

Session 9 Transcript
Chapter 8
A New Republic of the Heart: A Guide To “Being the Change” For Real, with Terry Patten

Terry: Hi, everybody. Delighted to be back here with you all. There are quite a few deeper, in some sense, more profound, and challenging pieces of our journey that have surfaced, at least to my awareness, just in this last week. So, I'll speak to those, but right here at the outset I think the first part of our business is for us to arrive more fully. So, I want to invite you to take a moment to find your way into a conscious posture, take a few deep breaths, relax your belly, and allow your spine to lengthen. Close your eyes. Just allow yourself to rest in awareness, allowing your breath, your bodily sensations, just the simple feeling of sitting, and the residues of your thoughts and feelings, your efforts, your anxieties, your excitements, all of what has washed through you in the last days.

Let yourself align to the deeper levels of your being, just settling into contact with that which is deepest and most real. Getting in touch with the inherent beauty and goodness, the reality of being, and in contact with this sacredness, also able to be present to the drama, the intensity of the moment, to show up in a timely way yet only in timelessness, rooted in timelessness. Perhaps we are freed up enough to also be timely, but this tends to show up as a push and pull; either I'm relaxed beyond all problem and dilemma, in the inherent goodness and beauty of existence, relaxed and feeling safe, or I am present to the timely press of events and the urgencies, and challenges and the threats.

That framing is apparent, and it's important that we acknowledge it, and it's also important that we relax and deepen to a deeper level, recognizing the timelessness and the well-being that are fundamental to every moment of experience. As an empowerment for us to show up right here, right now, in the midst of what matters, so allowing ourselves to find our way back. As we find our way back, we find our way from the casual buzzy mind of our active lives to the deep well of being in which, what kind of heroism is asked of us? Well, there's a kind of potential for that profound depth to show up as passion and capacity and persuasive power.

There's something revolutionary about awakening, and there's something revolutionary about activism too. Yet, what we're talking about here, this evolutionary activism to which this course is devoted and around which my book was organized, this is really, really deep stuff. It's at the edge of our evolution as human beings. It's asking us to grow and yet we're just also vulnerable individuals, vulnerable human beings.

One of our members, someone who's really quite devoted to this work, Roger Bats, had a sudden unexpected stroke just since we last met. Some of you were aware of this from our Facebook group. Some of you know Roger personally, but for some of you it may be news. We're a loose affiliation, some of us do and don't know one another, and yet in acknowledging this intention and entering into it together, we are a loose-knit sangha. Our heart of care is what brought us together. It's a heart of care that acknowledges our collective predicament and our own responsibility and the urgency of engagement. Yet, it also acknowledges our humanity. Every one of us is subject to sickness, old age, and death.

Now, it was a minor stroke, it turns out, and Roger is a bit of a miracle patient, and it appears that he's going to have 90% or more of his function intact, and will be back home maybe today or tomorrow, and

that he'll be back in the saddle completely really soon. So, I hope many of you joined me in holding him in heart and mind, and feeling this sense of community and connection.

The question in a way extends to all of us. I got a cold this week; no big deal, but my frailty comes forward to be felt. I lost a few IQ points. I wasn't very productive for a couple of days, that was hard for me. We are all subject to these things. Every one of us has our aches and our pains, and our mortality, and our experience of the heavenly messengers. Also, this week, we're focusing in on activism, on making a difference. This is the chapter where we really talk about it; it's a very, very rich and dense chapter with many ideas.

I hope you will raise your hands. Those of you who raised your hands and weren't able to speak during our last session, I want to invite you to raise your hands again. I also hope that you've engaged with the deepening questions, and that you're at a moment in your process where you can speak to the content of this in a richer and deeper way so that we can find our way into the shift that's implied by all those chapters on practice that we've just gone through, and by how this is everyone of us leaning into the edge of how we become adults, a new human adulthood in a different way, and how we're going to lean into doing that with one another as best we can, even if briefly in the midst of this course.

How going beyond this course, we can do that even more. So, as you contemplate that, you're in the driver's seat. You are a self-authenticating, increasingly mature individual finding your way into a new level of responsibility for the totality of experience. Still, not in an inflated and deluded way, in an ordinary way that accepts your humanity. As you arrive in that, there are real conversations about real stuff that are important for us to have with one another. That's the context, I hope, of the conversations that'll follow across this next bit of time that we're able to share.

I'm going to assume that no one has yet raised their hands. So, I'm going to attend to a very poignant and interesting question. Well actually first, Sheri, we have been wanting to do a poll. I wanted to find out how many people are in book study groups. How many people who are in book study groups; some people are not and then those who are, how many of you are having a rich and positive experience, as someone posted about on Facebook just recently?

How many are having a less satisfying experience, as I heard about? This is one of the questions that I want to address actually right after this poll. So, I would like to invite you back on, Sheri, to explain the poll: the 1, 2, and 3. Let's just hear from everybody really quickly.

Sheri: Sure. So, I'll launch the poll now and you can read it and choose option 1, 2, or 3 and then just click submit. So, the questions are as follows, or the responses are as follows: I'm meeting with a group and really like what's happening. I'm in a group, but we're really not jelling, or I am not in a group. So, here comes that poll now.

Terry: I hope everybody will press 1, 2, or 3. We're not quite there although we're getting closer. There's a few of you who haven't responded. Give me another couple seconds. Okay, thank you very much. Well, I'm really pleased. It seems like more people who are in groups are having a good experience than not, but there was a really useful and poignant question from somebody who's having a little more difficulty with her group. Without mentioning her name, she says that her group has had a hard time just with the logistics of getting together.

In addition, they haven't really reached solid agreements or commitments to participate. When people drop in and check in, that takes up most of the meeting, and the discussions haven't, in her opinion, really gained momentum so far, often because people are meeting before people have actually read the chapter or had time to contemplate even one of the questions that are offered about the chapter. She was expressing her upset about that, and wondering about guidance.

At the beginning, when we launched this offering, I had to make a decision in order to do this in a reasonably affordable way, and in a way that would support what I was trying to do. I had to make a choice not to get involved in troubleshooting any of the issues that might result that naturally come about in groups, and to make that everybody's responsibility. There's an unfairness in that. Some people will land with others who are really into doing it, and others will land with people who are less committed to the group and will, even if they themselves are really full of commitment and energy, won't be fully met in that. I knew that this was an imperfect situation.

I'm contemplating perhaps making an offering where I can guide that process and really draw people into deeper and more consistent experiences of what we call "We Space," and what we'll be getting into in the next two weeks. That would be a different offer.

Right now, what do you do, though, if you're in a group that isn't jelling, and you're feeling some frustration about that? I think that it might make sense for a group that is still a little wonky to create a thread of conversation in which you see if some critical mass of you, two or three of you, really want to bring some focused energy to creating maybe three, maybe two, maybe just one more group meeting that you really prepare for adequately in order to make it a deeper experience, a meeting that's long enough to go deep, or a couple of meetings, or three meetings.

I think three would be ideal, but it depends on what's the level of capacity and commitment in the group, and in a way paring it down to something simpler having fewer meetings. But really making a commitment is key. Then I think for someone to hold responsibility as the facilitator, and to choose in advance one or two key questions from the deepening questions for a particular chapter as the focus of the group conversation.

Then for people to really submit to and open to like part of the trick here ultimately, this is a very democratic egalitarian process, but we do need to have clarity and not spend a lot of time talking about decisions and consensus decision-making of inefficiencies. To fairly quickly decide on roles and giving somebody the authority to hold the container and to create a context, and then really energetically showing up, like following and listening are profound forms of leadership.

So, if the group of you, some subset of the group of you, can make that commitment, you can salvage out of an unsatisfying group experience, something that does come together at least for one, two, or three meetings here toward the end. I think you'll have a richer experience. We're about to go into the processes around We Space, which has deepened our subjectivity. Spending some time having a candid conversation, clearing the ground for a fresh commitment so that there can be a ground of trust and a ground of warmth and affection in all your groups, will be really important. I hope that's helpful.

Sheri: Terry, I don't know if you saw on the questions. Someone is asking, "How do you get into a group?" Is it too late to join a group or how might someone get into a group at this point?

Terry: Yeah, we set up groups early on. We set a deadline I think of the second or third meeting to ask to be put into a group, and then we put people into the group, even a couple people that were a little late for that, but at this time it's pretty late. What you can do though, if you'd like to meet with some other people is to go onto the Facebook group and let people know that. It may well be that others would be interested to meet with you even if you're not in a group. Now, it isn't too late to self-organize. It's a bit much for us to be doing that continuously throughout the time, though.

I also noticed that Di from South Australia was here in the middle of the night. Thank you Di, and she is here again. She had been able to join live last week and raised her hand. I hope you'll raise your hand at some point Di, so we can hear from you.

I see that Chris has raised your hand. I want to invite you on. Welcome, Chris.

Chris: Yeah, so I have a maybe more scholarly question. I am interested in how you would frame an integral ethics to me? So, you're already discussing this in the chapter, but it would be nice to hear it from you. This is something I would like to work on myself, and I was thinking if there is an integral ethical theory yet. When I heard about your book I thought probably this is something in the direction. Yeah, I'm interested in the conceptual founding or the philosophical grounding of the question, what you should do, what we should do?

Terry: That's interesting, Chris. This book in a way is all about applied ethics, but I think it's so much about an ethical theory. My previous book that I co-wrote with Ken, and Adam Leonard, and Marco Morelli, has a chapter on integral ethics that does have a basic theory of integral ethics that distinguishes personal morality from community ethics, in the sense used as the quadrants to break out. Law for instance is one of these quadrants of an integral ethical theory, because it's a systemic. We have ethical behavior, we have personal interior morality, and we have our social agreements around ethics rounding out the four quadrants in that theory.

However, I think it's interesting; I haven't thought a lot about a refined and updated, and timely refinement of the theoretical dimension mainly because I think the urgency of the moment is such that in a way being an ... One of the paradoxes here is in practice, we get past our abstracted relationship to experience. Theory is by its very nature about principles and therefore it is understanding or yet generalizations and it's about abstraction. In a sense, when you have a really good theory, then it arms you to show up in life in a way that's more consistent somehow. Sometimes bad theory is the basis for bad behavior and bad communication.

So, it's not as if there's no rule for a theory. I don't disrespect it. On the other hand, I think that we're in a moment now in which, as you know from reading this chapter on activism, it's a revolutionary moment. I'm characterizing it as a time in which we don't have time to stay in an abstracted and merely theoretical relationship to the ethical questions of our lives and then of our time.

Once theory is applied, especially in the context of a nondual view, we're actually dropping below our subject-object mentalized relationship to theoretical ideas and principles into an embodied experience of reality that at its most profound transcends time and space and is in touch with the central divinity of all things, and yet is present in the moment in an embodied way, present both to the local movement of life and relations and to all kinds of global patterns.

Through that, our care, there are moral theories like Jonathan Haidt's moral psychological theory is that identify five hardwired moral instincts and human societies — many of which are based on conformity and obedience to authority and instincts for purity and things like that. Whereas people who are more modernist and postmodernist really focus for the most part on care and harm reduction and fairness as the other dimension of a more sophisticated set of instincts.

I think that as practitioners, I think it's healthy for us to be drawn to have a rich understanding of other people's perspectives and an appreciation that for some people, obedience to authority feels like a moral issue. But I don't think that that's a moral value for you or for me, and that we can drop into a present awake relationship to our experience and primarily than ethics really is about care. At that point, then it's a matter of being fully present as awakened awareness and as care, and showing up for life as care in action.

We can have all kinds of sophisticated thoughts and distinctions that we draw ourselves into, but to some degree that draws us into again an abstracted relationship, whereas the emergency, the revolutionary nature of the moment is calling us past that abstracted relationship into showing up actively as care in action in a timely way in relationship to a moving life. That's really where I'd like to direct everybody's attention. Does that resonate for you? Do you get that?

Chris: Yeah. Okay, I'm unmuted. I think what we really have to just do both get to theory-wise and do the practice at the same time, I see the value of having the right theory in the fact that we have to communicate with very different people. We have to communicate with traditional people, with rational people, and postmodern people, and find a way of getting together and having communal actions. In a way, we need the right words to speak to them.

Terry: Well, sometimes a theory is going to be really helpful, very often showing up very present face to face in the moment with as much of your awakened awareness as possible, a wide care is all it takes, and that that will guide you across the communications gaps. Although understanding that for somebody who has a more traditional set of instincts, fear of the other and the outsider and a sense of the moral purity of my own tribe and my own group and a sense of obedience to the leader are moral issues, even though that they aren't for us.

I respect that and I appreciate your interest in it. It's been my experience that the focus on these theoretical issues has been a bit of a preoccupation in the integral community, to the detriment of our ability to respond in a timely and powerful way as leaders. I particularly criticize that in relation to our environmental ecological predicament, and the lack of leadership in the integral community relative to that issue.

I encourage you to challenge any inner bias toward getting the theory right, just in the sense make sure you're showing up in life in a timely way that expresses your care, and that your interest in theory doesn't function as a bypass of that immediacy, your relationships with other people.

Chris: Okay. Thanks. That was very helpful.

Terry: Yeah. Thank you, Chris. Good to meet you.

Chris: Yeah, good to talk to you.

Terry: Yeah, terrific. Okay, I see we have some other hands up.

Rose: It's me, Rose Moon.

Terry: Hi, Rose. Welcome.

Rose: Can you see me and hear me? Okay, I had an interesting experience this week. Actually, it started a couple weeks ago when I ran into a friend of mine who was running a group called Indivisible Sedona, which is a Democrat group. Their job is to go out and canvass and get people to vote, and vote Democratic and all that. I told her a little bit about my experience with you, and asked her if there'd be some way I could speak with the group about the polarization in politics. She was interested, and so she invited me to come to one of their meetings. I went to the meeting. It was delightful.

There were 15 women and 2 men. I was there long enough to listen to what everyone shared, because they went around the table. There were just so many really brilliant people there and a lot of people who were extremely emotional. One thing, Terry, that I hadn't planned on was all the perfume in the room. When I sat down in the chair, I thought I was going to pass out. I literally did. I moved my chair in front of a window so I could stay long enough to get to hear these women and men, and then I had to leave. I have asthma. I ended up spending the rest of the day in bed with a terrible headache.

It was something I hadn't thought about: how to, you know, that thing just hit me, but I'm still very excited about trying to figure out some way I can participate with these people. Because what I did share with them they were really hungry for this information. I was really putting it into my own words, not using the integral jargon, or geeking out, or anything like that. I'm looking forward to doing more work with them, and I have to figure out this problem with the perfume. That scent is so interesting as a phenomenon.

Terry: You did feel somewhat energized and more or less encouraged by the commitment of the other people. It's just clearly not an environment that you can have a healthy experience in the room with?

Rose: Right. I did want to share with you that I'm stepping out whenever I can and seeing what I can do. Because of you and your work and your book, I am finding that I have this ability to talk to people that I never had before. I really thank you for that. It really has made a big difference in my life. It's really changed everything.

Terry: Well, I'm glad to hear that Rose.

Rose: So, thank you. That's all I have to say.

Terry: Okay. Well, thank you. Great. This is a moment in which a lot of us who are committed to activism in the system here in the United States are feeling pretty challenged. It does seem that there is a late surge in the polling for Republican candidates and the approval numbers for President Trump and the circumstance does appear that this is going to be a closer election than we dreamed, that at a time when a full-throated repudiation of the corruption, dishonesty, brutality, hardheartedness, and so many different words to describe what's unhealthy about our national politics right now.

I think I and many others are looking at this with incredulity and a little bit of horror. It is a time in which actually leaning in with volunteer time and raising the level of commitment to the "in-the-system political activism" makes a lot of sense for those of us in the United States. It's important, I think. I think that those of you who are outside the United States, you have many different opportunities to engage different kinds of political activism. One of the things I'm going to be sharing with you this week, in addition to the deepening practices for next week, I'm going to be sharing a set of links for those of you who are curious to learn more about another form of integral thinking that's become quite influential in Europe called metamodernism.

I mentioned this before, so just a paragraph with maybe a dozen or two links to help you explore the world of metamodernism. This book, *The Listening Society*, that I don't have my copy handy here to hold up, but I think that's a rich value for those of you who are more interested in theory. It's a challenge to our ways of understanding development that I think has some richness to it, but there are many other things, including political parties in Denmark and Sweden and Norway, and also in the UK. I'm excited about what I see going on there.

There may be new kinds of approaches to politics that'll weave and penetrate into the value of the beast here in the US and the superpowers. I'm excited to see all of that, and I want to share about that with you.

We have a little bit of a paradox here. This chapter explores many, many rich perspectives, transpartisan activism, integral approaches to evolve in the future left and the future right, understandings of in the system, against the system, around the system activism. Examples of approaches in particular; four friends of mine had created four initiatives that I thought, in very different ways, each expressed a multidimensional approach to activism, where activism itself was being redefined by those examples.

We can have a richer conversation about some of that. I do want to invite questions if you have them. In a way, what we're dealing with also, like in my response to Chris, we've got a situation in which timely action is necessary, and getting too complex in our analysis can cause us to perhaps see some nuances of reality, but to stay in the, you know, we'd go meta, go meta, but never get into action and make a difference.

That tendency is something that I think was integral was Socrates. Marco Morelli and I wrote an essay, gosh now six years ago, called "Occupy Integral," in which we argued that integral in action had to be countered. The tendency to take a step back and see a bigger picture can be the alternative to actual moral engagement at a time when moral engagement, actual practical engagement, is a moral responsibility.

I want to both invite a richer conversation about the theory, and also invite us to feel the reality of the fact that in a sense the world is burning right now, and the ways in which our crisis social and political and human are presenting themselves are a challenge to our humanity.

You've raised your hand. I want to invite you on. Welcome.

Speaker: I have never been active in my life and neither been politically conscious, but I do want to engage in The Alternative, because I live in Denmark. I'm getting really afraid that I'm being seduced if there is some kind of a shadow-ish postmodernism among the people there. I was wondering if you

could give me some advice to how to handle that, because I know it is in me, this postmodernism, the shadow of it. Yeah, and I don't want to be engaged in that way.

Terry: Well, I don't know if there's a single thing I can say that will penetrate it altogether. It's inevitable that there will be... As soon as you get into doing something with a group, and you engage in collective action, you get your hands dirty. You have to do things, because you have to broaden your reach to more people, and therefore, more people who are in various ways unconscious. You have to come up with simple shorthand ways of expression that speak to large numbers of people and inevitably, those fall into clichés that are... Politics is a messy business.

There's a play by I think it was Sartre actually called *Dirty Hands* about an old revolutionary. He was always getting what he could get done, but then making compromises with the power brokers, and there was a young revolutionary who didn't want to ever compromise himself, and thought the old guy had dirty hands and resented him, and was a voice of purity. Then the young guy's girlfriend had a tryst with the old man. She found him attractive, and the young guy couldn't deal with his emotions, and he ended up murdering the old guy. So, he ended up with dirty hands, the pure young revolutionary.

It speaks to the fact that once you get into actually making a practical difference at a systemic level, and engaging in political action, there is no way you can avoid having partial approaches; they are part and parcel of that effort. The Alternative in Denmark undoubtedly is permeated by all kinds of little errors and confusions, particularly postmodern biases. I would not want to defend it as being pure, but what it is is an example of an attempt to change the way people talk about politics, to root their politics much more in a human, a set of human relationships and human connectedness.

That attempt is a healthy move. I don't think that it is an answer to all the things that we would want it to be, but if your alternative is to wait for some... Nope, not pure enough for me. I'm too pure for this. I'm too pure for that. You end up being irrelevant, too. I would encourage you to go ahead, both with the passion to be as intelligent and to be of benefit to the whole as authentically as you can, but also with a tantric or alchemically paradoxical, almost a tragic sense, knowing from the beginning that the world is not going to be perfected, that this is going to be a source of lessons, that some good may be done, but there will be errors in the process, and I'm willing to do it anyway. That kind of a spirit is necessary to your engagement, I think.

Speaker: Yes, okay. I have no expectations of it being perfect. So it was only my own way of handling myself, but I think what you said about getting my hands dirty, that was great for me to hear.

Terry: Good. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you very much, Terry.

Terry: Thank you. Let's see here. Okay, I see that I'm getting another question in writing from Annette, also another Dane. I'm pondering the categorizing of ourselves and others as traditionalists, modernists, postmodernists, integralists, et cetera. Is it done as a way of convenience, or is it believed that persons can really fit into one of these categories, or could it be that one person fits into more categories, depending on context and depending on the amount of pressure one person experiences in different moments?

I think that's absolutely the case. I do offer some cautions about believing in our levels and our interpretive frameworks in this chapter, and particularly I think in chapter what is it, five on integral theory. In fact, this metamodern movement is really built around a book that challenges the way we view development, identifying that people develop greater cognitive complexity. That's maybe one line of development, but that there's also the code or the symbol, or the interpretive structures that we use. So, somebody could have a great degree of cognitive complexity, but be completely committed to the modernist rationalist code, or somebody could be having a very simple level of meaning-making and cognitive complexity, but be working with postmodern sophisticated code, but in a more simplistic way.

They also identify that people have different states, and more in terms of feeling happy or unhappy than high mystical states, like we talk about more in integral theory. Also with the metamodern that's called depth, which has to do with our capacity to profoundly empathize and get the experience of the embodied experience of people, particularly people who are experiencing real wretchedness or real ecstasy, that the extremes of feeling good and bad, our capacity to be present to the tragic and agonizing dimensions of being a human being and also to the ordinary middling ground, and also to our potentials for joy and ecstasy and fulfillment and bliss, at the high end.

At the end, the metamodernists say, "Well, yes but there ends up being what they call an effective value meme or essentially a level." The convenience of talking about people like this has ... There are a lot of rich philosophical discussions going on around how to relate to all this. There is a value in the shorthand. There's also though a value in ... Part of what I emphasize is the fact that all these perspectives are both true and partial. Meaning that as soon as I take on the perspective of using these levels, there is something about that that's inherently going to be a little inaccurate, and it's going to reveal something about reality, but it's also going to obscure something about reality.

So, my relationship to the level idea has to ... It's like I have a sense of humor. This is true enough to look through. It's like a telescope or something that I look through and, oh I can see this and that that way and that's good, but sometimes I need to take my eye away from the telescope and just look at it directly, or look through a microscope or night-vision goggles, or some other lens that reveals some other aspect of reality, recognizing that every one of those lenses reveals something and obscures other things, and inevitably, there are some measures of distortion.

So, yeah, the levels are really, really useful, but they're not the only way to see everything and it's not the only way to orient. So, I hope that's a helpful comment.

There are a number of interesting written questions that have come in that I'm going to address and respond to, but I think I'd like to give us a chance to drop into small groups here. I'd like us to discuss this idea of a revolutionary spirit. I brought that up a little bit earlier in this session.

Part of what we're all dealing with is our understanding of the incredibly complex reality of our lives, as we are embedded in this 7 to 8 billion human being civilization, which in some ways has become completely unsustainable, and we're in this crisis that's affecting our societies and our relations, and yet for the most part we're still living wonderful middle-class lives on a beautiful living earth that may be threatened, but the sunrise this morning was beautiful. There is a madness to just becoming all freaked out and upset in the midst of an enjoyable day.

There is a madness in just ignoring all of it than staying in a trance. The suggestion here is that just as spiritual practice draws us to a revolutionary transition to an awakened relationship to life in which love is living us in a deeper and more fundamental way, there is a revolutionary relationship to all our politics and life. We're going to have to make radical transitions, or in a sense it appears our science is telling us we'll likely create an unlivable circumstance on the planet for our, maybe our own old age, depending on our age, and certainly our children and grandchildren, and everybody's inheritance.

How we take that onboard without becoming crazy is really tricky. So, I want to give us an opportunity to talk about how we feel as revolutionaries. How do we experience this? To what degree does that work for us? Let's put that in our own voice. I want to give us a minute. We'll go into our small group. We'll have a minute to say hello and to get clear, decide who's going to speak first, second, third. You may have more people. Then to speak each for three minutes on this, "How am I as a revolutionary? Do I not even like that framing? To what degree is that true? How am I growing into it? How does it ask me to grow?"

There are whole specific series of questions that Sheri will read now as she takes you into the small groups. So, please come on, Sheri, and set us up and take us into our groups.

Sheri: The questions are relating to chapter 8. This chapter argues that we aspire to revolutionary heroism. It rehabilitates and polarizes the archetype of the revolutionary, arguing that the most truly revolutionary thing we can do in our time is to bring wholeness and healing into this world of fragmentation. So the questions are, to make sure you understand these distinctions clearly, please speak this in your own words. Number two, what are your doubts and questions about the utility of revolutionary framing? The third and final question, how might you have to grow to inhabit that archetype authentically?

So, enjoy your groups. I'm going to just press the magic button. You go ahead and press your magic button and then you'll be in your groups.

Terry: Okay. Hi everybody. I think we're back. I had a rich triad just finish now, and some things surfaced as we were talking that I was sharing at the end that I'd like to share with everybody else, which is yeah, there is something a little funny about the revolutionary image. I think all of us, myself included, feel a little ambivalent about it at times. To some degree, we don't, well, we're probably not street fighters, and if we think of revolution as fighting in the streets, not only don't we want to do it, we don't want to give the bloody nose. We don't want to get the bloody nose.

We're more interested in harmony than we are in conflict. What I hope you are all seeing, and noticing, and feeling is the fact that there's something in this archetype of the revolutionary that the archetype of Jesus or Gautama, or Martin Luther King or Gandhi, these peaceful revolutionaries that we're in this crisis of fragmentation. Somehow the wholeness of being is finding its way forward through us, and all the virtues, all of what's best in us is needed. All of us are aspiring to be more awake, to be more loving, to be more functionally capable, to being more mature, to being more generous, to being more capable of humility. All kinds of virtues are in a sense under cultivation for us.

Yet we're not an exemplar of all of that. We can all grow in that. In a way, I think the revolution is fought in your own heart and is fought in your own relationships. The more that you become a presence of that inherent wholeness of being in the health of being, reasserting itself in this body mind, and in these

relationships, and in this family, and in this organization, in this community where you, your life is taking place. I hope that you'll orient to this by discovering, "No, there is something in that archetype that I can say yes to." I'm going to be looking not to what I push away from, but to what about that would awaken, and increase, and magnify what is best in me, and make me more the presence of the health of this human collective resurging in this time of fragmentation.

Okay, well, I want to continue to dialogue with all of you. Then why it takes us maybe into a little bit of a deeper contemplation.

Before I do, I want to respond; Marjorie asked a very simple and essential question. What is the difference between metamodernism and integral or postmodernism? Okay, well since I'm bringing this up, I should clarify. The whole idea in integral theory is that there is, that the culture evolves, as well as individuals, and that there was a time when there were only warlords and then we achieved nations and religions, and that was our traditional phase, and then science, and that's our modernist phase. Then recognize the incompleteness of science and necessity of our interiors, and ecology, and rights of minorities and all the subtle, and that becomes postmodernism.

Then there's something above and beyond postmodernism, and integral says that's named integral. Then some people just say, well let's just call it postmodernism. Metamodernism is a name for a way of constellating that. That is a reason in Europe, and really in a way they're just different bodies of this course. Metamodernism is a body of this course that's rooted mostly in the Nordic countries, but also all throughout Europe and getting more into the United States. It distinguishes itself from integral and that it is not very spiritual.

It is not particularly in the Nordic countries, which are mostly very rational and not very respectful of spirituality, there was a feeling that Wilber's identification with the whole integral theory with, certainly with teachers who have compromised reputations, there were some issues there, but there was also just a way that this course was engaged. They wanted a fresh take. They wanted a new community of this course. As somebody who has very, very deep personal history, and knowledge, and life experience rooted in the great spiritual traditions and realizations, I appreciate that that's a part of the integral.

Yet, I like metamodernism, because the metamodern, this course really emphasizes how the book *The Listening Society* is a political book, and it emphasizes how we have to care about how it feels to be a person, that the next domain of politics is to serve people being happy instead of unhappy, to not look at people just as economic units. Well, if you're getting your healthcare, you're getting your education, you've got sick leave, but what else do you want? As if only our economic needs are to be addressed by politics, but a politics that we actually take into account, a whole lived experience of being a person, and creating a society of people where there's less suicide and less anxiety, and less depression, and less addiction, and more community, and more joy.

That's the next agenda of politics. That's what metamodernism emphasizes. I think that's right on and terrific. Those are some of the things I appreciate about it. So, I appreciate the way the alternative parties are operating in terms of just having a conversation that our political conversation is tending to be. I think Indra Adnan, who initiated The Alternative in the UK, has said this and I think it's really right on. Less than 2% of the population of most countries are members of the political parties in those countries.

Those people happen to be people who are really focused on power. So, when those people focus on power, fight with each other over how they want to apply that power, that dispute ends up being magnified by the media and everybody is hypnotized by it. It's as if we all have a stake in the fight between the power-hungry, whereas if we just got together as people, and we talked about what matters to us, we wouldn't focus on the so-called political issues that divide everyone. In fact, our points of connection and our need for one another and the fact that we're in the same lifeboat would stand out much more.

Changing the conversation is at the root of things. Once we change that conversation, we can enter into the domain of politics, where power is negotiated and conflicting power claims and disputes are adjudicated. That is where politics, but we do that from the place of our humanity as human beings who understand that we have to participate in the arenas of power, because we have a moral responsibility to show up there. We're not individuals who are just obsessed with acquiring and wielding political power.

I think that reframing of politics is really valuable, and I think we do get that from the metamodern stream, and in a way that's really valuable. I feel also that it's a new shot of juice into the ... We have to evolve beyond postmodernism just for the sake of our shared future. Any movement that this postmodern is an expression of the inherent vitality of the evolutionary impulse in culture. I'm excited to see all of that. I hope that's helpful.

Let's see here. There are quite a few written questions. Bill points out that theory and action are, theory and practice, are not really a dichotomy. We act, then we reflect, then we correct course. In the process, we develop better theory. If it's all action all the time, then we'd go down the wrong path because we haven't examined our assumptions. Yeah, that fits all theory that doesn't work either. So, I was pointing that out, and I think that's a good rejoinder, Bill.

Then you also commented that you've been a revolutionary for most of your adult life, and you appreciate the archetype. You say your folks talked about new ways to be human beings as being the most revolutionary act. Well, that's right, and that's why I talk about wholeness and the healing of the world: "Tikkun Olam" it's called in the Jewish tradition, as being the essence of the revolutionary spirit in this time.

I hope that you folks are feeling also empowered by something else, which is this chapter redefines activism in a very capacious way, so that the word, and let's talk about this. I think I spoke about this in one of the early sessions, but I want to return to it. The word activism is complicated. It has the valence of being a little angry, being oppositional. There's a subtle negativity in the word. I think that all of us who recognize that flinch a little from it. We don't really necessarily want to embrace as our core identity and our core way of being in the world, this oppositional orientation.

I think that is really important to point to. Now, I chose the word, I chose it because I wanted to contrast it with the inner work. The outer work is acted in the world. The inner work is more interior, and therefore not active in the world. Therefore, we'll call it activism. If we are then embracing activism, saying it's important to be active in the world, are we saying it's important to be oppositional? No. In fact, what I see as the essence of the politics, the revolutionary politics of the moment is an orientation that is not only nonviolent, but actively non-oppositional.

One of the great heroes associated with this, Dr. King, has said something very beautiful. He said, "When you draw a circle and leave me out, I draw a bigger circle and include both of us, all of us." In a way, that non-oppositional instinct, that recognition, even though you think I am your enemy, I know and you have some intuitive awareness of the fact that we are actually in this lifeboat together. I am going to come back in a forceful way with the voice of love when it roars, and say, "No, I won't let you divide yourself from me. I am a stand for all of us on this lifeboat making it through the storm."

I am a stand for us no longer popping holes in the hull or destroying the life support systems that hold us. I know that I need you, and that we need each other to come together in a different way. I must stand for your health and your healing, even if you are opposing yourself to me and seeming even to demonize me, I am still not putting you out of my heart. There's an inherent authority in the health and the wholeness of the voice of love when it roars. That is the real spirit, the revolutionary spirit of the heart's intelligence at a deep level, knowing that wholeness is reasserting itself at some deep level, no matter what happens in the world itself, we've got this. Wholeness will reassert itself.

There may be many deaths, and we may have to go through who knows what, but the essence of what is whole is going to find its way forward, and it is the stuff of which miracles are made, and rested in a kind of confidence and knowledge that we are this wholeness, which is reasserting itself and which does work miracles of evolutionary emergency. We reassert the health of the system and we become a vehicle for the inherent sanity and wholeness, and health of being to magnify itself in the world of our relations.

That is the spirit of that kind of activism I'm interested in. I do think that it does have to express itself in politics. Sometimes, that's very important, and it needs to be prioritized. I think we're in that moment less than two weeks from the US election. Fellow Americans, let's get in there and do everything we can. The whole world is counting on us countering the excesses of this current administration. So, let's do it.

A lot of our creativity is outside the system, most of my creativity, which will continue after this course is over and hopefully some of you will be involved with me in that. It mostly works outside the system. It isn't all about thinking, it isn't about marches, it isn't about voting, it isn't about candidates. It's about becoming different kinds of people having initiatives that draw people into new kinds of relationships and create new kinds of synergies. There are many very positive expressions of this. All of them, however true they are, are still partial. They need more wholeness to come into being.

Our practice and our mutual practice are vehicles for which we become a source of strength to everyone who is in some way doing the work of this wholeness in action, this new republic of the heart. That's the spirit and the understanding that I hope will clarify and intensify in your lived experience. Oh now, I'm seeing more good questions, but we're close to the end of our time. I want to leave you with our next chapter, which is the first of our two chapters on new kinds of relationships and conversations in We Space.

Those of you who have a group that you're meeting with, this is going to be an opportunity. I hope to have a longer than usual session and to go into deeper territory. This We Space is really rich. Forewarned is forearmed; maybe you can schedule a longer than usual meeting and go into deeper space with one another. I'm looking forward to doing that with all of you a week from today. With that, I think let's open up our microphones and our cameras, and view each other and say goodbye.