permission to find out what you really feel. You need to basically make a commitment to yourself, that you want to start finding out what you really feel. The Guide says this has to be cultivated with prayer, meditation, and by a daily resolution of intent.

And that's what I'm saying daily review represents, without using the same words. If you make a daily resolution of intent -- practically speaking, a daily resolution of intent needs to manifest somehow -- if every day I say, "*I'm going to live my life better and differently*" then I should also be noticing, what's the next step? How am I doing that?

One of the ways to do that is to start noticing.

One of the best ways to notice, and not allow yourself to conveniently forget, overlook, exaggerate, or underestimate is Daily Review, which is only about 'making notes every day'.

We're such strong people; if we decide that we are 'x' kind of person, we are fully capable of ignoring all the evidence that we are we are another kind of person.

If you decide that what you want to do is to find out what you really feel, you need to start noticing what your actual feelings are, day by day. Because while you can fool yourself in your head, where it's quick and easy to exaggerate or overdramatize, the day to day evidence of what you felt is very hard to fake. Daily Review, with the intent to reveal your own feelings, is one of the best tools you can use for finding out what you feel, what actually happens in your inner life, what conflicts are ongoing, day in and day out, in you.

And for any mental exercise - for instance, if I asked you, what kind of person are you? Intellectually, you could give me an answer that isn't real. We can do that. We can be in our Idealized Self Image and simply describe it to the other person without realizing that we're describing an ideal.. But we can't do that on a day to day basis. On a day to day basis, we fall short, and we are at conflict with ourselves.

Welcome this work. It is about coming down to the grassroots level, about dealing with who we are, about noticing conflicts, and perhaps adjusting the Idealized Self Image a little bit, allowing it to be more flexible, allowing ourselves not to beat ourselves up for our imperfections. Also, if you're trying to find out who you are, the Guide say it's very important to be able to discern this in terms of personality and drive. To understand if you are on a quest for power, or on a quest for love.

And the day to day evidence, a 'data review', can help you uncover which of those is predominant in your life at this time (understanding that three weeks ago, or three years ago, or three decades ago, a different force may have dominated in your life). That's interesting to know; but to start with, we need to know who we are today.

Walking the Path

This last section is about doing the work, walking the path.

1) The first part of the work is becoming aware of our emotions.

Now the guide also says that after we make a positive intent to find our emotions, to not be disappointed or dismayed at what we find at first. In the first phases of awareness there will usually be a welling up of resentment that you were not conscious of before, and that may be connected to guilt and anxiety. And that is why the Guide talks about the Idealized Self Image. He's inviting you to look at your emotions and warning you that the first things you may see could reflect a lot of inner anxiety and conflict. Then he's trying to say that this is why you may not have admitted that you were dissatisfied with yourself, because there were a lot of disharmonious feelings that you were not ready to deal with or were not able to deal with. Now it's time to see that you are dissatisfied.

2) As the next step, we are looking for a re-establishment of balance, due to facing truth and making changes where and whenever possible. This balance may not have been previously attainable..

We make a positive intent to find what our feelings are, and then we open the doors, open the floodgates, and all this stuff pours out. Then we have to look at all of these. There are reasons why we may have been at conflict. There are reasons why we may have put ourselves in conflict. You need to see the conflict and then sift through it to find out why it's there.

The way I phrase it is -- when you say *'I want to know'* you open a door. Don't be surprised that stuff comes out! It's like deciding to clean a closet that had a bunch of stuff put in it, and you open the door saying, *'today's the day I'm going to clean the closet'* and the situation-comedy version / cartoon version is that everything in the closet falls on your head. Of course, you haven't looked in the closet for a long time -- psychically, energetically, you've been stuffing things in that closet without admitting it or realizing the consequences. So you are going to get a little bit of an 'explosion' at first, and you may not be fully prepared for it; but it will be okay. That's a natural course of events. Don't judge the situation, notice the situation.

3) Then notice what these conflicts are made of. Again, that's the tool of understanding. There might be an Idealized Self Image operating, like a poster on the wall that we've been comparing ourselves to, and so we store up resentments and feelings of failure. (in the handouts for this presentation, I made up examples of feelings we might discover).

4) The fourth aspect is that you will be able to find the main components of your Idealized Self-Image. That's where I digressed from my notes, and started talking about daydreams, because looking at our daydreams *is* a way of finding the components of our Idealized Self Image, the components of our drive, so we can then see where the drives might have created conflict.

You can have a quest for power and not admire it, those two things can co-exist. If you have a quest for power, and you don't admire it, then basically you don't admire what you're doing -- day in and day out! That's going to breed a lot of anxiety and resentment (and that goes 'in the closet'). Again, you open the closet, all this stuff falls out -- but that's okay. It's part of the process of cleaning it up!

5) After this is explored, the underlying neglected and shamefully covered core of your problem will evolve into emotional awareness. In other words, you were able to open the door. You were able to let the stuff out of the closet. Now you need to start sorting through it.

You may not be happy with the fact that you've been storing up so much stuff, but that's okay. And if you feel some shame, you're will need to let that go. Let those feelings wash over you. Because feeling overwhelmed by shame will lead you to push everything back in the closet.

Finally, the guide *says 'this is a painful process my friend'*. He doesn't mince words. He acknowledges this is a painful process.

The courage to go through this pain, which you may encounter again on various levels, has to be experienced. The inner will to go through it must always be cultivated in us. The inner will to inexorably face the truth in you, regardless of whether or not it is pleasant or flattering, must always be renewed afresh. What I feel the guide means is, it doesn't get easier, but you get better at it. And as you get better at it, you may be able to look more and more closely at your life.

Another way I phrase this is that, once you get an idea what's in front of you, and you've sorted through it, then you can crank up the microscope, and look a little deeper, a little more closely.

Another silly analogy is: if you've got a really messy room to clean, it's efficient to do a 'first pass' in cleaning it. You're not going to get everything the first time. Then you come back to the room 15 minutes later, and some of the clutter has been removed, and now you see what you might do on a 'second pass'. So you go through and you clean some things or pick up another batch of clutter. Then you go away for 15 minutes, and when you come back -- if you truly want to clean more deeply, there's always more to do! Now you might get out the scrub brushes. Now you get out some tools. Now you get out the tooth brush for the dirt in the tiny crevices, or use cleaning materials on the finger marks and the furniture, or clean the upholstery. You make as many passes as you have time for, and clean as deeply as you choose. And the next day, tasks may need to be repeated.

On a spiritual level, you will never be 'done'. The goal is not to be 'done'. The goal is to engage in the process. Because as you engage in the process, you get better and better at it. You see finer and finer layers and you will actually achieve both the power and the pleasure that we all want and deserve – by becoming aware, and by enacting your commitment to act.

There is no reason why we should not have personal power. But personal power usually results from building character, of doing our work, keeping our word, being reasonable, accepting defeat when it is inevitable, being graceful in defeat, being magnanimous in victory, being generous to others even when they do not approve of us, or reject us, And saying, *'I can understand that you have feelings and I have feelings. I wish we were together on this. And then we'll work towards being together on this. But I accept where we are today. And I have a sense of separation of disappointment of being alone or left behind.'*

Someone who addresses life like this is the kind of person that we think of as wise. This is the kind of person who usually wields true inner authority and power in a group. Now, that does not mean that other people aren't grabbing authority and power and doing what they please, but I am focused on helping people on a spiritual quest.

Pathwork is not going to tell you how to get the top job. Pathwork is not going to tell you how to get elected. Pathwork is not going to help you 'get' the right lover or friend. Pathwork is about a spiritual journey, the evolution of your being, clarifying of your conflicts, and gaining an appreciation of your real self.

The natural, inevitable consequence will be pleasure!

And the other natural, inevitable consequence will be that people who have done similar kinds of work, who understand to some degree this kind of spiritual development, they will see and understand what you have done and wish to engage with you. And that is where personal power comes from.

That's why this work needs to be truly understood in a spiritual quest, which may or may not manifest as power in the way that we are used to understanding it.

So the last note that I put, is that all of -- Yes, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Q: what do you mean, that those may not manifest?

A: I am saying that Pathwork is not a tool to get a better job. Pathwork is a spiritual path. And that means that for some of us, even if we do everything to the best of our abilities, we may not get what our minds imagined the reward should be. Because this is a spiritual quest, not a worldly quest. This work is about inner happiness; and inner happiness can exist in poverty. Inner happiness can exist with illness. Inner happiness can exist in solitude. If we look at our situations and say, *'Well, I did all these things, but my friend didn't come back'* then we have missed the point.

As part of your spiritual journey, your friend may have reflected to you where you were in disharmony, or attracted you to stay in disharmony. But once you understand how to make your life more harmonious, your friend may or may not choose to continue to be part of your journey. Do not attempt to use Pathwork to make something happen, sometime specific on the material plane. Does that make sense? It may not make you happy to hear that, but do you understand what I'm saying? (Yeah).

And that is the difference. Pathwork is not supposed to 'make' you happy. It was made available to help you develop spiritually; happiness will result from self-development, yet this may take some time. Human beings think that happy is having money in the bank, and friends and having a good job. That's not real spiritual happiness [Ref: PL 5]. We need to understand the difference. Does that answer your question? (No, but in some way.)

Okay. I understand that there may be some confusion there. But I think that it might be more about a protest than confusion. If you look at how you feel about what I said, there may be a place where there's an assumption that if you do everything right, you'll be happy. But that is not what spirituality is about. Spirituality is believing that if you do everything right (meaning spiritually, right) happiness is inevitable. You don't have to work for. It simply happens when we do what will result in happiness, instead of trying to reach out and grab something specific. That urgent sense of *'I have to have 'x' to live / have pleasure'* is what this very lecture is about. So, my invitation to you (and I do not mean this in any derogatory fashion) is to sit down and read through these two lectures. Consider that a strong desire for something specific could actually be the distortion of our instincts for self-preservation and/or procreation. Let me say that again: the strong desire for something specific can actually be a manifestation of a distortion. So you may have found a very valuable place to begin exploring this topic, where you insist *'But I want this'*.

These lectures suggest that you consider, *'What if I let it go?'* One point in the lecture (that I did not go over) was where the guide invites use to consider, *'How do you respond when you are defeated?'* The question is then, defeated in what way? And that depends on what you see as defeat.

On some level, it's nice to know which quest you're after. Because someone who's defeated in their quest for power, that's going to be different kind of defeat than being defeated at attaining connection and pleasure. It's going to bring up different kinds of emotions than someone who was on a quest for love, who is defeated by not getting approval, or getting love the way they want it. It helps to know which one you're after.

Then look at, how do you handle defeat? What feelings come up? Again, you can use Daily Review for two weeks to look at your daydreams, figure out which quest is activated more often, power or love, and then do Daily Review for another two weeks. Look at ,every time I feel

defeated, this is what I feel; and to notice where you may feel driven to do something about the defeat. When the reality is, you simply didn't get what you wanted.

This goes back to the beginning of the lecture, when I said that we imagine danger; we exaggerate, that not getting what we want all the time = death. You are in a duality. You're in a power current, or a love current. Because there is very little, that if we don't get it, we die immediately! Of course, there are those situations, but I know very few people who face them on a daily basis. What most of us face is imaginary death; and in that imaginary death is the key to distortions in our soul. Perhaps this will help.

Awareness Strengthens Positive Feelings

Let me close off with this thought. To do this work at all, it is important to develop a positive attitude. And here are the two quotes from the guide: **The more you become aware of, and understand the cause and effect of negative emotions, the weaker they will automatically become.** I'll read that again. **The more you become I'm aware of and understand the cause and effect of negative emotion, the weaker they will automatically become.** And why is that positive? Because the Guide is saying that negativity does not get stronger because it is looked at; it gets weaker. So, as bad as a feeling may seem, by looking at it, by becoming aware of it, and understanding the reasons for it, the feelings or urges will begin to soften and dissipate. They become weaker.

Eventually, a proper inner balance will begin to take place. You will see where being inwardly or outwardly aggressive is unjustified, and you will be learn to be aggressive in a healthy and constructive way. In becoming aware, and understanding these negativities and conflicts, you will become rebalanced internally. Instead of using aggression to try to get something that isn't real or worthy (=negative aggression), you will be able to exercise your inner will. You can still be in the world, you can still be you, but your aggression will be healthy and constructive (= positive aggression, as appropriate).

You do not lose - as I have said before, in a joke sense, you win, even though there's no winning. So, language tends to be dualistic. If you can take the time to look at all these factors, if you can take the time to become aware and to understand, yet have the idea that then you'll win, you won't! Once you understand there is no winning, that this is a process that you're here on the planet to learn, and learning is a day to day, month to month, year to year, decade to decades process – an exploration, an ongoing adventure -- that's when you win; when you no longer see it in black and white.

[Line issues regarding a question] How should we relate the night dreams with the day dreams?

Q: I mean, there is some message, a message behind that. Because it's our unconscious

Well, in previous lectures I've talked about the deeper levels of spirituality. As I said in the beginning, this lecture is about feet on the ground, life / death, finding ourselves in the wrong place doing the wrong thing. This, this lecture is about how to understand why we 'go wrong'. In previous lectures, I talked about the spiritual meaning of life on Earth, and that is to learn. One of the ways we learn is by being wrong, and letting go. We learn by getting wrapped up in an illusion and finding our way out.

There is a toy called a Chinese finger trap. And it's tube woven from strips of reeds or paper. You put a fingers in each end, and if you try to pull them out quickly, the woven pieces tighten up. If you pull, it grabs your fingers and you can't get out. But if you relax, and push your fingers together, and just slowly wiggle them out, you can get free. To some degree, that's what this lecture is about. When we're fighting for a solution, it's as if we are inside the Chinese finger trap, and we're pulling hard but we're not getting free. Yet we may actually enjoy the struggle, or be afraid to relax and let go. From a spiritual perspective, growing is about relaxing and letting go, looking at a situation and figuring out what is appropriate. That's growth. It is childish to simply tug and tug and tug. It is childish to say, *'But I want!'* and not understand that what you want may not be spiritually appropriate for you. Your spiritual path may be to learn to relax and see other alternatives that make sense. I thank you very much for your question.

There is no way in one presentation or one lecture I can include everything. So I can easily understand why, after only a two hour presentation, I haven't made things perfectly clear. I'm not supposed to make things perfectly clear! My hope is to challenge you, and pique your interest, and give you some things to think about, so that you continue your own personal work.

Thank you.

Oh, thanks to all you for being here.

I very much appreciate it.

Hope to talk to you another time.

Bye. Thank you.

Download study guide at www.janrigsby.org
Guide Quotes © The Pathwork Foundation 1999
Full text of this plus all other lectures may be downloaded from www.pathwork.org