

>> MG: Ready? Sit up. If you have a little sense of a little contraction, just let it go. We're leaving our weirdness and wounds at the door. We're participating in the evolution of love. Let's find our place. Find our way in. We're going to fly, now. Find your place. Locate yourself. Let's spend a minute in silence. We're good.

We are in the fifth movement of the symphony, and we are in the third level. What we're going to do, in a different way than we did the first two levels. The first two levels, we did an extensive set of exercises on each one. The next two, there's going to be movements, where we get up. We're going to weave the exercise into the Dharma, and we are going to, at precisely the right time, be at dinner, and we will be through the next two levels. So, that is what's happening. Now, what I want to ask everyone to do is collect yourself, into spiritual practice. Collect yourself. Collect your emotions. Collect your energy. Find yourself in a good position. Locate whatever is the best position for you to sit in, but you're in charge -- horse and the rider. You're the rider, not the horse. Just find it, because we're not going to fly together, and we want to be fully present. We're going to make two huge momentous leaps together. If you step in, what happens is, all the contractions of just tiredness and exhaustion -- and I'm feeling some of those. They just disappear. Just find your way and just drop in. On the inside, there is no exhaustion. That's actually true. On the inside, there is no contraction. You set your intention -- you drop yourself into the inside. You're in. Let's just find your way in.

[Marc chanting, singing]

[Singing]

[00:09:23]

>> MG: Amen. Hallelujah. Breathe it in. Breathe it in, to the Holy Silence of Presence. Bring it in. With just a little casual remark, you lose it. Just bring it in.

So, we are in Part Five, Symphony Piece 5. What level are we up to?

>> Three.

>> MG: Do we have a drum roll in the house? Here we go. Now, what's the rule? Now, what's going to happen now is, at Level Three, lots of the Principles are going to be into play. Lots of them, like six or seven played at Level One. A whole bunch played at Level Two, and, now the whole thing gets kind of clear. Not quite as clear as Four, Five and Six, but it gets really clear. This is the breakthrough. So, here we go.

What's our Principle? Our Principle is that at 6:28, it's very clear that Level Three needs to be such that there's no rate of exchange with Level Two. So, all of Level Two can't get you any of Level Three. So, Level Three Pleasure -- again, our topic here -- that's the key -- our topic, here, is pleasure. That's our topic. So, pleasure. So, Level Three Pleasure is to align with a cause and to serve the cause. Align with a set of Principles and to serve those Principles. And in aligning with that cause and in serving those Principles, to experience both your own alignment and your own value and your own goodness. Now, this is the pleasure of incarnating a virtue and serving a cause. You incarnate a virtue in the service of a

cause. This Level Three, let's say a couple of things about it, as we go. Now, we're going to move very slowly and very quickly, because life is paradoxical.

So, one. The first thing you need to know is that every level has a counterfeit. I'm going to start there, actually. So, what's the simple counterfeit of this level? The simple counterfeit is people are always busy. That's the counterfeit. The counterfeit of actually serving a cause is being busy. I'm doing stuff all the time. Again, it gives you an experience of doing something, but it's actually not the real thing. You're kind of running around, all the time, doing something. But it just doesn't actually find its way into serving a cause. That's a simple counterfeit. The deeper counterfeit is far more powerful, which we're going to see in a couple of minutes.

Before we get to the deeper counterfeit, let's say a couple of things. All of Level One doesn't get you any of Level Two. All of Level One, five senses pleasure, doesn't get you any of love, affection or relationships. All of Level Two, love affection and relationships, does not the pleasure of serving a cause, of being aligned with the virtue and offering that in service of a cause. So, all of love, affection, and relationships will not get you there. So, all of Level Two cannot get you, actually, any of Level Three. Now -- do the reverse engineering, like we've done up to now -- people are often willing to give up quite a lot of Level Two, in order to experience the pleasure of Level Three and to give up quite a lot of Two to experience Three and to give quite a lot of One to experience Two.

It's really important to see that. So, sometimes, someone will say to their partner, "I've got to go away. I'm going away, because I have a job, and my job is part of my passion. My job is taking me to Europe, for the next year." They'll say, "What do you mean? Don't you love me?" You'll say, "Well, you can come with me, we can be in touch, we can sustain the relationship." But, actually, I don't get from the relationship what I get from this Level Three Pleasure. They're not the same. That's a huge distinction that everyone lies about, all the time. For example, let's give an old school, non-politically correct semi-sexist example, but it will make the point anyways. So, it's wrong in every way, but we'll use it anyways, because it just makes the point. So, the guy's working late. Wife calls him and says, "Honey, why aren't you coming home? Don't you love us?" He says, "Honey, the only reason I'm here at the job is to support you. This is all love for you. This is all part of my love for you." She feels a little better. She hangs up. He goes back to work, completely enjoying his job. In other words, she wants his pleasure to be about them, about her and the kids. Now, he gets pleasure from her and the kids. That's Level Two Pleasure. But he also gets Level Three Pleasure, and Level Three Pleasure -- it could be he's working this job, just for the kids. That's completely possible. But it's also possible, that, actually, he's expressing -- of course, you can switch the "he" and the "she." That's a given. But just for this example, it's also possible that he's actually experiencing Level Three Pleasure, which has nothing to do with Level Two Pleasure. These are two complete, different components. He actually doesn't want to say that to her, because she wants to believe -- "she" being the archetype, here, that all of his pleasure is exhausted in her, which is a reified form of narcissism. Because, actually, all of his pleasure is not exhausted in her. These are two distinct forms of pleasure.

Now, sometimes, they come together, and when they come together, they're awesome. For me,

particularly, by the way, my personal love and creative eros, it's very important to me for those two to come together. It's very hard to me to be close to someone I'm not working with. I like those two eros to merge together, in a deep way. But I've give you two images of them merging together. One, Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie, about seven or eight years ago -- famous scene, *Mr. and Mrs. Smith*. How many people remember the movie? There you go. Remember the scene I'm talking about? There's two hitmen. Neither of them know that the other is a hitman or hitwoman. So, they're living this lovely life together, each one lying to the other one about what they really do. Each one goes out and does hits. At a certain point, they're hired to hit each other. There's this movie about what happens and how the story unfolds. They're each loyal to their creative endeavor, so they try and hit each other, but in this process, they wind up falling in love, in a whole different way. They're really experiencing genuine Level Two Pleasure. At some point, they align. There's this moment, when they're surround by 60 assassins or something like that. They came out like Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid. The only difference is, they succeed. In *Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid*, if you all remember, 40 years ago, that was the end of the movie. In this case, it was two-thirds in. So, there's a whole other third in which they're alive. But there's this wonderful scene, which they come out, guns blazing, passing each other machine guns and grenades and knives, tossing them in the air. And they become one machine of creative, destructive eros, ripping across the screen. But it's a wonderful image of shared creative eros.

The other person who spoke that image a lot was Ayn Rand. Everything Ayn Rand does is slightly immature. Ayn Rand is immature, at her core, even though she's got some real greatness and she can capture archetypes, which is why, by the way, when you read her -- I got excited by Ayn Rand when I was like 15. You sit there, and you read through *Atlas Shrugged* and *The Fountainhead*. You're 14,15 or somewhere around there. You devour the books. Which is missing in Ayn Rand is there's no children. You notice that. There's no children in any Ayn Rand books. It tells you something. There's no one who's actually helpless. Helpless people don't have a place in Ayn Rand. So, Ayn Rand is a flawed but beautifully expressed view, of a particular, *Urbarmensch* view. What she has, very beautifully is, she has the best love scenes around. The best sexual love scenes around are in Ayn Rand. They're not explicit, because you don't need to be explicit in a great sexual love scene. If you read, for example, I'll just throw one example at you, we mentioned this in passing, "The Seven Types of Sexing", page 254 in *Atlas Shrugged*, when Dagny Taggart meets up with -- anyone remember?

>> Roark.

>> No, no, no. You're mixing up your novels. Roark was in *The Fountainhead*. Dagny meets up with Hank Rearden. There's like a page and a half love scene, which is beyond belief, in its beautiful. It's stunning. It's one of the great scenes ever written. What it's really about is -- we use it when we do "The Seven Types of Sexing" teaching. We use it for Unique Self Sexing, those of you who remember. It's this complete meeting and shared eros. They're working together. They're building this railroad together. The fullness of their creative partnership and eros that expresses itself sexually. You've got this gorgeous play. The point is, for our purposes, is that meaning, in other words, creative cause eros is generally separate from Level Two. When you merge them, you create a new form of pleasure. When

you put Two and Three together, you create, actually, this whole new level of pleasure, which is this mixture of Two and Three. That's a unique form which is not necessary. For lots of people, that doesn't work. I'd say for the most of the world, they actually need to keep those separate. That's as legitimate, as beautiful and as powerful. I'm just mentioning that there is this particular form, which is a particular flavor, that some people like, which is putting Two and Three together. But, actually, for most of the world, in complete legitimacy -- not better or worse. I want to make that really clear. They actually like them separate. They like, "I have my relationship, which is my Level Two Pleasure. I have my Level Three Pleasure in a different part of the world," which is beautiful and gorgeous. So, generally, those are two distinct levels of pleasure, with no rate of exchange between them.

Now, let's take a look at a couple of Principles. So, we see the Rate of Exchange Principle pretty clearly. Now, what is the practice you need, to get this pleasure? How do you practice, here, and what's the price, if you will. I want to talk about this price in a number of ways. What's the price for this pleasure? It's a big one. So, the pleasure is the pleasure of a cause. Let's use that for a shorthand for what we're talking about -- the pleasure of a cause. What's the price? So, the price is, you require radical commitment, sacrifice and discernment. You have to cultivate discernment, radical commitment and sacrifice. I'm going to come back to what that means in a few minutes. I just want to hear the price. That's different than knowing the rules of conscious loving. That's different than attention. It's different price/practice, and the price is cultivating discernment, radical commitment and practice.

Now, again, what are we talking about here? We're talking about a level of pleasure. This is about pleasure. Now, let's keep going. What would the counterfeit be? What would the real counterfeit be, not the obvious counterfeit? It's obvious. It's two words. Simple. What's the real counterfeit? False cause. I'm a suicide bomber, and, paradoxically, there's pleasure in being a suicide bomber. It's the pleasure of serving a cause. It's a seductive pleasure. If there wasn't a seductive pleasure, no one would become a suicide bomber. A suicide bomber is an extreme example, and I admit that there's not an entire employment agency deploying suicide bombers around the world, but there's quite a few. But more than that, all the people working on false causes -- somebody is manning these things -- is people getting pleasure from them. So, a false cause is a counterfeit pleasure.

Now, keep applying the Principles. Remember we said, one of the principles was, that the higher, the deeper the pleasure, the harder it is -- Principle One -- to discern between the counterfeit and the real. Then, the next Principle was, and if you don't discern properly, the more damaging it is. Remember those principles? Now, they become really real. So, let's say, at Level One Pleasure, you know, you've got some butter pecan ice cream, and it's just not doing well. You're just slopping it down. Well, that's a missed opportunity, for sure. I mean, butter pecan can blow you all the way to Heaven. Vanilla? Not so much. In other words, you're definitely missing a major opportunity for pleasure and for context, to feel the caress of the Divine holding you, if you just slop down your butter peach ice cream. So, there's a major missed opportunity, which probably has profound ramifications in the world and in your unfolding and your ability to love, and that's real. If you consistently miss it, it's really real. But we can work it. You're going to get another butter pecan; have another try.

Level Two -- you might get divorced 17 times. It's certainly problematic. 17 times is high. 16 seems like a reasonable number. But 17 seems to be pushing it. All sorts of things happen when your relationships mess up. And so, that's real. That's a real thing. But look at Level Three, my friends. I just want you to see how more damaging it gets, when you have the counterfeit. When you're serving a false cause, with all of your energy and all of your passion, oh my God. So, that's really powerful, and it's much harder to discern the counterfeit, because false causes are seductive.

I remember watching the last Presidential Debate. I, literally, cried through it. Who was it between? Right. It was Romney and Obama. There was a very good Wall Street Journal article about the absurdity of the debate. Each one of them was parroting before you figures that they knew were wrong. The Wall Street Journal did a great piece of all the information Mitt Romney had. Everything he said, he knew was wrong, meaning partial. But everything Obama said was the same. We think Romney's the bad guy, and Obama is the good guy. No, they were both lying, meaning they were giving you partial truths, stringing them together in a particular way, to make it look a particular way. They were both talking a series of absurdities. Actually, Romney and Obama's positions on most issues weren't that far apart. The whole notion of this huge chasm between these two figures was absurd, if you actually study the issues. But, actually, to order to know that -- here's the big deal -- you've got to study the issues. You cannot read the newspaper. If the newspaper is your source of information about issues, you shouldn't vote. You just can't. Certainly, if you're not going to vote based on what's happening in the issues. In order to know anything about an issue, you've got to read, minimally, one position paper on each side. A position paper on each side of it -- see how they respond to each other and how they do the math, because math -- numbers can be played a thousand different ways. You can make numbers tell any story you want them to tell.

Then, this entire country is watching this utter absurdity, and you realize how you enlist people in a false cause. You weave and spin a narrative. You can spin any narrative you want. I'll give you one common narrative. I'm sure some people in this room have spun it. It was one of the most absurd narratives in the world, but I want to give it you. There's no difference between terrorists who blow up an Israeli bus and the Israeli army who, then, bombs the camps. That is the dumbest thing I've ever heard, in my entire life. It lacks any information, any situation, any way of making moral distinctions. It's utterly dumb, for about 13 different reasons. Because what it basically does is it compares a state, which is a Democratic state, which is a pluralistic state; which has Hadassah Hospital, which serves Jews, Arabs, every place, up and down; which is surrounded by -- one hundred million people want to, essentially, destroy it; which is committed to all the values of Democracy; with a terrorist organization, which is committed to one thing and one thing only, which is power, which doesn't spend any money on education; which executes people randomly; there is not one Democratic Arab state, if you haven't noticed; and misses one really simple thing. There are different levels of consciousness. Now, are Jews better than Arabs? That's the dumbest thing I ever heard. Of course not. There's wonderful Jews. There's wonderful Arabs. But there are different levels of consciousness in the Middle East. There's one Pluralistic Democracy, and no one is willing to say just those simple words, "There's one Pluralistic Democracy." There's not two. There's not three. There is only one. Every other one is an

utter violation of women's rights; is oppressive of the feminine and in a massive way. Every value that everyone in this room holds is utterly rejected, in the center of gravity of the Arab world, with one major exception, and the major exception is Turkey. Turkey is a major exception, and Turkey is one of the great, bright lights in the Arab world, which is a whole different reality in that region of the world.

But that's a very hard thing to say, because people are unwilling to make distinctions. I spent about ten years collecting newspaper articles that regularly compared Israel to Nazis. I've got an entire file. I was going to write a book on it. I just said, fuck it. But I've got an entire file with regular comparisons of Israel to Nazism. I've got news for you. Israel is not a Nazi state. How is it not a Nazi state? It's actually the only Democratic Pluralistic state that upholds the rights of women in the Middle East. If you say those words, you get shot, because people are so used to hearing things from newspapers and getting impressions from CNN. How many people have actually sat down and actually read a position paper? It's a 30 page position paper on what's actually happening in the Middle East, carefully and know the source of the position paper -- who published it; what its goal was; where it came from.

Now, I happen to be, in Israeli politics, a Leftist. So, I actually have a little credential, here. I lived in Haifa, with an Arab family, for years. I went into the West Bank. I was the only person in the West Bank, among the settler community, who didn't carry a gun. I walked everywhere. I was friends with everyone. I lived this; I don't talk it. I lived it deeply. When you walk out of the country, and you hear how people talk about it, it's got nothing to do with the reality. So, I'm using this as a intentionally provocative example of an area which people just don't think. They don't discern. They don't do their research. They don't check the issues. They don't look at what's actually going on, on the ground. They form opinions based on CNN, newspapers and 60 other things.

Now, I can give you forty other examples of that. Obamacare. Obamacare is a great example. To really understand Obamacare, do you know how much you really have to study, to really get how the number are working? It's such a complex game. Is Obamacare good or bad? I happen to be a big supporter a big supporter of Obamacare, but it's really complex. You have to actually understand how does this affect that, which affects that, which moves there. If you think you're going to get that from reading the New York Times, you won't. You've got to sit and read a bunch of position papers on both sides, compare it. If you don't want to read those position papers, you say, "That's not my job in life," that's totally fine. Just don't express an opinion on it. You say, "That's not what I do," that's completely fine. That's a completely legitimate life stance. We're all busy. Just don't have an opinion on it.

So, that's what I mean by -- now, this is challenging. Just hold it for second. That's what I mean by, you need to cultivate discernment. When my son, Yair, was one of the key kids, when he was 16, in the people protesting Sharon's policy on the settlements. Yair wanted to organize a demonstration against Sharon. So, he said to me, "Will you support me?" He said, "Dad, we're going to get arrested." I said, "Okay, what are you going to do?" "We're going to spike the country -- all the roads to the country, to make all the tires flat and stop traffic." A complex thing to do. So, I said, "Well, okay, what's your position?" So, he argued his position very brilliant. So, I said, "I'll support you, on one condition. Here's the condition. If you argue the opposite position with me, and you support Sharon's position,

spend two hours eloquently arguing Sharon's position, which is the opposite of your position. Then, I'll support any civil disobedience, as long as no one is hurt." We negotiated. He argued Sharon's position brilliantly. I supported him. In other words, you've got to be able to take the other perspective. You've got to fully be able to take the other perspective. If you're Israeli, you have to be able to take the Palestinian perspective. You don't have to agree with it. You can think that it's wrong, for 10 reasons and tragic, for 30 reasons. But you've got to be able to take it, to be able to see, how did it develop; where did it emerge from. And to be able to shift perspectives, to take a perspective on a perspective is a big deal.

These particular set of areas, as you can imagine, I wouldn't venture into this casually. I've spent my life in this particular area in the Middle East, read pretty much every paper. I spent a decade reading thousands and thousands of pages, talking to every leader, up, down thinking about this. And, again, I'm a left-winger, by nature. I lean left. And the level of tragedy, here, and the level of the misinformed narrative, is tragic. But, again, it's one of 50 examples.

So, false causes -- I want you to feel the intensity in the room, right now. So, feel the different quality of energy in the room. It's different than Level Two Pleasure. Feel the difference? I want you to feel -- and I want to evoke this quality in the room. I'm not going to talk about this is a very general, sweet and loving way. It's totally loving, but it's not sweet. Causes are complex. They're difficult. They affect things.

So, the counterfeit of a false cause -- oh my God, it's a disaster. It's an utter disaster. In cultivating discernment, there's two practices. One, shift perspectives. Argue vociferously the perspective that's the opposite of your perspective, one. Two, which is really the same as one, take a perspective on your perspective. Don't identify with your perspective. Take a perspective on your perspective. It's a big one. Three, move through your visceral contraction. If you have a visceral, body hurt contraction, which you identify with your position, move through it. Release it. This is place where you exercise your mind. Your mind, heart and body have to come together, and you think clearly. Thinking clearly is not an easy thing to do. It's a big deal.

Four, last one, know the distinction between your position and the position that was downloaded into you. That's a big one. Know the distinction between what your general position is, based on your own first person understanding and checking, and the position that you're repeating, that you think is your position -- but, actually, you heard it from your society; you heard it from your parents; you heard it from your social circle, you heard it from the newspaper you are reading. But it's actually not you. You're actually adopting this position, fighting for it vociferously, getting offended and hurt in your body, when it's challenged. But, actually, it's not really yours. You just adopted it. That distinction is the key to wisdom. It's the utter, absolute key to wisdom -- and be willing to be unpopular and to challenge sacred cows, because sacred cows usually need challenging. It's a big deal.

This is the counterfeit form of this pleasure is a false cause. Now, the practice is to cultivate discernment, radical commitment and sacrifice. I'm going to take just a two minute break, in the room. We're going to stay in the room and just entertain any questions.

>> Say that again?

>> MG: The practice is to cultivate discernment, radical commitment and sacrifice. That's the core to the practice. That's part one of the practice. We're going to get to part two. Let's just take a couple of minutes -- just anything that needs clarifying. I don't want to get too far off track, but if there's anyone who has something in the room that they want to raise, anyone and everyone is welcome. Brad, take it away, but briefly and to the point.

>> My life is about a cause.

>> MG: And you have deep access to this level of pleasure.

>> The key of what I'm doing is trying to get healthcare for the poor. My question is, how and who determines what is a just cause? That is something to be examined. Who determines what is a false cause? It would be lovely to come to an understanding of what makes the cause just.

>> MG: Good. Thank you, Brad, I just love the way you got to it. Thank you very much. That was beautiful.

>> This is really hard.

>> MG: I know. I'm with you. We've talked about this a little bit, over the last couple of years. Let's just say as follows. Just the realization that there is something called a just cause and something called a false cause, that, by itself, that you've already expressed, is already a momentous leap. I want you to stay with me on this. Just the notion that there actually is a hierarchy, that some causes are better than others -- just the re-introduction of hierarchy, is, by itself, powerful. One of the great losses in the world is that we've lost hierarchy. No one and nothing is ever better than anything else. We attack that, when we call it a "ranking." Ranking is bad. Actually, there are hierarchies. The entire world is made up of hierarchies.

Now, there are false hierarchies, which are what we call "dominator hierarchies," where you use the hierarchy to dominate. That's my friend, [00:41:30*], calls a "dominator hierarchy." Then, there's another kind of hierarchy, which is a holistic hierarchy. Holistic means it's a natural, organic hierarchy, where something is better than something else. Now, better doesn't mean it has more intrinsic value. It means it's got more going on. It's more complex. So, something more complex than something else. Of course. Is a dog more complex than an amoeba? Yes, that's a hierarchy. That's what we mean by a natural hierarchy. Or, for example, you may have six interpretations of Hamlet. Someone will say to you, they're all equal. No, they're not, actually. Actually, if you read the text, some interpreters of Hamlet are better than other interpreters of Hamlet, because they met the syntax; they meet the psychological structure. If you say that Hamlet is about dog catching, it's nice, but it doesn't cut it. So, one interpretation is better than another interpretation.

We might make another claim. We might say a Democracy is better than a Dictatorship. Well, who's to say? Well, we have this standard. How do we create a standard? So, we say, well, there are core values in the world. Core values like the good, the true and the beautiful. A Democracy serves the core values

of the good, the true and the beautiful, better than a dictatorship. We've made a hierarchy. Then, you say, "Who are you, to make up those values -- the good, the true and the beautiful?" So, then, we say, "We deploy a faculty of sense perception, called the Eye of the Spirit or the Eye of the Heart. The Eye of the Heart is what it is called in Sufism. The Eye of the Spirit is what it's called in Mystical Christianity. We actually look at reality. We look at the interior face of the cosmos. Then, we see what it reveals. And it turns out, that using the Eye of the Spirit and the Eye of the Heart -- every great tradition, the most subtle and speculative spiritual minds, hearts and bodies, from every different part of the world, over all of history all agreed that some version of the good, the true and the beautiful, is the natural alignment in the nature of reality. So, if a Democracy serves the good, the true and the beautiful better than a Dictatorship does, then we have the right to say Democracy is better than a dictatorship. That's a big deal. We just talked about a hierarchy.

The second you dismiss hierarchy, you dismiss any way to ever make a judgment, and you make all judgments bad. But, actually, that's a judgment by itself. Of course, you need judgment. Is there bad judgment? Is there false judgment? Of course there is. It's called prejudice. So, if someone would say to me, "I think Jews are better than Arabs," I'd walk out. That's a prejudice. That's called racism. That's a dumb idea, and it's not true. It's just not true. We're all created hominidea. We all have an initial, gorgeous, origin point of beauty. Then, different social structures, different cultural constructs create what they created in the world. It's our jobs to heal and transform the world.

But what we just want to recognize right now is, is what is a just cause? A just cause serves the emergence of the good, the true and the beautiful. That's what a just cause is. In the best way possible, in that particular situation and in those circumstances.

>> The key is genuine service, that moves us closer to source? It's a choice. It's a voice that moves us towards that the good, the true and the beautiful.

>> MG: We're in the same ball back.

>> So, I would put it in the context of a service that serves all is better.

>> MG: The most important thing is, we recognize together, our shared languages, and that there is a just cause and a false cause. We formulated two different ways of saying it. We can leave that for now, but that's good. Now, again, I want everybody to notice the energy in the room. A false cause/a just cause -- distinguishing between them is, on the one hand an enormous pleasure -- to serve a just cause is a great pleasure. It's one of the greatest pleasures to feel that you're aligned with a just cause, to be serving a just cause in the world. It's an enormous pleasure.

That's why I want to bring it back to it's a pleasure. It's not just meaningful. It's not just a nice thing to do. It gives you enormous pleasure. All of Level Two Pleasure cannot give you that pleasure. It evokes enormous angst. What we got to do is, let's let go of being wounded, around it. Let's let go of being wounded around it and hold the power of it. Don't get lost in the wound. This is where people get lost. People kill each other over this. People fight. But it actually doesn't come from doing the work. If you really do the work, you can sit down and work it out.

I'm going to tell you a secret about Middle East Diplomacy. It's a little secret. It's a wildly, sad tragedy that all the leaders in the Middle East know. A very close friend of mine was one of the key players in the Camp David Accords. My daughter is the Senior Advisor for Israel's Foreign Minister and is deeply involved in the Israeli political structure. My two sons are deeply involved. You know, I was involved in the structure, for a period of time. What I'm about to tell you, anyone will tell you, from Israel -- anyone will tell you, who's in the leadership of any of the key Arab countries -- we've all discussed this together, in hotels, outside of the Middle East -- that when you actually get the leadership together, the enlightened leadership on all sides, away from the cameras, away from the centers of gravity, you could always work it out. Everyone actually gets it. But, what happens is, often when you sit with your opposing interlocutors, who are, then, going back to the level of consciousness in their country, then all sorts of issues of power and control begin to play. Those things that are easily agreed on is Oslo, don't get translated, because of the way things play out. But, actually, the enlightened leadership of the Middle East, if they could get together and actually exercise political will, it would be fine. The tragedy is, is that when you go back into, as you were, the organization of each country, it gets lost in the vortex of the particular structures of each country. End. Next?

>> I just observed that the lack of discernment, the lack of doing the work, on the part of the vast majority of people in the world, leaves them, ultimately, disempowered, to know what the just cause really is. They choose, based on feelings --

>> MG: Absolutely. I just sat with Michael Murphy, who I mentioned earlier, who's the President is Esalen, who I love dearly -- and as I said to a bunch of you, he's going to be at our Board meeting, and we're doing an entire evening on "Faith-Based to Fact-Based." You've got to be willing to be fearless about this. I almost lost my friendship with Michael. The Israel topic came up, and Michael started saying classical sentences that you hear everywhere. I said, "Michael. You're such a smart guy. Where did you get this from?" "I heard it from here and here." "Michael, did you check your source?" I just said, "Michael, what the fuck are you talking about?" And he just kept repeating, just standard cliché lines and had a choice. He had a political choice. He's this powerful, political protector of mine, in a particular way, and I could have just let it go. I just couldn't do it. It was just out of integrity. We clashed it out. It wound up being a wonderful conversation, but it was touch and go, for awhile. Just like it was touch and go here, for a couple of people, for awhile. Because it's very hard for people to give it up.

I'll give you one other example of ways that a cause can work. Stay with me, in the back seats, there. In Israel, about 10, 15 years ago, I tried to make a major play for the following. All over Israel, there are checkpoints. Why are there checkpoints? Because if we don't have checkpoints, we have buses that blow up. I've seen a bus of schoolchildren blow up, it's not pretty. It's not pretty. So, you have to have checkpoints. No choice.

But they're also a disaster. There's an utter fucking disaster, because you're a Palestinian family. You're working hard. You're great people. You've got to go to Israel for your job. You get stopped by soldiers, and the soldiers are 18-year-old kids, and these kids have to search you. They've got to figure out how

to do it in a way to stop someone from getting a bomb in, to blow up a bus. But they've also got to hold your dignity. How do you do that? Not easy. So, I made a suggestion that we should actually train the best soldiers in the country -- the best -- to do the checkpoints. Then, we should create a ceremony at the checkpoint, in which everyone will bow to each other. Then, they offered each other gifts. So, the soldier who is going to do the search, first had to offer a gift, of juice, or fruit; and did an enormous, deep show of respect for the person they were searching. And, then, they found a ritualized way to do the search. And after the search, they would give another gift and bow. Everyone said to me, "What are you talking about?" That's such a dramatic -- I said, actually, it's free. You don't have to negotiate territory. You don't have to negotiate any structural, financial issues. You're negotiating with the most important thing in the world -- respect. By doing that, you could actually change something in the political structure without the genuine, substantive issue that actually have to be worked out. It has enormous value. It got shot down, but it's an example of a creative, political move that can be done, that can actually engage some of the core values, without getting lost in very, very dangerous substantive exchanges, which don't reflect reality and which actually reduce on both sides, security and sustainability.

So, there's actually a lot of creativity we can deploy. I believe that creativity is not being deployed politically. There's a lot we can do -- we have to do. But these are all examples of causes. So, let's go one more step, and, then, we're going to exercise it. Any other questions?

>> So, my question is two parts. It's the distinction between a false cause and zealotry, because you can be a zealot, for a just cause. The difference between being an effective service to a cause and if you end up being ineffective.

>> MG: Awesome. Those are two brilliant distinctions. Those are fantastic. One is, if you're a zealot for a cause, which is a true cause, the cause becomes, then, a false cause. A zealot means you're an extremist. So, let's just catch this for a second. The nature of an extremist is an extremist always serves a good cause. What an extremist says is -- listen carefully -- there can never be too much of my cause. So, let's say I'm pro-life, or I'm pro-choice. So, who in this room is against life? No one against life, here? Who in this room is against choice? So, how can you have a pro-life/pro-choice camp, on the abortion issue? The answer is -- what is the extremist pro-life position say? There can never be enough life. So, even if, God forbid, a woman was raped by her father yesterday, and we can do an abortion tomorrow, the notion that there's some nascent life trumps, and she can't have an abortion. It's a pro-life position. Pro-choice -- you can never have enough choice. So, if a woman is five months pregnant, and she decides, "Summer is coming. Bikinis are looking good. I'll get an abortion." Pro-choice -- my body; myself. You can never have enough choice. So, what extremism says is, I have a value. You can never have too much of my value, and I'm never going to be willing to actually engage in a dialectical relationship, with other values. My value rules. That's what zealotry is. So, zealotry takes a true cause and turns it into a false cause, which is precisely what extremism is. Remember, extremists almost always serve a good cause. But they basically say, you can never have too much of my cause, and my value never has to conflict and dance with other values, to create a larger whole. Which, by the word,

Shalom; Peace, or a larger whole actually means -- Shalom means the wholeness that comes from clashing opposites. That's what it actually means. So, thank you. That's beautiful.

Clearly, the pleasure in serving a cause, when you're effective, is completely different than being ineffective. So, part of the pleasure comes from the effectiveness. Anyone else? Kirsten?

>> [00:56:11*]

>> MG: I'm using love in the relational sense. Love, as we know, has three faces. But, right now, I'm using love as the inner subjective sense, for the sake of this map, right now. That's correct. From a map perspective, in our larger world spirituality map, which is rooted in the great traditions, where there's three faces of love. So, obviously, when I'm working for a cause, it's motivated by love, as well. That's absolutely true. We're using love as love affection and relationships. And in the final writing of this, we'll adjust that. That's absolutely right. Anyone else? Yes, Nance?

>> [00:57:01*] I feel in my heart, the angst and severity in the world is a very painful thing.

>> MG: Let's look at that sentence, just for a second. Which sentence is it?

>> The third one, down on the right. Honoring your feelings and ideas, I recognize your right to feel and think as you do. So, I want to challenge that one. I want to completely challenge that one. In other words, again, that comes out -- I'm going to be really direct here. I couldn't disagree with that more. That comes out of a notion of a kind of ultimate relativism. "I honor your right to think and feel as you do." Well, actually, let's kind of think about it, for a second. We're in a boat together. The famous image in the Nazarene's Parable. We're in a boat together, and you decide to drill a hole under your part of the boat, because that's what you feel like doing. Now, you say, "It's my part of the boat." Well, it is, but we're all in the boat together. So, actually, how you feel and think always affects your action. There's no such thing as feeling and thinking that doesn't affect action. Feeling and thinking always affects action. So, actually, I honor the right to all of your feelings and thoughts. I also honor the right for us to engage in conversation, for me, to try and persuade you, using the best available heart logic, mind logic and body logic, that some positions are better than others. It could be I'm misunderstanding number three. So, if number three says, "All feeling and ideas are all intrinsically and equally deserving of the same honor," I would disagree. Nazi Germany, for example. A lot of thinking and feeling going on there, but it's not doing a lot of good things in the world. So, again, it seems to me -- and I'm completely happy to be corrected. I'm not attached to this, at all. This is not part of the Dharma. This is just a conversation happening in the room. But it seems to, that comes out of the context of a liberal position that affirms the ultimate subjectivity of everything, and there's no, actually, objective things better than other things.

There's a second way to read it. Let's completely reject everything I just said. Let's now read it a second way. "No, actually, Marc, everything you said is right, but that's not what we're saying here. We're saying we've got to honor the feeling and idea; and first, I've got to honor it, before I engage you in conversation over it. So, I've got to take your perspective, honor what you're thinking and feeling, and, then, I can engage you in conversation. But if I don't start with honoring it, we can't enter

the conversation. This would be a second way to read it, in which case, I fully -- I'm bored. There we go. That was great. That was fun. So, are we going to go for the second reading? Everybody agree on the second reading? We're in. But I want you to get the distinction. It's a very, very big distinction. Thank you for pointing to it. So, we have now clarified number three.

>> MG: New voice. Jeff?

>> I think what we did is we may have evolved number three.

>> MG: I think so, too.

>> But, actually, your critique is accurate to the paradigm out of which this emerged. It's rooted in the value of first person experience, over Dharma.

>> MG: That's correct. Now, watch what just happened. This is actually how texts evolve. This is actually how it happens. We actually just saw it, in the study hall, as it were. Jeff is absolutely right, and I appreciate you coming back to that. There's no question in my mind that it emerged from that. I've talked to Gerry about it. There's no question that this is where it emerged from. But what we just did is, we just honored the text and evolved it, within the context of Dharma, being able to still hold to the text, and, then, infuse it with the next level of meaning, which is exactly what I hope everyone does to every text I write. That's exactly what we want to happen to our texts. We don't want to reify them. We want them to evolved. In other words, it's an evolutionary process of emergence, and, literally, you just saw, now, in this room, the way a text evolves. That's exactly how it happens. Nance is a voice in the study hall, "So, what about this?" Then, there's another voice in the study hall. Then, there's -- kind of the study hall takes a vote. Then, someone else in the study hall says -- literally, you just saw the process of evolution of sacred texts. What a marvelous snapshot. Sequoia?

>> Isn't that the opposite of fundamentalism?

>> MG: Exactly right. That is, right there, the opposite of fundamentalism. Home run, bases loaded, top or bottom of the ninth -- I don't remember which one's the end. But that's exactly right.

Fundamentalism doesn't allow this process. So, if you're evolving it, you're betraying the text. What we're saying is that, actually, when a text is written in love, what the writer of the text means is, this is my best hit, at my level of consciousness, now, for the best way to understand love is. And, then, as love evolves -- because, remember, we're a Sangha participating in the evolution of love. As we bring Dharma, as we have in the last five years, into this context -- what we do is, we don't throw it out. We say, "Wow, it's beautiful." Then, it evolves naturally. That's how we actually get to the next step.

There's a beautiful, beautiful, beautiful passage in the Talmud, which some of you may have been reading last night, because we actually distributed it to people's pillow. Heather was actually bringing it around to people. It's a story about Moses, in which Moses is sitting with God, and they're watching a sage, called [01:03:00*], in the second century read the Torah and interpret it. Moses, who is the original giver of the Torah, sits and says, basically, in Aramaic, "I have no idea what the fuck the guy's talking about." Moses has given the Torah, and this sage, from 1,500 years later is reading it and

explaining it, and Moses says, "I have no idea what they're talking about. This has nothing to do with what I said 1,500 years ago." Then, Moses gets it, "That's the way it's supposed to happen." That was the transmission, at the level of consciousness that was Moses, then, we evolve it step by step. Sequoia, thank you. Jeff, thank you. You really clarified that. Thank you very, very much. Peter?

>> [01:04:20*]

>> MG: There, you got it. Beautiful. What Peter is -- I'm just reflecting back, what he's saying and repeated it in slightly different words. I think it's a thousand percent home run, which is, actually, we're always aligning with a just or unjust cause, ten times a day. Often, we're unconscious to it. But there's always -- that's very close to what I meant yesterday, when I said, "Man lives in inescapable frameworks," meaning we're always making a set of decisions. There's always a set of core values at play. It's not only in a public cause, but we're actually always aligning with a cause or not aligning with a cause, and there's enormous pleasure from aligning with a just cause. You have to be willing -- when I say this, again, I try to model in the room. Obviously, this is a great room of people, which tends to liberal, left wing positions, and I took, intentionally, an unpopular position on something I happen to know a lot about, just in order to evoke the angst in the room. I want you to feel that, about a cause. Causes are hard. They're hard. And, when you really do the work, the pleasure of knowing, actually, the nature of an issue, of really knowing it; really getting it; really sinking in deep, and, then, aligning with a just cause, is stupendous. It's an incredible, sensual, erotic pleasure.

And all of Level One and all of Level Two cannot give you any of Level Three. Let's go one last step. So, the price for this cause -- here's a place where the price and the spiritual practice split. The price is, as we've already said, cultivating discernment, radical commitment and sacrifice. The spiritual practice is identify a cause you're willing to die for and live for it. Now, whenever you talk to a group of Westerners, who are particularly liberal, and you say, "Identify a cause that you're willing to die for," they look at you like you're crazy. "Do you think you're talking to a group of suicide bombers? We wouldn't die for a cause." Well, that's pathetic, if you wouldn't. Let's stay with this for a second. I'm not suggesting you should -- it's a really bad idea to do, but if there's nothing you're willing to die for, then you're actually an idolator. And your idolatry is your own long life. So, you've got to have a boundary. At some point, if someone puts a gun to your head and says, "I'm going to blow you away if you don't kill this 100 children," you let him blow you away. You don't kill 100 children. That's a cause. Your life can't be your own idolatry. If staying alive is your idolatry, not only are you an idolator, you're a failure, because you're going to die. So, you're a failed idolator, which is a bad combination.

So, which means, you've got to be able to identify a cause you're willing to die for, then, don't die for it -- that's a dumb idea -- live for it. But identify a cause you're willing to die for. You care so much about this, that you'd be willing to give your life up for it, and, then, live for it. That's a big, big deal. So, just kind of feel into that. If there's nothing you're willing to die for, then, you're already dead. So, just go hang out. You're already dead. If there's nothing you're willing to die for, then you're died. All you are doing is you're just trying to live -- in the end, that's not going to work anyways. So, you

actually become alive when you stand for something larger than yourself. That's when you're actually born.

Actually, there's a fundamentalist distortion of it, but here's the deal. We talk about fundamentalist in a derisive way. I like fundamentalism. I'm not a fundamentalist. I spend my life trying to build an alternative to it. I think it's about the most dangerous thing in the world. That's all true, but, there's actually wisdom in fundamentalism. It's just distorted. So, part of the wisdom of fundamentalism, for example is, is this very idea that there's something larger than me. They got this one right, guys. They just picked the wrong thing off it. But they got the right idea. There's an energy in that that's very powerful. There's a reason.

I remember when Bush was running for President against Gore, in the election. I remember my friend, Erica Fox in Boston. We were good friends. She taught at Harvard Law School, and she was absolutely sure that Bush was going to lose and that Bush was evil. Those two things: Bush is evil, and he's going to lose. Why? Well, she thought he was going to lose, because she didn't know anyone -- there was no one she knew -- no one -- who was going to vote for Bush. She would talk; she would compare Bush and Hitler regularly. Bush is not Hitler. That's a really bad comparison. I happen to have met him. Quite a nice guy. He's quite intelligent, by the way. The notion of this dumb, evil idiot is just the most ignorant, ridiculous idea in the world. He's an enormously intelligent man and an enormously loving man. I have a friend who's in the Secret Service. Ask the Secret Service people what the difference is between working for the Bush people and working for the Clinton people. All of them say that the Bush people are so much loving, considerate, open, completely interesting. The Clinton people are, basically, kind of cruel, ignore them, etc. It's strange. We obviously like Bill better than George, of course. But what's that about? I think Bush was dead wrong in about ten different things. That's not the point. The point is, he was actually a compassionate, loving man in a particular world view, who was expressing and articulating a particular expression about world view. Now, I think that world view is wrong, for ten different reasons. But the kind of demonization -- really? Let's go slow.

So, we've got to really identify a cause you're willing to die for and live for it. That's a big deal. That's a big, big process. Once you get there's a cause you're willing to die for -- just to give you a specific example. Would you be willing to give up your life to save a school bus of 100 children? How many people would be, in the room? There it is. You got one. Right there. Everybody. That's it. And you can figure out 50 of them over the next two minutes. Go ahead, Susan?

>> The cause doesn't have to be oppositional.

>> MG: Amen. At the same time, there's a hidden opposition that you're fighting. You're fighting culture. You're actually fighting for a deeper way to live. You're fighting a superficial, consumer culture, and you actually creating an internal vision of what it means to be alive, which is powerful. Brad, give us a quick one.

>> When you're shifting perspectives, that's a good way to get to just cause. When you're forcing yourself to shift the perspective, so that it's actually about the greater good of all, it's a larger

perspective. It's not just the good. It has to be from that larger perspective.

>> MG: Amen. Steve, last one and then, we go.

>> [01:13:21*]

>> MG: It's always easy for extremists to sabotage a process. That's absolutely true. How many people here have flown, in the last year? Did you notice that it took a long time to get through security? Do you remember when we all used to fly and didn't go through security? How many people remember flying without going through security? You would come like 25 minutes before your plane. You'd roll on in here. Now, who created this entire thing of security in airports? A few dozen people changed the entire structure. That's absolutely true. One of the shadows of technology is it gives the individual who is pathological greater reach. You go on the internet, and a person can say anything they want, about anything they want, any way they want. You have no control over it whatsoever. There's a site on the internet, which is a Nazi site, called "Unity of Nobility" or something like that. Please don't go look for it and click it. It will just make the ratings go higher. It's a Neo-Nazi site, that has a picture of me on it, with a Nazi gold star -- that whole deal. You try to get it taken off the internet; you can't. It will never work, because that's the nature of the internet. The nature of a rogue atomic bomb. Those are real, real issues today that need to be dealt with. They're a real powerful and serious deal.

Let's go to the last step. Here we go. So, what we're going to do now is, we're going to exercise this. We're, clearly, not going to do one more level. I think that's self-evident in the room. What we're going to do is, we're going to finish by exercising this, and we're going to do it in a particular way. Now, again, let's kind of wrap it here for a second.

So, this is Level Three Pleasure. Now, the higher the level, the harder it is to discern between the counterfeit and the true pleasure. However, there is discernment. The counterfeit would be a false cause. To be able to discern is the price. The price of getting the pleasure is actually identifying a true cause. Because when you're serving a false cause, ultimately, the pleasure breaks down. It has to. It's not sustainable pleasure. To get sustainable pleasure, you have to be serving a true cause. A true cause requires investigation and discernment. It requires sacrificial action. It requires commitment. To get that pleasure, one of the core practices in the world is identifying a set of values that you're willing to stake your life for, that you're willing to stake your life on. If you're doing that, then you're actually losing an essential pleasure in the world. Now, that doesn't mean -- I want to be really clear. We have this notion that that means being a fanatic. It has nothing to do with fanaticism at all. It has to do with the passion of standing proudly and delightedly, for a cause and identifying yourself with that cause. It's a gorgeous thing. I would say the thing that the Kennedy family, particularly under Teddy, after the two brothers were killed -- Teddy Kennedy, after he went through the tragedy of the '80 presidential election. How do you pronounce that?

>> Chappaquiddick.

>> MG: After he went through that tragedy, he really should have disappeared. He managed somehow to evolve and spent 25 years in the Senate, standing for causes, really beautifully. His particular level of

pleasure -- it wasn't about Eastern enlightenment. It was about standing for causes. That's what it was about. Teddy is really the archetype of that particular pleasure, of standing for a cause. That's a gorgeous pleasure. Without that pleasure, it doesn't work. Now, watch for a second. Last Principle, and we go into the exercise. If you try and get an earlier level of pleasure, let's say Level Two, to give you Level Three pleasure, it collapses. If you say, "My cause is my relationship," I think you're lying. This is powerful. And, again, politically incorrect.

So, what people do, is they try to make their relationship their cause. So, what are you doing, then? You're, then, asking -- it's one of our Principles -- you're asking Level Two Pleasure, which is beautiful, holy, sacred -- to give you Level Three Pleasure. And, then, Level Two Pleasure collapses -- remember we said we'd give an example for this -- under the weight of a burden it can't bear. Because what Level Two Pleasure can give you is Level Two Pleasure. I know this is challenging, for some people in the room. Remember, that the job of a good Dharma is to comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable. Everyone of us, myself completely included, has some part of us where we're comfortable, and we want to be challenged to pleasure. So, we're all in this together. So, in this together, you can't make your relationship your cause, unless you decide, well, my cause is to work on relationships, so I'm going to make mine the model. I mean, you can semi-try and work it. But, generally, it's just not true. Your relationship is your relationship. And it's beautiful and it's holy. It's a sacred goal. It's a holy grail. I can't give you enough superlatives, to show you how much I honor the beauty of working on a relationship. But it's not your fucking cause. Your cause is something else. It's a different structure, and we collapse the two -- they're actually different qualities of pleasure. Getting that piece of the Principle is a big, fucking deal. Because it actually allows you to actually get right relationship with each of those levels of pleasure. If you try and make your relationship into your cause, what will happen is, your relationship will begin to collapse and show signs of wear. Because your relationship can give you Relationship Level Two Pleasure. It cannot give you Level Three Pleasure. So, there's implications to this map. There's lots of them. It's a true Dharma. Unlike a pop song, it keeps giving fruit.

So, let's hold this here. What we're going to do now is, I'm going to ask everyone. We've got about 15 minutes left. We're going to move into the exercise. I'm going to ask everyone in the room to really kind of hold in and to hold Silence of Presence. So, unless you've got an absolutely necessary word, we're going to move into a particular place, here. So, I'm going to ask everyone to sit up, if you can. We're going to clear the pillows, and we're going to come towards the center of the room. Come on to the dance floor, towards the center of the room. We're going to stand in Silence of Presence for about a minute. So, we'll come into this space.

Try to hold Silence of Presence, friends. Try and hold it, not because of some enforced, crazy thing, but because we can actually hold the Dharma, and the Dharma will take us into the practice. So, we're in a ritualized, sacred space. We're in a Reality Consideration, Pleasure Symphony/ Dharmic Retreat, Participating in the evolution of love. We're holding Silence of Presence as a sacred practice of silence, so that the Dharma, then, informs where we're going.

So, we're in. We're going to go through a five step ritual, each step short, and we're going to end, with everyone in the room talking. So, we're in sacred space. We're in Level Three Pleasure.

So, Part One of the ritual -- ready, everyone? Here we go. "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they would not be judged by the color of their skin but the content of their character." That's a man with a cause. Martin Luther King.

"I have a dream, that one day in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification. One day, right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls, as sisters and brothers. I have a dream today. I have a dream that, one day, every valley shall exalted. Every hill and mountain shall be made low. The rough places will be made plain and the correct places will be made straight. And the Glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh, shall see it together. This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith, we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair, a stone of hope. With this faith, we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation, into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith, we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free, one day. And this will be the day when all of God's children, will be able to sing, with new meaning, "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of the Pilgrim's pride. From every mountainside, let freedom ring." And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. So, let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California. But not only that. Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia. Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee. Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring. When we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: Free at last. Free at last. Great God Almighty, we are free at last.

So, we're in this meditation. We're in this meditation of a man standing for a cause. And we're going to stay with these words, because we're not in information now. We're in an analytic meditation. So, we hear the words again.

Now, as you listen to him, do you feel the pleasure in that? We've reduced pleasure. We've made it so narrow, pleasure becomes a cupcake. That man is intensely in pleasure. You can feel the power of it. And it's a level of pleasure that's so powerful, that level of pleasure you will not get from your relationship with your partner. It's not better or worse. It's a different quality of pleasure. All of Level Two will not get you Level Three. It's not better or worse. These are not hierarchal. Level Three is not better than Level Two. It's different. It's a different quality. To live in the world without accessing the Martin Luther King that lives in you, is to actually live without an essential dimension of pleasure. But

more than that, it's to live without giving the gift you have to give. But more than that. It actually robs from you, the ability to get the full pleasure of One and Two. You can't get Level One and Two Pleasure, unless you're actually living Level Three Pleasure. If, basically, you're trying to fill your life, but you're not willing to actually stand for a cause, with radical commitment, with radical sacrifice, with discernment to identify a true cause, you're living half a life. You're losing. Not just you're not doing your philanthropy -- fuck your philanthropy. Not just you're not giving your good service. Fuck your good service. You're not getting pleasure. You're not actually living in pleasure. The level of pleasure -- the depth of a life available, is unlike any other.

So, what we're going to do now, is, we're going to hear it again, this time, with some musical form. We're just going to slow dance it and then, that slow dance, of these same words -- because we're in practice. We're in meditation -- is going to turn into a second song. After the second song, we're going to dance what that passion is. We're going to, then, come together in a circle. In that circle, we're just going to go around the circle, every person, 20 seconds to declare your cause, whatever it is. So, take it away. One after the other -- song one, song two and at the end of the second song, we're going -- [abrupt end]

Let's form a circle. Let's bring it into a circle. Holy Silence of Presence. We'll start with Paul, because he's right there and just 30 seconds, state the cause that you're standing for or the cause you want to stand for and think big. Feel the pleasure of it. All ethics are rooted in pleasure. It all comes into one. It's a rewoven tapestry, in the very source code. Stand for your cause. In standing for it, commit to it. [abrupt end]

Deep bow. Deep bow. To close, my commitment is to stand in the tradition of the lineage masters -- Buddha, Laozi, Moses -- all the traditions, who are my predecessors, who I love dearly, and to bring Dharma into the world, as fearlessly as I know; to articulate the Dharma of the evolution of love; the Dharma of Unique Self; the Dharma of conscious eros; the Dharma of conscious capitalism; the Dharmas that form the core of what we're doing; The Dharma of the masculine and the feminine. And to the best of my ability, use the gifts that I have to create a new download into the source code of culture that will participate directly and catalyze the evolution of love, in the ways that it desperately needs to be catalyzed.

We stand together. We stand together. Particularly, we stand together as a lineage. Part of my job is to empower students. Students/friends, to then become bright and shining lights, themselves, each in their own place. Standing around the circle, there's 17,18 people involved in different pieces and projects of writing and study. In our inner circle, there's another 30, 40 people that are involved in that deep sense. We're all connecting to each other. So, no one can do it alone. We're actually creating a Sangha together, by creating an articulated sense of the evolution of love and Unique Self. By actually being willing to place ourselves inside. Last night, we all sat in that seat, and we all took responsibility for our place in that Sangha. It means both sitting in that seat, and it means both receiving in the Dharma. It means both staying in. It means both committing and not being afraid to commit. There's submission, separation and sweetness. You need all three. We all need all three. You can't skip it. You can only

stand in by fully standing in. When we fully step in, we actually don't become less powerful. We become radically empowered. That's the way it works. To really stand for the radical empowerment of everyone in our circle, for the radical Unique Self of everyone in our circle. To actually, each person unfold, participate in evolving another piece of the Dharma and another piece of love. I'll work as best as I can with every individual persons, in project after project after project and book after book after book, until we put a group of thirty books in the world, that all link together. We're well on the way to doing it, that actually changes something in the very source code. And that is pleasure. That's where we are, right now. That's pleasure. That's why you feel that quality of pleasure. We felt the first quality of pleasure. We felt the second quality of pleasure. We felt the third quality. Let's just say it -- this Dharma of pleasure is the best thing in the world. There's no Dharma like it in the world. Nothing like it. It just doesn't exist. When you put the whole thing together, just putting this into the world, as we said in the very beginning, this is an organizing framework that a person could actually live in. Once you get the whole thing together, you can actually live in it. It's a world spirituality framework. That's just wild. As you begin to put together what we've done in our Wisdom Schools, together, and articulated as a cogent, interlocking Dharma, it just doesn't exist. It's our job to put into the world -- and each of us will pick up a particular piece of it, and put a particular piece of it into the world. Some of us will support the structures that allow that to happen. But, actually, we're at a unique place. We're at a unique juxtaposition, a unique pivoting point. It's very rare that people get to be in this place, where we actually have the ability to put something into the source code of the world's culture. This is a wild thing.

Without Shalom holding its place in a deep way and being tended to; without the Board of CSW; without each person working on a project; without each person working in their own individual lives, doing what they do -- we're not involved in that circle. Without it all, it doesn't happen.

Anyone who wants to step in, step in. Find us. But find us, not just because it's ethical; find us not just because it's aligned; find us because it's fucking pleasurable. That's Level Three.

And so it is. So we end here. It's now about time for the pleasure of dinner. We are going to deep bow to the God in the center of the circle. We are going to gather tomorrow morning. We are, now, about to hit Level Four. We end tomorrow at what time? Jeff, Shelly?

>> 12:00.

>> 12:00 is good. So, can we start at 9:30? Does that work for everybody? So, tonight, have a beautiful, gorgeous night.

>> We should start at 9:00, in case there's a little more Dharma.

>> It's up to you guys. Is that okay with everyone? Cool in the room? Okay. So, we are together at 9:00 tomorrow morning. See you there.

Awesome. Have a beautiful evening. Amen. Amen.