

Pathwork® Steps

The Transition from the No-Current to the Yes-Current

Pathwork Lecture #125

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PoRtWaVunk0&t=634s>

Transcript of YouTube Video by Jan Rigsby

(59:07 mins)

The topic for Pathwork Steps online meetings and study guide this month was Pathwork Lecture 125, *The Transition from the No-Current to the Yes-Current*.

Introduction

And what I did this month is I went through all the notes that I take during the online meetings where people share. And sometimes I go back and forth with them on concepts, issues, interpretations, etc. I went through all the notes that I take and I lifted comments that participants made as illustrations of ways to address this lecture and viewpoints about this lecture. It's why I hold the online meetings. Because, to me, people already know this information; they have an intuition. They have a sense of what is right and wrong; what is in accordance with divine; spiritual law versus I want to call it selfish intent, self-centered intent. And the purpose of development is to become less self-centered and become more aware and involved in the group development-- the development of our family, our neighborhood, our cities, countries, nations, and our world, which naturally would contribute to any larger spiritual aspect.

So, for me, people already know this. But we are inhibited by our defenses; by our conditioning; by our programming. So that we're told, "*It's over there*" and we head in a certain direction in our lives. And then at a certain point, mid-life (whatever "mid-life" means...) we realize that may not be what we actually believe. And as we uncover what we actually believe, it comes into conflict with what we've been taught; what we have lovingly embraced. So that the transition is difficult because it feels like we're rejecting others when on some level we are. We are taking what we were taught and we are making something more; something better out of it.

My dad used to tease me when I was fairly successful. And one point I made more than he did, and he said the sign of a successful parent is when their child earns more than they do. And it was particularly loving to me. My father tended to speak in terms of real-world and in terms of practical... what we could call measuring points. That he would be so generous. That he would say, "*Wow, my kid is successful because they have gotten further along than I have.*" And that's how I speak and feel about spiritual growth; that the goal is for your kids to develop more fully than you did. And it is also my personal experience there's a little twinge there when they get to the point where you see that they actually are developing more than you did. Where they are freer; where they are kinder than; where they are more loving. And it's not always easy to take some credit for that. I must have done something right because you feel free to do that; that you are at ease; that you contribute more than I feel I did at your age. So there's a twinge there. But then my father's words come back to me. And I think we need to be proud of this. That they are already, at a younger age than I was, doing more in the world; contributing more in the world than I feel that I did.

So what I'm speaking of here is that there is a knowing. There is a flowering that can happen in a person. And part of this flowering happens when you can distinguish; when you can differentiate between (as this lecture focuses on) the no-current versus the yes-current. So again, with parents and children, there's a tendency to fall into a rut of "*No, no, no,*" which is not good for the child and it's an unnecessary part of development. And good parents try to balance that with trying to find as many "yes" places as they possibly can so that the child is learning both aspects. If there is a "*No, you cannot, should not do this*" versus a "*yes, here's an option, here's an opening. Here's a way for you to flow.*"

Study Guide Structure & Framework

When I divide these lectures into segments, I look for four main points so that I can divide it into four weeks. And this month I divided the lecture into:

- 1) The meaning of yes and no-current because you can't really discuss the transition until you have a sense of what these two aspects are; these two flavors are. So the meaning of the yes and no-current.
- 2) Finding your "no," which you have to admit is there in order to transition from it.
- 3) There's a section on inner will versus outer will, where there's a conflict between what the ego; what the outside of you wants versus that quiet voice inside that says, "*I want to make some changes. This is not who I am. This is not who I want to be.*" So the conflict between inner will and outer will, which is discussed at length in Pathwork Lecture 64, which was a previous [month's] topic.
- 4) And then lastly, there was a section on negativity towards the process. And I'll explain that in a few minutes.

But anyway, those were the four sections.

Part I: The Meaning of Yes-Current and No-Current

So, the first part, the meaning of the yes and no-current. "*No*" is not a no-current. And "*Yes*" is not a yes-current. What we're referring to here is a tendency to be in a place where "*no*" is the first response. "*Current*" meaning, just as if you were in a river and it was moving quickly and you lose the ability to make a free choice on any given topic or subject. Where something comes up and you're in the current, you're in the flow of no. So the answer "*no*" pops up without your thinking. And you may not realize that any given situation might elicit a different answer from you. But you can't think that way because you're in no-current. You can think of it similarly, if you were in a situation where you were rushed all morning and someone asked an opinion or a decision. And you shot something back because you feel like "*I have to finish this, I have to move on. I have to go.*" Instead of realizing that this decision or this opinion needs some reflection and bookmarking it. And saying, "*No, that's in a different mindset than I am right now. Let me finish what I need to do right now. And then I'll come back to that later.*" So when we're in a current going in a certain direction; another way of thinking of it is if we think we're in a yes-current. For instance, we are partying, we are having fun with our friends. We may be dismissive of things that would interfere with that. So that's a form of a current too. It's a yes-current. But the yes-current can also be forced. It can be "*I must have a good time. No negative items, no negative conversation can come up right now. It will spoil my fun.*"

So we want to transition from the no-current to a yes-current. But we want the yes-current to be honest. And instead of being a tight, narrow channel, that yes-current that the Guide is referring to is an easy, flowing current, where we're open but moving towards a "*yes*." So, in effect, the no-current is a way of being in the negative. And the yes-current is a way of being in the positive. And inherently a no-current is more closed off because it's a "*no*" rather than a yes-current that is saying "*yes*" to what is real in the moment. Even though they both use the same word "*current*" to describe them.

So in terms of saying "*yes*" and "*no*" there's an attitude about saying "*yes*" that opens us up. And there's also an attitude about saying "*no*." If you can't say "*no*" you're not saying "*yes*." So when "*yes*" is forced and doesn't allow for "*no*" it's a strong current. It's a forcing current. So the yes-current needs to be honest; that sometimes like a sailboat, you have to tack left and right to get to where you're going. So that's a little bit of explanation of how we're referring to the yes and no-current.

The other thing about a yes and no-current is the invisible illusion that one answer represents a life-affirming answer. And one answer affirms something that feels like death or negation. This is the classic duality, which

is discussed in Pathwork Lecture 143. So whenever there is an illusion that one answer is life-affirming and the other answer is deadly; deadly to anything; an idea; or thought; a freedom. So [between] life or death... you're always going to choose the answer that is life-affirming rather than an idea that deadens any part of you. The trick there is sometimes feeling deadened can feel safe. And safe is life-affirming. So this braid of life and death has to be carefully examined as to whether you are really facing a difficult, deadly situation or whether you're just facing a little frustration of your will. So when your will is frustrated that's not death, but we may avoid that. We may identify that as death so that we go into resistance; rebellion as a form of life. So the duality of life versus death also impacts how we perceive "no" versus "yes."

Part II: Finding the No-Current

So the second part is finding your "no." And there's a little resistance to this. We don't want to believe that we're in a no-current. We don't want to think that we are negative. We prefer to think "*Oh, we're just being practical. Or we're just being agreeable.*" So we're casting off things that are disagreeable. Agreeable is a yes-current, but agreeable can be a negation of the full spectrum of what's going on around us. It can be a forced "*this is good for me*" versus "*what is good for me*" and an inability to review a given situation based on changed circumstances. So what was good for you when you were three and what was good for you when you were 7, or 13, or 20, or 27 is not necessarily what's good for you today. And yet, if we hold a tightness around values and beliefs, we may not realize that we're still governed by certain attitudes; by certain decisions that we made when we were quite young that truly need to be reviewed at this point. So in finding our "no", we may need to find where we're avoiding opening up to new situations.

Participant Sharing & Process Work - Here's where I'm going to read from the examples that participants brought up:

One person said that moving from a no-current to a yes-current had a domino effect. That she had a hostile relationship with her parents. And then she made a decision (after a long period of contemplating what the difficulties in the family dynamic were about) she made a decision to take a different attitude. And when she took a different attitude instead of being at war with her parents, she decided to simply be with her parents. They loved her, she loved them. To let the past go and see if there could be a bit of starting over. And when she did that, when she had a different attitude, what she noticed was that her parents noticed her attitude and that theirs changed. And for this participant, she said, "*I now realize what the Guide means when he says you create your own reality.*"

And I loved this story because this is not something that can be purely intellectualized. You cannot know in advance what someone else's response or reaction will be. It is based upon them, and their perceptions, and their life, and their spiritual task. You can't predict where they're going to go. So intellectually, you can say, "*my changing my attitude can't possibly change a given situation.*" But what Pathwork invites us to do is try it... not commit to it for the rest of our life. Not to make or sign contracts saying, "*what we're going to do for the next five years*" but to explore changing our own attitude. And then observing what changes around us. My experience is that changes in my attitude do change the attitudes of people around me. And in the participant sharing many other people noticed similar shifts in dynamics.

Another participant said that her mother had a negative attitude towards life. And so she developed a false bravado. She tried to be a cheerleader. So she had a mother being negative and she was trying to surmount that. That sounds positive. Except it was not precisely her nature to be a cheerleader. She was, in effect, trying to enliven a situation that felt stultifying; that felt deadly. And once she realized the role that she took on, the persona that she took on, just to counteract the negativity of her mother, she said, "*I feel the smallness of this attitude. The forced quality, like wearing a shoe that is too tight.*" I was very touched by her sharing.

Another participant said, "*I see how I want to broadcast my image of how things ought to be. So I demand the Earth plane to conform to my visions of right and wrong.*" And in a previous lecture, we talked about how this is one of the misconceptions about being a human being on the planet. We're not here to make the planet in

the image of our belief system. So that she wound up taking up a persona of an enforcer. *"I know right and wrong. I need to create that on the Earth."* But the actual purpose of being here, according to the Pathwork lectures, is to explore our negativity, to explore our "no", to explore our resistance. And if we wish to be resistant, go ahead and do that. And then notice what the results are. In effect with spiritual law and karmic accounting, if you behave badly the chances are very good that you're going to get negativity brought back to you. By changing to a positive attitude, by looking for positive ways to express yourselves, you may be met by more positive and affirmative behavior. So when I behave negatively (even if I think I'm positive) I think I know what's right and wrong and I want to enforce right. It's that enforcement element that telegraphs to other people and says, *"I'm going to change you. You're wrong and I'm going to change you,"* which is inherently not a positive view. Instead of allowing them to explore what is true for them spiritually. Enforcing our attitude diminishes their free will and their value as a divine being.

Another participant said, *"I created this relationship mess. I created damage to others, so I feel guilty."* Okay, and as we talked about it what I noticed was number one, there was an exaggeration. *"I created this relationship mess"* is trying to take responsibility for everything. And while that's admirable, (it's admirable to look for our part in a situation) it is not true that we can create a huge relationship mess. The truth is other people can walk away. Other people have an ability to react and be in relationship with us and impact our behavior.

In Pathwork Lecture 180, which is *The Spiritual Meaning of Relationship*, the Guide hints (he doesn't use percentages), but he hints that we can only be responsible for half of the relationship. Now, if you have authority and domination over another human being i.e. parent to child, you do have more influence over that person than if you were dealing with an adult who is free to come and go. So we can have more than 50%. But we can't have 100%. So even domination over a child, we may literally be able to destroy that child's life, but that does not change how that child thinks. It's a physical power, which we can exercise. When we say *"I created this relationship mess"* what we're really talking about is *"I engaged in a relationship that spiraled into negative territory and I didn't do anything about it."* And when we claim that responsibility, it is important to remember that there was another person involved and they must also have wanted to be in a negative relationship because they didn't leave.

So I talked about the power that parent has over child, but in relationship, talking about intimate relationship in the sense of an inter-connectedness, whether that's an intimate male/female, female/male, male/male, even if it's an intimate relationship. You can also have this relationship anytime there's a financial connection between two people. You can have it between parents and adult children about estates and legacies. You can have it between roommates over the difficulty of finding another room so that the one roommate feels trapped in a given situation. You can have it over landlord and tenant, employer and employee. You can have an uneven relationship that doesn't work well because the other person is not free to choose. They are not as free to walk away. So when we create in the phrase *"I created a relationship mess,"* there may be a grain of truth in *"I had the power to not do that, but I didn't honor that."* I continued being self-centered and demanding of my own needs. But it's important to recognize that the other person has a part in this. Even if it looks like they were trapped. Adults are very seldom truly trapped. We make choices and we don't want to unmake those choices. And that unwillingness to start over is what keeps us in relationship.

So first, there was an exaggeration in how much responsibility can be taken. And secondly, there can be an overreaction where we are attempting to claim responsibility for the lives others lead. And this is an area where we can misinterpret. I have the ability to make my position in my family less pleasant. I have that ability. And my family members can't necessarily make my participation pleasant. They don't have that power. But the truth is I can't really ruin their lives unless they become over-invested in my negativity; over-invested in my participation in specific events; in a specific way.

So if they are willing to give me space and basically say, *"we'd love to have you three or four times a year, but that'll do. Because your participation doesn't really work well for us."* And yet we honor the relationship. Then how could that adversely affect their lives too much? It's always a shame that there's somebody you

know and love and you are related to, you have ties to, and you don't enjoy their company. But it is our job as adults to monitor that and to create a gerrymandered relationship that honors our desires, hopes, and needs, while honoring as much of another person's as we can manage. And so in relationship, both parties are responsible for negative dynamics that occur. And both parties have a capacity to make changes to that negative dynamic. So what I'm speaking of is in a sentence "*I created this relationship mess*," it's an exaggeration and it's also taking responsibility for other people's actions that we don't actually control. We can influence. But we cannot control.

Another way of looking at the no-current, which I contributed was that a no-current acts like a sea anchor. And I draw a little diagram where the boat is trying to hit forward, but they've left a sea anchor in the water. And I did a bit of sailing so I know about sea anchors. And they are basically buckets on a string and they fill with water and they retard movement of a boat. It's a way of keeping a boat in a relatively stable position when you can't touch the bottom. So out at sea, you throw over a sea anchor. It's not 100% effective, but it does tend to slow the movement of the boat if you don't try to put on an engine or put up sails, which could overpower the resistance of the sea anchor.

A no-current is like that. You can say, "*I want a relationship*" but lurking within you in a place that you don't want to admit is a fear of intimacy, or uncertainty about your value as a person, or, or, or... All of these things act to retard the more superficial desire for certain things. I want financial stability. And yet in me there might be a place that doesn't want to obey the rules and doesn't want to do the same thing from week to week. And most of the time financial stability is a long-term project. It's built upon week-by-week, month-by-month, year-by-year. When you change direction every few weeks, it can sometimes be difficult to build financial stability. So this is how one desire conflicts with another. And the words we say (which are admirable sometimes) don't manifest because we haven't brought up and explored the opposing, the opposite, the concurrent, opposite force within us. So this would be our "no" to a given situation. It's not so much that it's unconscious, you don't really deal with the unconscious. But it may not be overt. It may not be easy to spot. So a lot of Pathwork is about self-analysis; about noticing the tiny details; to notice the cringe; to notice a reluctance; to notice an immediate "no." When, if we think about it, we did want to do something. Or to notice a "yes" and then regret. "*I wish I hadn't said yes to that because I don't really want to do it.*" To notice that there may be two currents going on. And to try to resolve what they are about. So that when we say, "*no thank you, I don't want to do that,*" we mean it. And we move on and we're not full of regret. And if we decide, "*Gee, I wish I'd said that!*" Then the next time we're more open to an invitation or a suggestion. And when we say "yes" and regret it, "*Agghh, I didn't want to spend my time doing that!*" Then again the next time, if we look at that, and we're honest about it, the next time we might adjust our "yes." "*Yes, I can do that for an hour*" instead of getting caught into a full day's activity. But this requires being honest with ourselves. So finding our "no" means that we have to tell the truth. And that's not easy.

Other ways to find your "no" are by observing, as I said, self-denial one moment and then grabbing at it another moment. So we can notice that normally it's like, "*no, that's okay. No, that's okay. No, it's okay.*" And then we find ourselves grabbing. If you say in public (this is one of mine) if you say in public "*no, I won't have dessert, thank you*" as if you're some model dietary or health nut. And then you go home and eat ice cream. So you deny it on one realm. But then, on a private, more private realm, you grab at it. Or at another opportunity you reach for it. That tells you that there's conflict here. You've got two currents going on. And they're acting out in different arenas. It's one way of finding that there's a "no" going on.

Another way of finding your "no" is that it returns over and over. So this is a place where someone says, "*I thought I healed that. I thought I dealt with it.*" And here it is again. Well, it continues to surface because of cause and effect. Cause and effect I talk about in a lot of lectures because each lecture may touch on a concept. This lecture touched on cause and effect. And there's another lecture that goes far more deeply into that. So, the lecture on cause and effect, the primary lecture, is Pathwork Lecture 196 *Commitment Cause and Effect*. What that lecture emphasizes is that if we are only dealing with the effect and we do not address the cause, the cause will produce another effect. So you can be constantly battling the effects. And if you don't go deeper and find out what is causing these effects, these symptoms, then they will just reproduce again.

I like to think of it biologically. So, if you've got an illness and it's spawning different symptoms and you only treat the symptoms, like you've got a rash and you deal with it with a topical cream. The rash may go down and then something else comes up. And you deal with that. And then something else comes up. Some diseases are very, very difficult to diagnose because they produce random symptoms that come and go. And unless a doctor is looking for a specific, deeper cause they may not catch it. I remember one example where someone had a deep ache in their chest area. And they self-diagnosed this as a heart attack and started feeling very depressed and very vulnerable. They thought they were going to die. And then they finally went to a doctor. And they diagnosed an infection in the sternum, which was easily cleared up with antibiotics. So, yet, could a heart attack cause that kind of symptom? Yes, it could. And there are other things that could also produce such symptoms. So anything that returns over and over again, we may have to look deeper than we've looked in the past to find the common cause of different symptoms or similar symptoms expressed at different times.

Another way of finding your "no" is recognizing that we collude with it. So there's a place where (and this is a phrase that was used in the meetings) a person confessed that "no" can feel like a best friend. We like our "no." It creates a quiet environment. It relieves us of responsibilities. It sends away distressing information by refusing to deal with it. That "no" can feel like a best friend. That's a powerful admission! That we are colluding with "no" because we just want peace and quiet right now. And we're not taking responsibility for what the "no" is doing in our lives.

Another way of finding our "no" is noticing how many "shoulds" we express in our lives. This can be technical, where you say the word "should" a lot and you become aware of it. It can also be an energy, an attitude. It's very subtle and harder to find. But if we are constantly saying I "should" do something then what we're expressing (and I'm laughing because I'm going to give you another lecture number) we're expressing a form of the idealized self-image. So we have a mask self that represents who we long to be, who we want to be, what society wants us to be. And we would like to be accepted by society. And this is an idealized self-image, Pathwork Lecture 83. And this concept talks about how we create a persona, as I've mentioned before, that gets us what we want. And that becomes a "should." It becomes a slave master. It becomes a taskmaster, a harsh voice that says, "*No, you can't be your unique self. It doesn't fit the mold. It doesn't fit the picture.*" It doesn't fit the image of who you say you want to be. So "shoulds" tell us that there is an idea out there that we have dreamed of and we want to fit that. And it sounds like "*You should do this. You should not do that.*" The question is, well what are we doing? And what if the image was, once again, created when we were younger and it's just hung around past its use by date? And this image should have been enlivened and changed. It should be something real, something that represents who we are today. Not something leftover from our teenage years, or our early 20s, or even from our childhood.

So, you can find the "no" by 1) observing because it returns over and over, 2) by realizing that we secretly like it, and 3) because of words like "should." I "should" not have any "no" is an example of not wanting to be the kind of person who's negative. And yet if you have the "no" you need to deal with the "no."

Part III: Inner Will v. Outer Will

Now part three was inner will versus outer will. And in this section we talked about the value of talking to others. That one of the ways the inner will comes out is in quiet, relaxed conversation with others, not shouting directions, and not giving orders, and not defending yourself. But in quiet, intimate conversation with others. There's an aspect of the Pathwork where it says, "*you can't do this alone.*" And I like to be generous with that interpretation. It doesn't mean you have to be taught or find a teacher or guru. What it means is that it is very difficult to find some of the more subtle threads of negativity within us; the ways that we hide; the ways that we defend. If we are in relationship with other people we speak it and we can feel it. And if we can't feel it, they may be able to also. And the feedback from other people can make something very subtle and very abstract very concrete. And that this is one of the most powerful elements of being in relationship. That it is the struggles and the fights. And the painful aspect of being in relationship is about revealing yourself. And realizing you're not 100% who you thought you were. And you're certainly not 100%

who you want to be. And it is only in those unguarded moments, in those casual conversations, in those intimate confessions to one another that these truths may come out. Your inner will may express itself and the outer will is not activated to shut it down.

Participant Sharing & Process Work - So the comments made by participants were that talking makes my thoughts concrete, more concrete. So when I speak it, I can hear it. It's real. Rather than being a fleeting thought like a shooting star that I don't quite pay attention to. There's something about talking that puts it into the room. We can sense an echoing in the room.

I personally went through something a few weeks ago where I said something unkind. The minute the words came out of my mouth I knew they were unkind. I am not a perfect person. I did not immediately catch them and fix the damage. It's as if I froze, deer in the headlights, I froze. And the damage was done. The other person received those unkind words and felt devastated by them. Partly because they weren't expecting that. It's important for me to see that. I haven't completely figured out what that was all about. But obviously there's a part of me that was angry or upset and that shouted out unkind words as defensive or attack. And by saying the words, I know that that exists. It's not a "maybe" anymore. That exists. And it allows me to begin to examine. If it's still subtle, it could take months for me to look at that. It's not the worst thing I've ever done. It's not the biggest thing I've ever done. It's just a very small example. But my point is that that's an example of what the participant said, "*talking makes my thoughts more concrete.*" Not necessarily clean and wonderful, but more concrete so that I can then begin to work on them.

Another person says that they saw an opportunity to be and express self-righteousness. So they were going to say it, but as they formed the words they realized that that would be an expression of self-righteousness. And they consciously thought it was a lovely way of expressing it. "*Meh... I'm gonna let somebody else do that.*" So you don't actually have to say the words to prepare to say the words and realize I'm going to park that someplace and deal with it later. I'm not going to offer that in conversation. I don't think that what I'm saying is clean, honest, right. So sorry, but yeah, "*let somebody else do that*" was a comic way of pulling back from being self-righteous and saying, "*if somebody else wants to be self-righteous, I'll let them take their turn.*" I now know that I was trying to be self-righteous. I can work on that.

Another person said that Pathwork concepts "*feel like medicine that doesn't taste good, but it's good for you.*" So finding your "no" does not taste good. It makes you feel terrible. But it is good for the soul to see the truth. And if there's an aspect of us that is angry, or feeling deprived, and grabby... all the negative emotions that you can imagine. If there's an area of us that feels that way, that needs to be addressed. It is important to address it. So seeing who we are is as important as an illness registering a symptom. The most deadly illnesses are the ones that you can't find; you can't see; there are no symptoms until it has gotten to the point where it has compromised major organs in your body and becomes a major battle to deal with. So as nasty as it is to feel negativity come out of your mouth, it is an opportunity to clean that up on a deep level so that that doesn't happen again.

Another person said that they had lived a life, that they were recognizing a commonality, and this comes out of their use of daily review, where they kept notes week-by-week, month-by-month on things that happened. And they found a trend. And they said the trend was "*I don't ask.*" And then they had to look deeper than that. Well, why don't you ask? And she said, "*So people won't be able to say no and then have power over me.*" So if you can imagine this dynamic: I'm not going to ask because then they'll say no, and I'll feel bad. And then they'll own me. And this inhibits this person from interacting with other human beings, which is a terrible loss to not be able to ask. And then they said, "*Because I don't ask, the need becomes acute. And then a strong current develops where I have to have whatever it is at any cost.*" So these feelings, these needs for human interaction, human sharing, asking for help to do something where you can't do it by yourself, they don't go away. They begin to build up and build up. And they shoot out and grab, as I described a few minutes ago. And then she said, so #1) I don't ask #2) the need becomes acute. And then I feel backed into a corner. And I have to break out in order to survive. It becomes a life or death struggle just to be. And the quality of the

being no longer matters. And she said, *"I would steal, lie, hide or run away. Because at that point, I've created a situation where I feel I have no choice."*

And this is where the inner will was denied until the outer will feels that it has to take action to survive. And the outer world will take action. That's its job: to survive. The inner will is about self-development. And if you think of it as being a little optional that we can survive without self-development, that we may not be happy and joyful without self-development. So the outer will is geared to safety, security. The inner will is geared towards making a better life, a more joyous life. They have to work hand in hand. You can't have a better, joyous life if you're dead. You can't have a better, joyous life if you're ostracized from society for no good reason, except perhaps your stubbornness. So the outer will has a place. It recognizes things that we need *to do*. The inner will recognizes who we need *to be*. Its voice is softer, gentler and can be overridden easily by the outer will until the outer will may become a tyrant.

Another person said, *"Feelings versus talking. Feelings often tell me a different story than the mind tells."* So this is a place where there's an inner dialogue. And you can get to the point where you can sense it. It's like touch sense or hearing or sight. You may not be aware of it today. But if you decide to become sensitive to something, if you decide to try to tell the distinction between the noises outside your home; the calls of the birds outside your home; the different sounds of automobiles in traffic. It's the same to discern the differences with your ears as to discern color differences with your eyes, as to discern texture feelings with your fingertips. And now what we're talking about is an inner sense. An inner sense of what the mind says, what the intellect says versus what feelings say without using language. So, feelings, she said, *"Often tell me a different story than the mind tells."* And to hear that different story, you have to become sensitive to what the feelings are attempting to express.

A crude example is, if you listen to a very small child, you say, *"Well, what's wrong?"* The child has a limited vocabulary. It has a limited ability to understand how in time and space, it's situation fits. So the child can only give you a very, very small glimmer of what it perceives is wrong. And, as an adult, we need to understand the context for that.

- The child says, *"I hurt."*
- We have to say, *"Well, where does it hurt?"*
- *"My foot hurts."*
"Okay, when does your foot hurt?"

To find out whether it's a tight shoe or a splinter that's gotten into the child's foot. Feelings are similar. We need to allow feelings to express themselves in their natural state and then go back over and see if we can understand on a deeper level what those feelings are expressing, the story they're telling. Without are you right or are you wrong? Are you at conflict with the mind? So hearing the clear story.

When I do meetings I often say there's a difference between translating and interpreting. Translation, such as the United Nations or in a multi-language environment, translation is an art form because the languages don't have the same word to describe the same things. And there are meta meanings to certain words in one language that don't have the same meta meaning in another language. So translation is not simplistic; it's a skill and an art. And it is very important not to put interpretation of the actual message into that translation. If you interpret a message, you're taking information and you're converting it into what you need, what you want, what agrees with you, the story you wish to promote, or the story you wish to hinder.

So that's the difference between translation and interpretation. When you're working with feelings, it is important not to interpret the feelings before you actually understand and have translated the feelings into what they are trying to express, which may be at odds with the mind; the intellect; people around you; pressures from your beloved; or from society. So, again, I think that some of the participant's phrases are beautiful, poetic statements: *"Feelings often tell me a different story than the mind tells."*

One of the stories that I tell about feelings and specifically on the topic of eros is that, as a woman who is not very flowery or aggressively female/feminine, I sometimes admire very sexy, very revealing, very clingy, very female/feminine clothing. And so the story I tell is if I would walk by a store window and I would see a dress in the window and it's a red dress. And it's gorgeous, looks great on the mannequin. And I walk into the store and I am blinded by my eros for this. There's something about this I want. And being blinded by it, even if I tried on the dress, I am in an image of "*I need this, I need this in my life.*" And I buy the dress. And I go home, try the dress in private, away from that rush of feeling. And it doesn't suit who I am. There may be a part of me that wants to manifest. But that doesn't mean it wants to manifest in a red dress. So, what I use this story to illustrate is that it's important to recognize that something wanted to be expressed and it was symbolized in the red dress in the store. But it's not demanding that that be the way it expresses itself. It's up to me to decide what aspect of me hasn't been allowed to breathe and to create an avenue for that to breathe. Even though I was inspired by one thing, that's not necessarily the road it needs to go down. So I use this example of eros for something to express that that is eros, which is another Pathwork lecture! It's Pathwork Lecture 44 on *Love, Eros, and Sex*. And the Guide describes eros as a soul movement. It [eros] says you need some aspect of this. And we mistakenly believe that the thing that inspired us is what we need. But that is an interpretation rather than a translation of the energy force.

Part IV: Negativity Towards the Process

Another comment that someone made is "*Why is this the first time I am standing up for myself?*" In other words, when you hit the realization where you've done all the work and you have found this deeper part of you... Why? Why did it take so long? The first has to do, my answer was, the first has to do with your need to be charitable towards the human experience. A lot of conditioning is done in our childhood. For many of us the conditioning was love, was done with great love. So that we did... think of it like a dog. We did tricks for the snacks. That's not a terrible thing. It's a reality of life. That what our parents responded positively to, we gravitated towards that activity, that attitude. That may or may not reflect our true nature. Now the love is real. The wanting to participate is real. But the thing itself, like I expressed with the dress and eros, the thing itself may not be what we want to spend our hours and days manifesting on the planet.

So if you think of, for instance, a family that has a long line of doctors. And they have a very intelligent child. And they think, "*Wouldn't it be lovely if we all did something similar and you grew up to be a doctor?*" And the child without realizing it says, "*Yes, yes, I would love to be an integral part of this family. I would love to have those conversations at the dinner table and be recognized as a professional and recognized as a peer within my own family.*" This is an admirable goal. Question is, does that kid actually want to be a doctor? Or is there another way that that same family inheritance of energy and talent and skill might be expressed that isn't being expressed in physical biology/physical medicine?

"*So why is this the first time I'm standing up for myself?*" Because there's a lot of conditioning to socialize and civilize a human being. And it's not easy to begin to distinguish our real self from the environment that we grew up in. Secondly, we have inherited a lot of tricks as we grow up. Ways of directing our energy; ways of getting praise; ways of fitting in and ways of compensating ourselves for what we want; but don't get. So one of the terms the Guide uses for this is *pseudo-solutions*, which is a way of saying false solutions, a.k.a. *pseudo-solutions*. A *pseudo-solution* is a way to prevent or at least reduce the pain.

So, I'm going to use the family dynamic of family being doctors, which applies whether it's lawyers, or asbestos pipe fitters, or inventory planners, or even a family where all the all the spouses, one of them chose taking care of the children and staying home and the other person worked. They say one of you must do this, and you have good... you're a good candidate for this. You should be the one to stay home. You have household ability and understanding and that's your goal in life. And I'm desperately trying to change the gender because when I was growing up, my family assumed that even if I went to college and even if I did a job, that I would sacrifice that job once I got married and had children. Because that's what women did. It's an attitude that served society well for a period of time. It's not very popular today. Even if people stay home for a number of years, we don't stay home for 20 years raising the children to complete adulthood. And today, we

have the option of the male or the female partner choosing which one wants to stay home. Or (and I don't want to go further into it), but there's a lot of change in terms of who does what in gender that no longer fits the ways we were taught as children.

Still to this day, people who are adults now were taught when they were taught 20 years ago, which does not support attitudes of today. So we had full-body experiences as children of what is met with hostility and what is met with love. And these full-body experiences, for instance, if you do something the parent doesn't like, they might grab your arm and pull you, hard, for a few feet. "*Come on, let's catch up with me!*" That is a full-body experience for a child. And the child tries to put that experience into language that it understands at that moment. There are so many variations, I hesitate to make a story out of it. Perhaps you can just hear that children have full-body experiences. And then they translate that into a context, as they know it. And what they do with that is they develop strategies to get through life.

Sometimes we don't go back and review the strategies. That's part of what pseudo-solutions are. But there are other strategies to maximize pleasure that we don't look at that may have worked well in the family dynamic. And then we grow up and we leave the family, and we go out into the general society. And those tricks and techniques may not work. In fact, they may create negative situations where we thought they would create positive. And there we are conflicted. I'm doing the right thing and getting the wrong answer. What this has to do with is this last part, which is negativity towards the process. The process of examining who we are is a lifelong process. It's not intended to be an 18-month process. It's not intended to happen at 37, 42, 53, or 64. It depends on the person. And it's a process where it is layered. And you'll do some of it in your 30s, some of it your 40s, etc. So the difference here is that negativity towards the process is about "*When will I be done?*" Now that sounds positive, "*When will I be done?*" But please laugh with me! We don't necessarily want life to be done. And what Pathwork is suggesting is the process of self-analysis, and self-revelment, and self-growth, and development is ongoing as long as you are alive. This can be an enjoyable, pleasurable, constructive part of your life. It is not something that gets "*done*" so that you can move on to something else. It is actually the main purpose of your life as a human being.

So that's a summary of Pathwork Lecture 125, *The Transition from the No-Current to the Yes-Current*. Thanks for listening and thanks for your interest in Pathwork Lectures.

All Pathwork lectures may be downloaded at no charge from www.pathwork.org

Jan's study guides, audio presentation links, and video links may be downloaded at no charge from www.janrigsby.org

Jan publishes monthly and weekly newsletters by subscription (no charge). She also hosts free weekly online group process / group sharing meetings for those who study the lectures.

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