

Actualize OS

10 WEEK TRAINING

WITH KEN WILBER



ACTUALIZE OS

Q & A

INSTALLATION FOUR



Q&A

Ryan: Hello everyone and welcome to the Q&A for installation four, types. My name is Ryan, we are ready to begin. Why don't we jump in? This week we are doing the Q&A for types, and we've got some rich questions this week. I'm really looking forward to discussing some of them with you.

QUESTION 1: HOW CAN I USE MY PERSONALITY TYPE TO LIVE A BETTER LIFE?

Ryan: The first question from Marcy. Marcy says, "Thank you Ken for this piece on types. It's all starting to become so clear to me now. I just started learning about my personality type afterwards. I guess I am a feminine two. I feel that I tend to over-give. How with this new understanding of my type can I create a life that nurtures me as well as those I love, instead of leaving myself behind?"

Ken: Well one of the major points of learning your type, whatever the kind of type it might be, is that armed with this awareness you can start to take measures that will help balance it out, harmonize it with other types, making it less domineering and dominating, basically become free of it to some extent. In this particular case, the very fact that this piece of information has now entered your awareness, that you're both feminine type and Enneagram type two, which together mean that you definitely have a strong tendency to take care of others at the expense of also taking care of yourself. The very fact that you see that is not some sort of intrinsic, indelible, unchangeable core of your being, but it's simply a possible type. That very understanding will allow you to start working to change this to some degree.

You'll likely always have a tendency to be these types to one degree or another. You'll always be female, unless you take the Caitlyn Jenner route, and you'll mostly be a type two. But you can start to see those with awareness, to surround them with consciousness, to start to loosen their stranglehold on you and allow you to start supplementing them with other types, other qualities, other characteristics. This is a conscious choice you make. It's a move based on your willpower. But there is, after all, there's a whole range of feminine type, and you can start to cultivate those that

give more attention to yourself and less slavish devotion to others. Types like the warrior or the artisan or the poet or the mother or creator as maker, and not just mother nurturer. The nurse's healing force, focusing on the self as the source and not just the self as caregiver. Focused on others.

All the rules that focus on female autonomy and Eros, and not just female communion and Agape, and now are a whole range of characteristics of Enneagram type two that are more self-focused qualities such as intuitive and adaptable, enthusiastic, healthy pride, freedom and so on. The whole point here is that being aware of a quality gives you a chance to change that quality, within whatever limits you have. But being aware of these qualities definitely gives you a much greater chance of changing them than being completely unaware of them, which gives you zero chance of changing them.

You want to just simply start by noticing when you are indeed falling into a kind of hyper-giving mode, and simply ask yourself how can I also be more giving and more nurturing to myself, and that I don't have to stop caring for others. I simply have to add myself to those who I care about, and that I nurture and love. And then if you do that, I think very quickly you'll start to notice some balance in this one-sidedness and a great deal of harmony, and resonance will quickly begin to emerge.

Ryan: Great. I was just mentioning *The Wisdom of the Enneagram*, which is one of those books that gives some information about how to work with bringing your type into health, because you can be a two or a seven or a nine, and be to varying degrees of letting your personality type control you, versus some self transcendence with it, and not being fully controlled by it, and instead using it to your benefit.

Ken: That's the point of all typologies really. To understand the strengths of that type and to make sure that you make abundant use of those possible strengths. But then it's also to not get merely trapped in that type, and so you don't also look at the strengths of other types and start to cultivate some of those as well. That's really the whole point of types, is both to understand them and take advantage of them, and also to be free of them.

Ryan: I think that's a really interesting point, Ken, and I also want to reiterate it. Oftentimes people can take their typology and start to see it as, as you said, as kind of a fixed, unchangeable prescription for the rest of their life. And often they will even rationalize or excuse some of their behaviors by saying, "Oh, that's just my type. I can't do anything about that." But really it's a tool for self transcendence, because by being able to make it object, we can start to transcend it, and use the strength of it intentionally instead of being limited by it completely.

QUESTION 2: HOW DO WOMEN FIT INTO THE ADVANCEMENT OF INTEGRAL THEORY?

Great, thank you. I'm going to move on to a question from Gareth. Gareth said, "I heard you say in an *Integral Naked* audio a long time ago that Integral or the Integral community will become more real when women show up to the party. I'm paraphrasing when I say that, but that was the essence of it, and I think I remember that. What did you mean by that?"

Ken: Yeah, women show up to the party. I'll give a real short answer to this. There's often been a historic pattern between men and women when it comes to the introduction of new ideas or new products or new behaviors, and of course there are many exceptions to this, as there always are when we're talking about differences between men and women. But it's a common generalization. Men with their agency and Eros tend to push the boundaries, push the envelope. They tend to be test pilots, crazy pioneers, wild inventors.

Women with their communion and Agape tend to be the relationship builders, the nest builders, the community sustainers. Men tend to move into an area first, and then women tend to sustain it. So men would clear the forest and build the log cabins. Women would run the home and sustain the family. When the internet was first invented, 95% of those who used it were males. Today over 65% are female. When the role of physician was first created, close to 100% were men. Today more women enter medical school than men do.

When Integral first started, the large majority of those involved were men, and that's when I made that statement. But then within a few years of saying that the Integral psychology course at JFK had 68% women. I think it's coming along nicely, actually. Of course, some aspects of Integral can get quite intellectual and heady, and this can tend to slightly interest more men than women. But women are just as enthusiastic and they're finding ways to adapt Integral in ways that aren't as stodgy and academic. They're creating courses in Integral parenting or Integral relationships, Integral dancing, Integral yoga and so on. They are indeed starting to move in significant ways, and I think it's coming along really quite well.

Ryan: I think that's fascinating. I want to add the caveat that we say men and women, and that's because in the large part, the majority of men tend to predominantly rely on the masculine drives, and women tend to predominantly rely on the feminine drives. But those are the large generalizations that kind of speak about the middle of the bell curve, and there's masculine and feminine in both men and women, and some men who rely heavily on the feminine drives and some women who rely heavily on the masculine drives.

So really what you're saying is that when there's something new emerging it's the people that are kind of relying heavily on the drive of Eros and agency that are kind of rushing into that unknown territory, which can be kind of a lot of men and some women. And then as time progresses, more women, which I actually really appreciate because that tendency of Agape and communion tends to really bring it down onto earth into the community, into activism and application and all sorts of ranges of things.

It's very cool. One of the things that I really appreciate about the OS community is I've been part of your community for a long time, Ken, the Integral movement, and definitely as time has progressed over the past decade, there has been a lot more women coming into the community. It was heavily more on the side of having a lot of men in those early years, and now in the Facebook community it is I think... really speaks to kind of what you said. When women show up to the party, it will become real, because it's really... In a lot of cases there are a lot of women holding the container

and driving the community in the Facebook community, that are really actually nurturing the global connections.

That's been really amazing to be a part of, and every single cycle through it there have been some women that have really helped nurture the community. Betina, Goldula, Joffre, those are some of the women from the early stages all the way through each course, so it just keeps on unfolding every single time. It's really beautiful to be a part of.

Ken: Excellent.

QUESTION 3: HOW DO CYCLES FIT INTO INTEGRAL THEORY?

Ryan: Thank you. Now I have a question from Elizabeth. This is an interesting question. Elizabeth asks, "Where do cycles fit? Women have moon cycles. Seasons come in cycles. The moon has cycles. Perennial plants have cycles, et cetera, et cetera. It seems like cycles are another fundamental element of reality, and especially connected with the feminine."

Ken: Yeah, and I can also answer this very quickly, because it's pretty straightforward. Cycles are a fundamental form of translation or horizontal movement on any given level. Few cycles actually move vertically, but thousands of them move horizontally and constitute the living patterns of holons as they move through the many different types of life cycles. As this person mentioned, there's the woman's moon cycles, season cycles, perennial plants and so on. And of course, virtually all of the heavenly bodies, stars, nebula, planets, moons, are moving, but they're moving in cycles, and so they cycle periodically through their pathways. All living beings go through life cycles from birth to death, and then new beings starting all over again. Bodily components and organs and biochemical systems operate in cycles like krebs cycle, and so on.

Cycles fundamentally represent the periodic repetition of certain actions that accomplish particular tasks, and nature's evolution has found it efficient to simply repeat the cycle so it doesn't have to invent a totally new way to do something each time it's needed. That's why there's so many. As I said, literally just thousands. We'll often use cycles in for example integral life practice, when we alternate training practices in a cyclical way. It might be one practice followed by another then another, and then repeat the whole cycle. Or even in some forms of meditation, you count your breaths from one to 10 and then you repeat the cycle. Cycles are just everywhere.

They're indeed fundamental patterns of cosmic grooves. Evolution is built into the very fabric of the universe, and we certainly take advantage of them whenever it's appropriate. They're just fundamental ingredients of the way the cosmos itself is built.

QUESTION 4: HOW CAN WE MAXIMIZE POSITIVE MASCULINITY IN THE WORLD?

Ryan: Awesome. That's very interesting. I think that's a really interesting insight into that.

Richard says, "It seems like there are two sides to the masculine." I'm going to try to read this the way it came in. "It seems like there are two sides to the masculine. Maybe like a light side and a dark

side. One that I find really offensive, overbearing, destructive, abusive, crass, and on. There are lots of ways to say it. It seems some form of the masculine is behind a lot of the world's problems. Many call it patriarchy, capitalism, dogma, et cetera. It's this kind of negative masculine. Then there's this other side in many of the men that I consider friends and brothers. Warm, supportive, considerate, protective, trying to take care of others and provide, maybe paternal but not patriarchal. Guys who want to fix things or build things, wanting to make a contribution. How can we make a world that has more of the good side and less of the bad side? I hope that's clear. Thanks in advance, Ken."

Ken: It's kind of a spooky topic. These two sides of the masculine are actually just the healthy and the unhealthy sides of masculinity. Eros and agency when healthy strive for a higher wholeness for building and creating, for exploring, adventuring, for pushing the envelope to help create a greater common good, for establishing healthy self-esteem so as to be able to interact in very healthy and caring ways with others, for creating a working self-organization, as functional healthy reality, for protecting and caring for one's loved ones, and ultimately all of humanity and the earth itself. It's just on and on and on. These are some of the best of the best of the masculine principle. And from Plotinus to Marcus Aurelius to Winston Churchill to Abraham Lincoln to Mahatma Gandhi to Martin Luther King, humanity has been enormously benefited from this principle.

But then there are the pathological forms of Eros and agency, namely phobos and alienation, repression, dissociation. Here we see social oppression, warfare, torture, slavery, trafficking, rape, murder, and on and on. And this is the masculine principle gone sour, deranged, pathological, dysfunctional, twisted, and it's probably created more human suffering and torment than any other single force in all of human history. For every Abraham Lincoln, there's a Hitler. For every Martin Luther King, there's a Stalin. For every George Washington a Pol Pot, and on and on and on.

The cure for all of this is in a word, evolution, or development in the overall growth and unfolding of human beings. We had to get from virtually unconscious, unaware animals to social animals capable of fully respecting all other beings, and that couldn't happen in just one step. It's too complex. It's too sophisticated. It's taken several steps to get to fully world-centric, tolerant, caring human beings, because we really are animals plus a certain kind of intelligence. All those intermediate steps from basic animal to world-centric care, all of those intermediate steps basically create various kinds of monsters, because they're animals with vastly increased intelligence and cunning, but not yet enough increased wisdom and love, and so the mixture produces Hitlers and Genghis Khans and Stalins and Himmlers, and on and on.

Today, every human being is still born at square one, and has to grow and develop from egocentric infrared and magenta and red to ethnocentric amber to world-centric orange, before they have the capacity to demonstrate universal love and compassion and care. And that is a dicey, tricky, rocky road. All we can do is work as diligently as we can to accelerate that development through processes like education and healthy families and so on, and the increased awareness of things of course like Integral theory. That's where we are, and it's definitely a close horse race, but we're not just entities that are born and within six months can adopt a world-centric, loving, caring

stance. The mind is built of all sorts of building blocks and the steps and stages towards that world-centric stance, which incidentally, in the million or so years humans have been on the planet, that capacity for world-centric universal care is only 200-years-old.

It was only 200 or 300 years ago that humans considered slavery wrong. Astonishingly, every major religion teaching love and concern and blah, blah, blah, all accepted slavery, if you can imagine. I mean it wasn't even considered something worth discussing. It was just that's the way nature was. That's the way God made it, and not a single individual considered it immoral. I mean it's just staggering. A third of the democracy of Athens were slaves. Nobody concerned about that. It's been just really staggeringly slow process from moving from the great apes to moving to Abraham Lincoln and Susan B. Anthony. It's just unbelievable that it took us that long, but it did.

The scary thing is that every human being that's born has to start at the beginning and do it all over again, and there's any number of places to get derailed, and all of them are ugly. I mean it's a weird, weird, weird situation when you think about it. But it's also astonishing that we can be alive in a world within this last 200 years, when we do have world-centric morals that are in existence and that at least a fair percentage of the human race thinks about and considers ideal and holds out as something that we ought to strive for. This is radically new. This was not the common stance of human beings through a million years of our history. It was just alien. This is just outrageous, really. I mean it's truly unbelievable.

Given just the way that the sexes divided early on, and just given the necessities of what the early stages of survival required, it really fell to men to both provide and to protect. When a woman was pregnant and the bear was outside the cave, she wasn't exactly capable of defending herself easily, and so she usually relied either on the tribe or as civilization got more complex, she relied on a powerful and strong male to protect her and her offspring. That also meant that men, in addition to protecting and providing, were also ones that were predisposed to fight other men, because our identities were still growing. Until you have identity that identifies with all humans regardless of race, color, sex or creed, then you're only identified with some humans, and that means other humans are alien, and that means dangerous, and that means warfare.

The vast majority of structures that humans have lived in for close to a million of years have been castles of one sort or another, because you simply had to protect yourself from others that you weren't identified with. Being able to even walk through an area and not get attacked was unheard of. Because everybody's still born at square one today, most places on the planet today, you still can't walk safely and expect not to get attacked, because the vast majority of people are still at ethnocentric or lower stages of development, and that means they will inherently see other humans as dangerous, as threats and as enemies. And that's simply the way it is.

It's a long, strange trip, but fortunately, we are in an era where world-centric has come into existence as a moral ideal, and so that's where we are. It's not men hating or men bashing to say that males have predominantly been the instigators of things like warfare and murder and torture and so on, because that's simply... As the necessary cast for survival were divided up between men and

women, those tasks fell to the males. It wasn't their choice. It wasn't that men and women started out in a room and they both had equal capacities, and the women said, "Oh, we'll choose to be loving and nurturing and caring," and the men said, "Oh, well we want to be bastards and murderers and rapists and torturers," and therefore we have a right to hate them. Nature did it. If you want to blame somebody, blame her.

But that's just the way it turned out. But it is true that a large part of the ugliness introduced into human history was introduced by males. But also a great deal of the good things that have been introduced into human history, for the same reason. Men don't get the credit for this, just like they don't get the blame for being more let's say warring. But they also just happen to be the pioneers and the envelope pushers, and so a lot of the really great inventions and the positive things that have come to humanity have also come from men.

But what we're hoping, and we have some questions on this a little bit later, so I'll stop here and take it up then, but we want out of movements like feminism is not just ways to free women from the roles that they were forced to assume in the past, and by forced it means both men and women chose to behave this way... Most of the roles and the patriarchy that women assumed, they assumed out of choice. They weren't oppressed by men. Feminists like Janet Chafetz have demonstrated... the quality of life studies demonstrated that in most forms of patriarchy, quality of life was much lower for men than it was for women. This wasn't some choice that males wanted to do.

But what a real feminism should do is help free both men and women from roles that were imposed on them by pre-world-centric stages of development, because they were rigid roles that were really unfair to both men and women. Men were the disposable sex. They were forced to fight and die for whatever group that the men and women were identified with. If a man insulted somebody's wife, he was expected to dual to the death to defend her honor. Most sociologists refer to men as the disposable sex during those eras. What feminism should be doing is freeing both men and women from the roles that we got stuck in due to the necessities of life in earlier times, and those were very limiting.

But they weren't forced on either sex by the other sex. They were forced on both sexes out of choice by the demands nature made for us simply to survive. That's what we want to get over. Men are still stuck in roles that they have had for thousands of years, and it's killing us about a decade earlier than it kills women.

Ryan: Men and women. I think this is a fascinating discussion, Ken. Really, really interesting to think that... In some of your other calls that we've had, you've talked about how we live in a broken, fragmented humanity. We've really been kind of a species at war with itself forever. Pretty much as soon as we got to the stage where we started fighting over resources, which was very early on, we would have to battle over riverbeds and that kind of stuff. There has been this entire history where we have had an inside and an outside group, and one was a threat to the way of life for the other, and that's been the case. And we've had to put ourselves into these confining and restrictive and

painful gender roles for thousands of years because of this egocentric and ethnocentric history of evolution that we've been going through.

And now, just in the past 50 years, getting to the place where we can actually transcend that as a species, and it's just starting. Then there's amazing stuff like the Prime Minister of Canada right now, Justin Trudeau, being very explicit about a world-centric consciousness that is taking a balanced approach, which is really, really awesome. We're on the brink of something really exciting and really new for both men and women, and creating a world that works well for all of us, instead of just painful and really confining.

It's also really exciting to see how much it's growing generation after generation. I think the world-centric consciousness is just growing more and more every year, so very cool.

QUESTION 5 : HOW CAN I GROW IN "COMMUNION" AS A MAN?

I'm going to ask another question here from Evan. Evan said, "After listening to the session on types and drives, I had a huge emotional breakthrough and I cried. I realized that I have spent my entire life until now focused entirely on both Eros and agency. What I realized is that I have completely neglected communion. I felt the pressure of always having to grow and be better, but I've kind of become extremely isolated and maybe even abusive to myself. I guess my question is now that I've come to realize how unbalanced I have been, how can I begin to do something to make my life better, i.e. add more communion?"

Ken: The common masculine problem, too much agency and Eros and not enough communion and Agape. This is a massively widespread problem for men in our culture, and men get almost no help at all on how to handle this. They're basically just kind of simply ridiculed for their problems, made fun of, and in ways that are absolutely taboo for any other minority. Men are a minority, by the way. Females represent 51% of the population. But you can make fun of what idiots males are in a way that would get you crucified if you said the same kind of thing about blacks or Hispanics or females or gays and so on. But jokes about what an idiot guys are are just absolutely common. When it comes to the sources of oppression, the one pool from which everybody draws their oppressing force is white Anglo-Saxon males.

Feminism has helped women become more self-aware and learned how to throw off... We were talking about those rigidly fixed roles inherited from past eras, and feminism has helped women do that. But men have nothing like that, and they're still stuck in old roles. Whereas a real feminism, as I was saying, would help both men and women become free of their fixed inherited roles. But when push comes to shove, men are still kind of expected to be the supporters of their families. They're sometimes called success objects. As women are looked at as sex objects, men are looked at as success objects. 90% of work-related deaths are suffered by males. With the exception of engineering, there are now more women entering college in every department, including medicine and law, than there are men.

When accurate comparisons are actually made, adjusting for marriage status, education, class and job type, women actually make as much or more than men for the same job. This \$0.72 to the dollar is nonsense. Over 50 empirical studies have been done on domestic violence, and all 50 showed the same thing. When it comes to domestic violence in every category, from guns to knives, women initiate domestic violence more often than men. In other words, men have really been left behind in cultural advancement, and they're not even allowed to complain of their plight, because they're supposed to be the cause of all social oppression anywhere, so they have no right to protest their plight at all. And they certainly get no help when it comes to their major problem, namely balancing agency and communion, and Eros and Agape. It's really cold out there for men. They're not even really expected to bring the problem up because they're not allowed to have problems.

The first place to start is with simple awareness, as we were saying earlier. Simply notice when you focus on self and exclude others, and exclude group and exclude communal actions and activities and behaviors. Deliberately go against your grain, and start including communal activities in your daily actions. Take up team sports, attend group activities, from yoga classes to choir practice to reading groups to computer classes to dance classes. You can certainly avail yourself of online social media, but try to include as many in-person activities as possible, because there's a genuine, subtle energy that comes from living bodies, not computers, and that will help activate much more quickly the subtle energies in the body.

You have to make this a deliberate choice of yours, and start acting in these more communal ways. There's just really no other way to do it. You just put one foot in front of the other, deliberately start choosing the communal. And start noticing relationships in general. I mean just even as you look around, the tendency is that we abstract single isolated things, and we just kind of focus on individual things and individual events and so on. But if you really stand back and just notice your visual field, all you really see is relationships. All you're really seeing is patterns, and those patterns are what's fundamental. If you look closely at those patterns, they all consist of holon. They're all wholes that are parts of other wholes that are parts of other wholes, and that goes all the way up to the universe itself. The whole of this universe is simply part of the next moment's universe. The next moment transcends and includes this moment, and going all the way back to the big bang.

Relationships are really fundamental, and relationships are agency in communion. They're wholes in parts. Wholes is agency, is autonomy, is masculine, and part is to be in relationship, is feminine, is communion, and those are absolutely evenly combined in the real world. What we don't want to do is just really get focused on agency and focused on Eros and caught up in individual things and events, and we start to focus our behavior around that as well, and end up focusing just on isolated events, and then pretty soon we're self-focused, and then we go from just being self-autonomous to being actually alienated, actually split off from our relationships, and that's where we start to get depressed, and that's where we start to get suicidal, and then of course have a very high rate of suicide. It's largely because our pathological tendency is towards hyper-agency, and not enough communion.

Study after study shows that being in relationships adds anywhere from seven to 15 years to life expectancy. It's just absolutely crucial for human organisms. And it's the one thing that men will tend to neglect. So this individual is not unlike the vast majority of men out there. As I say, men get no help from their culture at all. It's really alarming, actually. And truly sad. It's something that men have to make an effort to overcome.

Ryan: Ken, thank you for that. I want to say I relate to Evan, because I have a similar experience myself. The suggestion that you made, and something that I found personally really helpful, is groups and classes. There's so many ways. You can sign up for a cooking class or an exercise class or go to group or anything. There are tons of groups on meetup.com. People are organizing them on Facebook now. But really anything. It's really cool because one of the recommendations is a practice anyway, so Crossfit and exercise practice or a meditation group, these hit some of the core needs of our integral practice anyway, and they're an opportunity to build communion.

So if that's something that's a new discovery for you, Evan, or anybody else who is finding out that they're feeling very isolated and alone, well participate in the community online, have conversations there and make friends online, but as Ken's saying, yeah, there's a subtle energy when there's actual physical bodies in the same room. And it doesn't have to be a deeply profound experience in order for it to give you the experience of communion. Sign up for a cooking class, go learn how to make some pasta with other people, and that'll start to address it.

Ken: Even if it sounds goofy, even something like that, even a cooking class, just say, "Oh hell, I'm going to try it," and do it. By the way, get in a relationship with a woman or a man, whatever your preference is. But just get in a relationship. I mean that's as good a place to start as any.

Ryan: Also classes are a great place to meet people for a relationship too. Maybe check out a dance class, or a yoga class. A lot of people to meet.

Ken: Go to libraries, go to grocery stores.

Ryan: Awesome. Thank you, Ken.

QUESTION 6: HOW CAN WE REINTEGRATE THE FEMININE IN THE WESTERN WORLD?

I'm going to jump into the next question. This one's from Kim, and Kim said, "The Dalai Lama," and I've heard this a lot of times. "The Dalai Lama once said, 'The world will be saved by the western woman.' What is your understanding of what is meant by that?" It seems that we've become a society obsessed with the Eros side, and we've already talked about this a lot, and it's having a major consequence. How can reintegrate the feminine and Agape?

Ken: This is incredibly important, and I mean we hear this just all the time. When I start out it's going to sound like I'm badmouthing women, but I'm not, because there's a great deal of truth to this. But it really, really, really has to be set in an Integral context, and this is a topic that we probably see the disaster of leaving out a fully Integral approach more than any other topic, because first of all, it's a very widespread topic. We hear it all the time, that we do have patriarchy, we need more

feminine values and so on. In a certain sense, I've explained that the earlier stages were patriarchal, not because men chose it, because men and women chose it, and if anybody is to blame, like I say, it's mother nature. Men didn't have a choice in this thing.

It is true that most cultures in the world today are still largely patriarchal, and of course, in the developing countries that generally have a bit lower cultural center of gravity, those are even more patriarchal than civilized, more developed countries. That's because the earlier stages tend to be more stereotypically separated into sexual types. Most cultures in the world today are still patriarchal to a large extent, and that's because most of the earlier stages of human evolution were patriarchal. This was a choice of women, as I said, as well as men.

Janet Chafetz, who's just a brilliant feminist systems theorist, pointed out that this patriarchal inclination was due to the simple fact that on average men have greater upper body strength and women give birth and lactate, and thus men tended to take up the productive work of things like hunting and building and clearing forest and protecting, warfare and so on, and women tended the hearth and ran the family, and did items that they could do as easily when they were pregnant as when they weren't. As much as feminists today want to downplay the role of motherhood, and it's understandable why. It's because feminists want to be the doctor and not marry the doctor, and that's absolutely fine. It's great. And so because mother is simply another role where you are in relation to caring for somebody, and they wanted to tend to play that down. They realized a little bit later that they went too far, and tended to almost make fun of motherhood, and they really didn't mean to do that.

But in earlier eras, particularly when birth control wasn't understood, women spent a lot of time pregnant, and so they needed protection from nature, from wild animals, from other human beings. Like I said, when the bear is outside the cave and the woman was pregnant, she couldn't really defend herself easily, so she tended to rely on the tribe or on a strong, powerful male to do so. Then when farming was developed, and the first form of farming was horticulture, which is done with a hand-drawn stick or digging hoe, and a pregnant woman could do that just as easily as when she wasn't pregnant. In horticultural societies as a matter of fact, about 80% of the foodstuffs were produced by women, and also in horticultural societies, a third of them had female only deities, so they tended to be matrifocal.

When agriculture was developed from horticulture... Horticulture was a simple digging stick or hoe. Agriculture was a heavy animal-drawn plow. When women did that they had very high rates of miscarriage, and so as Janet Chafetz points out, they tended to stop getting involved in food production. And 97% of agrarian cultures are patriarchal, and over 90% of them have male only deities. Women weren't forced out of farming. They chose not to. They weren't being oppressed. They were making a wise decision in terms of their own Darwinian advantage to get their own DNA passed on.

It was only with the coming of the machine age when machines began doing the work that previously male bodies were called on to do, only then equality between the sexes could even be

conceived or was even desired. Within a few hundred years, women gained the right to vote, and now increasingly move into roles that previously only men would occupy. And again that's not because of widespread oppression. It wasn't that in 200 BC women were banging on the door to be physicians. It simply didn't cross their mind. It didn't cross men's mind either. But today, yeah. And today more women are physicians than men are. Nobody's oppressing anybody here.

Right now, because we've moved from these patriarchal, which mostly means nature-determined stages of development, into machine and information age, we're right at the transition period from the pre-machine patriarchal ages to today's machine and information ages, where equality is held out as desirable, and it's finally achievable goal, and so that's what we're doing. We're right between a patriarchal age and a partnership age. Female values are indeed slowly catching up. When we say what does culture need, is more female values, that's fine, as long as we don't at the same time say, "And males are to blame for oppressing feminine values, et cetera, et cetera." That's just not the way it happened.

But we still have some catching up to do in some ways, anyhow. As I mentioned, in some ways women are now ahead of men in cultural gains, including education, they're ahead of men, and pay for work, they're ahead of men. But we have to be very, very careful when we say we still need female values, because it's not just enough to be female and make a contribution to our culture. We have to take development into account.

Let's look at Carol Gilligan's stages of female moral development. According to Gilligan, women go through four major stages of moral development. Stage one she called selfish. The young girl cares only for herself, and in Integral theory of course we call this egocentric. Stage two Gilligan called care. The young woman extends care from just herself to her group, and Integral calls this of course ethnocentric. Now of course the group is still prejudiced. It's racist or sexist or homophobic or some such, as all ethnocentric groups are. But it is an advance from the previous stage. Stage three Gilligan called universal care, since the woman here treats all humans fairly, regardless of race, color, sex or creed. Of course, we call that world-centric. Then stage four she called integrated, which we call Integral.

When we say that our culture needs more feminine values, that's not really true. We definitely do not need more stage one and stage two female values. We do not need more narcissistic and racist, sexist values, which is exactly what the first two and most common female value stages are. What we need are more stage three and stage four female values. Of course, we need more stage three and stage four male values as well. So it's definitely not enough to simply be female and be making a contribution to culture. If you're stage one or stage two female, you're hurting culture just as much as patriarchy does.

What do we need in order to introduce more feminine and Agape values into our culture? We need to develop our females from stage one and stage two, where the majority of them are, to stage three and stage four, where they can make a real contribution. Just introducing female values,

when the majority of them are stage one and stage two, will hurt this culture badly. That's what we need.

Again, this is just another example of why the path of growing must be taken into account when dealing with any of our major problems. Of course it's almost always left out, including when we discuss the patriarchy and female values. It's left out with disastrous results. What we want are stage three and stage four female values, because then we're kicking in with real Agape and real communion, and not racist, sexist, narcissistic values, which are disastrous. But what's what we get from females in stage one and two. So yes, we need more female values, but only from the higher stages, and then we're going to get the advantage of the great, great benefits of female values. But it's not enough to just be female. As a matter of fact, the majority of female values in this world right now are hurting this world. That's an eye-opener.

Ryan: Yeah, that is an eye-opener, Ken. Thank you for that. I think it's actually really interesting. There are people on this course from all over the place, but here in the US, it's kind of evident when we see women in politics that are stepping into leadership roles, but they're not necessarily the kind of women that we want stepping into leadership roles because they say some really racist and ethnocentric and some often bigoted statements, but they...

Ken: Bless them, but and fundamentalist Christian women. They believe that they should obey their husbands. They believe that they were put on this earth to serve and to take care of their family. They're not supposed to be providers. They're not supposed to stand on their own or have any concern for themselves. That's not helping.

Ryan: Yeah, that's not helping.

Ken: We don't need those female values. We don't. 1000 years ago, yeah, absolutely. Today, no. It's hurting.

Ryan: I think it's interesting because what you're saying is we went through a stage of matriarchy and a stage of patriarchy, and now we're moving through that into an emergent stage of partnership. And in that, I think the Dalai Lama quote is very interesting because he said the western woman will save the world, and really I think what he's referencing is exactly what you're talking about, which is the emergent feminine of this world-centric feminine that is partnering with the world-centric masculine in this new process of creating new systems and a structure for how we do things. The women in this community, the women in this course are the kind of women that he's talking about. It's a new stage of world-centric values that we're in in partnership together, and that's very cool.

Ken: Exactly. What we want to also watch out for, and there's people who are talking about partnership societies. What these feminists feel that they have to do is to go back in history and find some time when there was a partnership society, so that they can then prove that partnership is a human possibility. If they can point to some era in the past where there was partnership, then they can say, "See, now that was oppressed, and again, men oppressed that and pushed it out of

existence. But it does exist, and so we can get it back.” But that’s really not the way this partnership works, because in the previous societies, like in the so-called matrifocal, which were all horticultural societies, these were at magic to mythic levels of development, and there wasn’t really... The types of differentiation that occurred there, there were not self-aware individuals that had individual roles that they could take up. These were very conformist, ethnocentric societies.

The partnership was actually a kind of embedded fusion. It wasn’t a self-aware individual being able to choose to have an equality with a partner. That didn’t exist. Partnership is an emergent quality. It’s something that has yet to emerge on a large scale. It comes into being, starting at orange and green and higher. It doesn’t exist anywhere prior to that. So we don’t have to go back and point to partnership societies. They never existed. They’re in the process of emerging, and so that’s what we’re looking for, is to help this evolutionary emergent occur, and that’s what’s starting to occur. Unfortunately, it’s still less than 30% of the world’s population. But it’s that 30% that’s going to lead us into these partnership occasions, and that of course is what we want.

Ryan: It’s very exciting. I think it’s a very exciting context. It is new, and what the world-centric women and the world-centric men are doing right now in pioneering this new partnership collaborative is creating something that has never existed before that can start to serve all of humanity in a new way that hasn’t ever existed, so it’s really exciting.

QUESTION 7: HOW DOES INTEGRAL FIT IN WITH THE DUAL NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE?

Ken, we’re over time, but there’s one question, the last question that I was really interested to ask you, and I wonder if you still have time for it on the call or if we should save it for the next one.

Ken: Sure, go ahead.

Ryan: Anybody who has to drop off the line, go ahead, but this’ll be in the recording.

Here’s the last question, Ken. Thomas or Thomas said, “In the Daoist philosophy, they speak about two aspects of the primordial creative force, they call it the yin and the yang, that intertwine with each other to create the cosmos. The masculine and feminine, the positive and negative electric charges, the left and right hemispheres of the brain, et cetera, are all apparent opposites. Could you please share your thoughts and insights about these mysterious forces that seem to be creating and governing our existence at a primordial level?”

Ken: I can also do this briefly because it’s very straightforward. The manifest world as we know it is basically made of opposites. Almost any concept you can think of makes sense only in terms of its opposite. Infinite versus finite. Up versus down. Good versus evil. In versus out. North versus south. Pleasure versus pain. And on and on and on. One of the ways that the great traditions tend to think of liberation or enlightenment or radical freedom is freedom from the opposites. The Upanishads say enlightenment is freedom from the pairs, that is, the pairs of opposites.

Because the entire universe is basically composed of opposites, that when the universe was first created, it sort of stands to reason that there was a first pair of opposites, and then this gave rise to a second pair and then a third and then thousands and then millions and then billions and then gazillions of opposites. Most of the traditions have some concept for that original pair of opposites upon which all the others depend, and that's indeed items like yin and yang. You see polarities like this everywhere.

And the point, in terms of enlightenment, is to basically drop all of these opposites, because they keep us bound to just half of the manifest realm. Whatever opposite we're attached to, we're getting rid of the other one so we're getting rid of half of reality. That way we're never going to get the whole. We're never going to get unified consciousness. It's always going to be a half-consciousness. And that's why the traditions all maintain that enlightenment is freedom from the pairs. You've got to get out of this half-consciousness. So we do that by resting in pure, non-dual, meaning no opposites, awareness.

Nagarjuna, the great Buddhist sage, got the point across by saying that ultimate reality was neither A nor its opposite not A, nor both, nor neither. In other words awareness free from all opposites. When we rest as the pure mirror mind or the pure witness we simply allow whatever wants to arise to arise, and we merely witness with it, without judgment, without condemnation or identification. If pain comes up, we allow pain to come up. If happiness arises, we allow happiness. If sadness arises, we allow sadness. In other words, there isn't anything that we don't allow, and that way we're radically letting go of all opposites all together and resting in that primordial reality that exists before the world of opposites arise and get us caught up in their fights and battles and suffering and pain and half-truths. Witnessing both yin and yang, we're free of them both, and that's the great liberation. And that's a brief tour of the world of opposites.

Ryan: Wow. Awesome, Ken. Thank you. That's a great note to end on. I'll talk to you next week. Good hearing your voice.

Ken: Okay, buddy.

Ryan: Thank you for taking the time, Ken.

Ken: Thanks everybody. Bye now.

Ryan: Thank you. Bye.



ACTUALIZE OS