

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY COURSE



SUNDAY PRESENTIAL COURSE

(14 CLASES)

Imparted by

DR. RUBÉN FELDMAN GONZÁLEZ



HOLOKINESIS
• LIBROS •

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY COURSE

Copyright © by Rubén Feldman González

All rights reserved. Total reproduction prohibited or partial of this work by any means or procedure, including reprography and computer processing, the photocopy and the recording, without the consent of the author, holder of the rights.

(Translated by Ignacio Rodríguez and revised by Rubén Feldman González)

Edition 2019



PROLOGUE

Psychologies prior to Holokinetic Psychology studied behavior.

Holokinetic Psychology studies the mind and is the first scientific psychology of written history.

Both Jiddu Krishnamurti and David Bohm insisted that I should start the Holokinetic Psychology.

When I overcame my fear of looking foolish, I did it. It was in 1978.

I could not rely on any previous psychology, because David Bohm had completed the understanding of the concept of time.

I had to emphasize that a good part of the brain had been inactive for almost a million years.

We work with half a brain inactive and we see the results in the economy based on war, in the planning of misery, in the social chaos with its corruption and with its international organized crime.

The ecological tragedy is another product of a brain that does not work completely.

We can add the recent end of international free trade.

David Bohm told me that I was writing for minds of very determined, intelligent people, willing to be pioneers in spreading the teaching of Holokinetic Psychology.

Pioneers do not seek their own interest and the current Professors in Europe and America spread Holokinetic Psychology without seeking personal gain.

I am convinced that I have started the most important psychological teaching there is.

The same thought both Jiddu Krishnamurti and David Bohm, among many others.

That's why I write for all people in simple language, which must be polished with the complete and repeated reading of my written work.

Unitary Perception is a way of life, it is a brain function, it is not a formulated technique, as the facts of listening and seeing are not formulated techniques.

This course of fourteen classes is a complete introduction to the study of Holokinetic Psychology and its multiple implications in all human activities.

Rubén Feldman González

TOPICS - CLASS 1

- INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 1 (7)
- FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (7)
- PRECEDENTS OF THE PARADIGM SHIFT IN SCIENCE (7)
- THE EMERGENCE OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (8)
- THE BRAIN AND ITS THREE WAYS OF FUNCTIONING (9)
- BERNHEIM'S EXPERIENCE (THOUGHT IS HYPNOSIS) (10)
- IS IT POSSIBLE TO GET RID OF HYPNOSIS? (12)
- DEFINITION OF UNITARY PERCEPTION FROM DIVERSE FIELDS OF STUDY (13)
- WHY HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY? (14)
- COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING OF TIME (15)
- OBJECTIVES IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (17)
- DIAGNOSES THAT DO NOT BENEFIT FROM UNITARY PERCEPTION (19)
- ABOUT THE DIAGNOSTICS AND STATISTICAL MANUAL (DSM) AND DIAGNOSIS IN 5 AXIS (20)
- STRESS (21)
- GENERAL ASPECTS OF A PATIENT'S INITIAL ASSESSMENT (23)
- TRANSFERENCE AND COUNTER- TRANSFERENCE (25)
- CONFIDENTIALITY (25)
- FRAGMENTARY PERCEPTION (28)
- INSTRUMENTS OF THOUGHT AND THEIR WAY OF EXPLAINING REALITY (28)
- THE HOLOGRAM (A PARADIGMATIC INSTRUMENT) (29)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS CLASS 1 (31)
- EXAMPLES OF THE HYPNOSIS OF THOUGHT (42)

- IS C INACTIVE WHILE B FUNCTIONS? (54)
- WHY IS BREATHING NOT EMPHASIZED IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY ? (56)
- REPETITIVE THOUGHT AND ITS END IN UNITARY PERCEPTION (59)
- THE THREE CONSCIOUSNESSES IN THE BIBLE (HUMAN, ADAMIC AND KRISTIC) (72)

CLASS 1

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, July 25th, 2010.

Rubén Feldman González (RFG): Good morning. July 25th, 2010. We're in the Second Sunday Presential Course, which will last four months. We've fourteen students here in Mexicali, Mexico, and we're connected via Internet (Logitech) with nine people in Buenos Aires, of which at least three are instructors.

We're saying this is the Second Presential Course, and it'll last four months. Every Sunday, four hours, from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM in Mexicali, and from 2:00 to 6:00 PM in Buenos Aires.

This is dedicated to the divided mankind, with the hope that we'll contribute to unite mankind in peace and love.

What are we talking about? We're talking about Holokinetic Psychology, and we're talking about Unitary Perception and horizontal conflict, which are the fundamental elements of Holokinetic Psychology.

When I say Holokinetic Psychology it can't be mixed with the 32 previous psychologies... -according to the European list of the psychological formulations, or forms, that exist, there are 32 before Holokinetic Psychology... so we say we can't mix Holokinetic Psychology with any of the previous ones, and that causes some resistance, but let me explain that, first of all.

I've written some dates in the whiteboard. I like to compare what we're doing with what happened in Astronomy, just to have an idea. In 147 A.D., Ptolemy made a map of the solar system putting Earth as the center. That map lasted for one thousand and five hundred years. One thousand and five hundred years until, after Copernicus dies in 1542 -that's nearly one thousand and five hundred years later... did they start talking about the Sun as the center of the solar system? No!

They kept talking about the Earth as the center, almost for a hundred years after Copernicus' death, whose book is published after his death, because he was afraid of being burned by the Catholic Inquisition for saying the Sun was the center.

Galileo Galilei taught Astronomy and Maths at Italian universities, and despite having written a book called *Copernicus' Astronomy* and being an expert in Copernicus, he didn't teach Copernicus in his classes, out of fear of being burned too.

When do we start to know about Copernicus, who died in 1542? After the French Revolution, which happened in 1789, and after Napoleon established Copernicus' Astronomy in Europe and Egypt. It means we start to know about Copernicus after 1800. It means mankind spent one thousand and seven hundred years and more with a wrong idea in science.

And this isn't the only example, but we're going to use only that example, to see how slow the understanding of the new in science is. Very slow. Let's not talk about what happened in Quantum Mechanics when they said the electron is also a wave, besides being a particle, and the frightening understanding that something can be two things at the same time. The electron can be a particle and a wave. This was said by de Broglie (1929) and it sounded like something absurd.

Much later, in 1940, Planck and many others start to assimilate this. But Holokinetic Psychology is born when David Bohm, who was a collaborator -not student, Albert Einstein's collaborator at Princeton University- when David Bohm formulates his concept of Holokinesis, mathematically. Then we can say Holokinesis is born mathematically in 1986.

I was lucky to meet David Bohm in 1978, and I saw how the concept developed in his mind until the wonderful moment in which he formulates it mathematically in 1986. I was lucky and privileged to witness that process with David Bohm.

In those twelve years of talks with David Bohm, we were able to start Holokinetic Psychology. When I tell him, "This, -which

changes the concept of time, or rather complements the concept of time, - has to change Psychology,” he tells me, “Of course.” Then a dialogue started and, luckily, Jiddu Krishnamurti, JK, joined us. I'm going to refer to him as JK from now on. In that ten-year dialogue with JK, and around twelve years with David Bohm, we elaborated the language of Holokinetic Psychology.

We're in 2010. It's been a long time, and how much is known about Holokinetic Psychology at faculties, at the university? Let's not say the Faculty of Psychology, at university in general? Very little or nothing. We have a record of how difficult it is to incorporate the new things in science, no matter how surprising it seems -and it is.

What are we saying? We're saying that the brain functions in three very different ways. The brain has three ways of functioning, and each one of these ways has its own laws. This is a new level of abstraction in Neurology, which, of course, also takes the contemporary neurologist and psychologist by surprise: the brain functions in three different ways. There's a known way, which we call Precinct C to make it easy, which is the known, which is memory.

Since Giordano Bruno, they've been saying Psychology is based on memory. We already know Giordano Bruno's destiny, who was burned in February 1600 in the Vatican, and he didn't say very shocking things. Bruno said Psychology is based on memory, and the Psychology that we know is still based on memory and thought, and on that product of thought which we call “I,” which has our name.

But that way of functioning, which is the one we know, has its laws: in the first place, cyclicity, repetition. Just like sleep repeats itself: we wake up at seven, let's say, if we're lucky, and we go to bed at ten -if we respect the laws of nature- and that happens repeatedly. It happens every day that way, in a cyclical and repetitive way. The same that happens with sleep, happens with hunger. Every four hours, hunger repeats itself in a cyclical, daily way. And in the same way, memory repeats itself, because if it didn't repeat, it wouldn't be memory; in the same way, thought repeats itself. I had a patient who'd broken

up with his girlfriend, and I asked him (making a joke) how many times a day he thought about his girlfriend, and he told me, “Yeah, several times.” I tell him, “You’re a liar. You’re thinking about her ALL the time.” It’s a cycle that won’t stop. A cycle that you can’t even stop. Thought is cyclical, it’s repeated.

However, there’s another precinct of functioning, which we’re going to call B to keep things easy, which is Unitary Perception, and in that precinct, the laws that rule Precinct C are absent: cyclicity, repetition, duality, unconsciousness, incoherence. You don’t see those laws in Precinct B. In Precinct B everything seems fresh, everything seems new. One can read a book in Precinct B, a book one has already read two or three times, and it seems new. Why? Because one is in another precinct of brain functioning, where the law of repetition doesn’t exist. Therefore, nothing is repeated in Unitary Perception, that is, in Precinct B.

We keep Precinct A for that which is considered sacred. The Catholic Pope says that human beings are born on Earth to sanctify themselves. It means that sanctification is something sacred. Enlightenment, of which the Buddhists talk, is something sacred. We keep Precinct A, or sacred precinct - which also requires a special brain functioning- for all that for which there seems not to be a language. With JK and David Bohm we talked about this and we agreed that for Precinct A to come (because one can’t look for it, but it can come), it’s necessary to be living in B, which is the functional precinct where one knows true love, thanks to a profound peace that begins, a profound peace. And there can’t be true peace without Unitary Perception, that is, without Precinct B.

A friend of Freud called Bernheim said thought, Precinct C, is hypnosis. Thought is hypnosis. This is saying quite a lot, and he was based on an experiment that carries his name, “*Bernheim’s experiment*,” based on the following: a subject is hypnotized and he’s told to count up to three when he wakes up. He’s hypnotized, and when the subject wakes up, he counts up to three and Bernheim asks him, “Why did you count up to three?” -because all this is unconscious. Then the subject, (Bernheim says, to save face) can say, “I counted up to three

because I have to go to the supermarket to buy bananas, pears and grapes,” and the act of giving an explanation to that hypnotic suggestion of counting up to three isn't part of the hypnosis, or rather it's part of the hypnosis, but since he has forgotten the hypnotic induction, he gives an explanation for it.

Bernheim says, “All we call thought has that nature.” We say we're Mexican, Argentinian, Spaniards, American or Russian, by hypnosis, Bernheim says, and when we're asked for an explanation, we give it, just like what happens in Bernheim's experience. In the name of that, we kill each other. Why? Because we have no idea we're hypnotized, and we don't know that thought is hypnosis. In the same way beliefs, which are products of thought, philosophy, metaphysics, all that which is repetitive, isn't only thought, but also surprisingly, with Bernheim's explanation, hypnosis; nothing less. Nothing less than hypnosis.

Is it possible to be free from that hypnosis we carry in the genes? Because hypnosis is conditioning, and genes condition us. There are people who are born with diabetes, that is, who are genetically hypnotized to be diabetic. There are people who are born with schizophrenia, genetically hypnotized to be schizophrenic. And they will be.

And after birth, not because of the gene, but in an *epigenetic* way, as Sigmund Freud said, above gene, after birth (*epigenetic* means “after birth”) there's hypnosis that starts at home and perhaps ends at the university, but continues every day with television, literature, metaphysics, philosophy, music, and so on. Hypnosis continues. That hypnosis is collective, it exists in every human being, and it's mutual: we hypnotize each other through thought.

Is it possible to be free from hypnosis? Only in Unitary Perception.

Is freedom from hypnosis total or partial? That's what we're going to see in this Course.

I wrote something in a moment of Unitary Perception, when I think I was free from hypnosis. I wrote this:

The benediction comes with the energy of a hurricane, penetrating, levitating, radiant, pacifying, joyful, galvanizing (Unitary Perception energizes oneself). How can the human body bear it?

The reason for looking after one's health, the balanced diet, one hour of daily walking, is not to live for a long time, but for your BODY to be READY for this energy, this benediction, this peace, this joy, this extreme and indescribable glorious splendor that impregnates each moment of the true life.

Enlightenment is simply human life, as it should have always been lived by everyone, from its inception until today.

So, we demythologize Enlightenment, and we say Enlightenment is when the brain functions in ABC, as it was meant to function. If the brain functions completely, ABC, that's Enlightenment, and it's the natural and complete way the brain is meant to function, it simply doesn't happen frequently. Why not? Because we've built a society, a culture, an education, which prevent the brain from functioning completely, because since we're born we're being hypnotized, we're being injected with ideas: nation, beliefs, philosophy, metaphysics, ideology. And a brain that is injected with all that can't function completely! It atrophies, it atrophies, and it'll repeat until death the same rituals, the same political slogans, the same sympathy towards all those heroes who died giving their lives with a machine gun in their hands. How fascinated we are by violent heroes! Isn't it true? We're fascinated, why? Because we've been hypnotized to be fascinated by them.

Is there any good hypnosis? Let's say, the Ten Commandments. "You shall not murder, you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, you shall not steal." The Ten Commandments, are they a good hypnosis? Of course they're a good hypnosis, because they allow a pacific coexistence among human beings. But,

who knows the Ten Commandments nowadays? Very few people, because hypnosis goes in another direction: fast and permanent profit.

In Unitary Perception, what happens? De-hypnosis; hypnosis is lost, and that's one of the great values of Unitary Perception, besides the immediate peace Unitary Perception brings.

How does one define Unitary Perception? One can define it from every human discipline. For example, from Psychology we can say Unitary Perception is: to perceive everything perceptible at the same time, without any expectation, without any effort, because one doesn't need effort to listen, or to see, or to feel the weight. So, how does one define Unitary Perception in Psychology? "To perceive everything perceptible at the same time." Simple. And because of being so simple, it can be rejected, because we like philosophical, metaphysical, and literary abstractions.

In Epistemology, the study of how we know, how does one define it? One defines it by saying that the most important thing in the act of observation is observation, observation itself. It's not what we observe or the observer -Rubén. That's why in Epistemology we define Unitary Perception saying, "Unitary Perception is pure observation (*pure* means *burning, intense*) that encompasses the observable, which at the same time encompasses the observer". Epistemological definition.

Neurological definition: Unitary Perception is one of at least three ways in which the brain functions, where the laws of repetition, cyclicity, duality, incoherence, and unconsciousness don't exist. Simple. But we're not friends of the simple.

And how does one define Unitary Perception in Physics? Unitary Perception is [conscious] contact with Holokinesis. Ah! Then we have to talk a bit about Holokinesis, which is the name of the Psychology we're imparting and spreading.

Why *Holokinetic Psychology*? In honor of David Bohm, yes, and also in honor of the updated science up to the most recent moment. Bohm's Holokinesis is a concept that transforms not

only Physics, it also transforms the way we do science, the way we do experimentation, and that's why it's difficult to assimilate, hard to swallow. In common language, we can say Holokinesis is a hard pill to swallow.

What is Holokinesis? To make it simple (we're going to see it more deeply later), the universe is made of matter and energy, and lately it's been said there's an interface between matter and energy, which is mind. It means matter is universal. For example, sodium is in our blood, it's in the sun and it's in the Alfa Tauri star, in Aldebaran, and it's in the Antares star. Sodium, which is matter, is in the entire universe.

Energy, is it in the entire universe? Light is in the entire universe, otherwise, we wouldn't be able to see Aldebaran or Antares, the sun or the moon, which reflects the sunlight. So, energy is universal too.

And the mind, is it universal too? We're going to see that a little bit later. So, David Bohm says there is matter, mind and energy in the universe, but there are (something showed technologically by the hologram) two orders of universal reality: one that is the explicate, which is what we see, what we touch, and another, implicate order, which is only inferable, and both of them are in the same place in the entire universe, the explicate and the implicate order, and all the matter, mind and energy have those two orders: the visible explicate, and the inferable implicate. And Holokinesis, David Bohm says, is the movement that exists between the implicate order and the explicate order of matter, mind and energy, in the entire universe.

That's all, and nothing less. What does this mean? That that movement, Holokinesis, is the movement from here to here: the paradox of movement. That's the surprising thing, because we're used to believe, say and think that movement is always from here to there. At certain speed we can arrive in Tijuana in two hours by car, but if we go by helicopter we arrive in half an hour. So, from here to there, there are two hours or half an hour, depending on the speed. But in the movement from here to here there can't be speed, because it's *from here to here*. And

that movement is Holokinesis.

On the other hand, time and space have their relevance when we talk about the movement from here to there. From here to Tijuana there are two hours, well, how far is Tijuana? “Two hours from here.” No, don't tell me that, don't talk to me about time, talk to me about distance. “Oh, two hundred kilometers.” Right? Whatever.

Because we mix the concepts of distance and time. But when we talk about movement from here to here, the concept of distance ends. And what happens to the concept of time? The concept of time becomes irrelevant, which means: Newton's absolute time (which is for example, half past ten in Mexicali, in the morning), Newton's *absolute* time is complemented with Einstein's relative time, who says [time] depends on the observer's position, and so on, and the observer's speed. Now, David Bohm in 1986, when he formulates Holokinesis mathematically, tells us something tremendous, the great pill that is hard to swallow: *time is irrelevant*.

Ah, it means that, to have a complete understanding of time, we have to know that time is absolute, relative and it's also irrelevant. And if Psychology has to be transformed, as it was transformed and had to be thanks to Holokinesis, how does one express oneself in the language of irrelevant time? How does one do? We can't say, “I'm going to achieve Unitary Perception,” why? Because achieving occurs in absolute time, in ten minutes, in ten days, in twenty years. That is, the musician achieves learning guitar in six years, let's say, and if he wants to become virtuoso, eight years. To achieve learning guitar virtuously, a person needs eight years. Then he reaches it, he achieves it because it was in time, it was, six or eight years. The physician needs four, six, eight years, it depends on what he wants to be, to be a physician, to achieve being a physician. In absolute time, four, six, eight years.

Very well. There's no problem there. But when we refer to Holokinetic Psychology, we can't say, “I'm going to achieve Unitary Perception,” because Unitary Perception is either happening or not, and it's always here. What does it mean to

live completely here? It means Unitary Perception. Then, how do we refer to that? Simply, Unitary Perception means to live completely here. Another very-difficult-to-swallow pill, very difficult to swallow. Then, how do we live completely here? Listening completely to the sound at the same time, feeling the weight of the body while we listen, and seeing the whole of light, which is the entire visual field: a hundred and eighty degrees and a hundred and eighty degrees, the entire semi-sphere that is in front of us, is the visual field, which can be seen in Unitary Perception while one feels the weight and while one listens to all sound. If you attempt it, you're going to see very soon, very soon, not to say immediately, that peace comes, and peace is the seal of guarantee that you're doing Unitary Perception right.

I told JK, who was the one who taught me Unitary Perception, thank God:

“And why do I have to listen? Why do I have to feel the weight?, it seems so silly to me.”

He tells me, “Do it and see what happens.”

“No, but tell me something, tell me what will happen.”

“No, no. Do it and see what happens.”

Now, JK's wisdom was very big, because if JK had told me what happens, that day, March the 23rd 1975, while I was studying psychiatry in the United States, at the University of Pittsburgh, I would've thought he was crazy. If JK had told me what happens when one attempts Unitary Perception in a constant way, day by day, moment by moment, from fact to fact, and he had told me sincerely what happens, I would've said, “This guy is crazy,” and I would never had taken it seriously. So I thank JK for his wisdom of having told me, “Do it and see what happens, I'm not going to tell you what happens, because if I tell you what happens, you'll never take it seriously.” He knew I was conditioned as a physician and that I couldn't accept the things that happen in Unitary Perception, in that moment I wouldn't have been able to accept it if he told me

what happens if one lives Unitary Perception. Because to say that what happens is wonderful is an understatement. Because to say that what happens in Unitary Perception is transcendental is an understatement. Because to say that what happens in Unitary Perception is the most important thing in life, the most beautiful thing a person can live, is an understatement.

Then, we have to say there are seven objectives:

The objective of this Course is for you to take the reading of the written work seriously. At this moment [2010] they are around twenty three books.

The objective of Holokinetic Psychotherapy, what is it? To go from C to B; from all we know, memory, thought, “I,” to the unknown, Unitary Perception, benediction, peace, love, energy.

What is the objective of Precinct C, Memory, thought, “I”? Profit, prestige, power and lots of pleasure. And if we don't find any of those things, we get angry and we live with fear, anger and sorrow.

The objective [to reiterate] of the Course is for you take the study of the written work seriously and, if you want, you can take the oral and written exams to become professors in Holokinetic Psychology of the International Academy of Sciences of the Republic of San Marino [Mexico Branch], which sponsors these academic activities.

Many people tell me, “How are you going to take exams about something unknown like Unitary Perception?” No, we don't take exams of that. The exam is to learn to use the clear, concise, concrete, coherent, complete language: CCCCC. A clear, concise, concrete, complete and coherent language. In order to teach the most important thing in the mind, which is Unitary Perception. The exam isn't to know whether the student is in Unitary Perception. That would be ridiculous. It's to know whether he can teach without confusing people. It is most important not to create confusion if we're going to teach the

most important thing in life, which is Precinct B, Unitary Perception.

So, (to a woman in Audience) what is the objective of the Course?

Audience: To facilitate the reading of the written work and of course, if one wants, to take the exam to become a professor.

RFG: Yes. To read what is written and, if you want, to take the exam to be a professor of the International Academy of Sciences [Mexico Branch].

What is the objective of Holokinetic Psychotherapy?

Audience: To help the patient to attempt Unitary Perception, to get in contact with conflict.

RFG: And also ultimately to be free from conflict.

That is, to go from C to B. That's the objective of [Holokinetic] Psychotherapy.

Javier, what is the objective of C?

Audience: Power, prestige, profit, pleasure.

RFG: Very good, very good. And Eduardo, could you tell me what is the objective of the exam of the International Academy of Sciences [RSM – Mexico Branch]?

Audience: To know whether you're capable of transmitting the message without egotistic language.

RFG: Without the egocentric, hypnotic, and temporal language. It seems you've read something, and so it is. The exam is to make sure the student, already a professor of the International Academy of Sciences [RSM - Mexico Branch], transmits what Unitary Perception is and what horizontal conflict is without distortion, a distortion that comes from a wrong language, and that language is egocentric, temporal, and hypnotic. We're going to see that.

Audience: And dual.

RFG: Sure, it's dual, yes, it's dual too, just like its origin which is thought. Language is dual, thought is dual. We're going to see that, but thought is dual because it always moves between the “pretty” and the “ugly,” “tall” and “short,” it always moves between the opposites, the “good” and the “bad.”

What's interesting is that Jesus Christ himself, two thousand years ago said, “Don't call me good, because only God knows what is good.” What was he trying to say? He wanted to take people out of dual language, out of the good and the bad. You have to love your brother; whether he's good or bad, leave that to God. Beautiful, beautiful.

Well, we have to read something about current psychological diagnosis. We're going to see a little bit about it. Why? Because some diagnoses don't benefit from Unitary Perception, that is, from Holokinetic Psychology. Which are those diagnoses? Schizophrenia, mental retardation (mental “delay” in Mexico), bad sleep, attention deficit. In those cases, it's not convenient to teach Unitary Perception, because it is a waste of time. Why a waste of time? “It's cruel to say this”, it seems cruel, right? But it's not cruel, it's simply that a schizophrenic can't understand, because the nature of schizophrenia is incoherence, and the nature of Unitary Perception is coherence. They're incompatible. Then the schizophrenic can get even more confused, which is saying a lot, when we try to teach him Unitary Perception.

A person with mental retardation doesn't have the intelligence quotient to understand the essential abstractions that are needed to transmit this teaching. They're quite interesting abstractions, not to say difficult, and essential. The mentally retarded person can't understand, because of the lack of intelligence quotient.

A person who sleeps badly, does he have problems to understand? Yes, because the person who doesn't sleep well develops a kind of little incoherence and lack of memory. The prototype of the person who doesn't sleep well is the person with depression, medical depression. I don't mean being sad or

being in bereavement. Medical depression, which is defined as bad sleep and bad energy. When we say depression, when I say depression, remember I'm saying: bad sleep and little energy. The person with depression doesn't benefit unless he's taking a good antidepressant medicine, he's sleeping well and he has recovered energy, only then can he learn Unitary Perception.

In attention deficit, precisely they don't have the necessary attention to know, to concentrate and understand what we're saying. Something that he must understand from many points of view. It isn't enough to say Unitary Perception is to perceive everything perceptible at the same time, because we've already seen that in Epistemology it's defined in a profound way, and also in Physics, in Mathematics there's another definition, and so on.

And it's good to take a look at the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Number IV*, which will be V in May 2012. The current diagnostic manual in Psychology is a-theoretical, that is, it has no theory. What for? So the psychoanalyst doesn't fight with the behaviorist and the gestaltic, do you understand me? But above all, what for? To lower the cost of diagnosis and to allow a sixth-grade boy to diagnose, so there's no need for a psychologist or a psychiatrist.

What is the objective of the Diagnostic Manual Number IV and V and the three previous ones? De-professionalize psychology. De-professionalize it. It means: "professionals aren't necessary to do psychology, so the psychology service gets cheaper." Why does Jimmy Carter do this? Because he's overwhelmed when the advisers come and tell him that depression had increased 20% in the United States. And Jimmy Carter is overwhelmed when they tell him that, in 1940, depression began at age forty, in 1950 depression started at age thirty, in 1960 depression starts to appear at age twenty, and since 1970, as Spitz says -René Spitz founding Hospitalism- depression begins in the baby. He discovers it, he's working with newborn children, he realizes that children who don't have a mother and who received the cold bottle, *mamila* or feeding bottle from the refrigerator, without the mother's embrace, without the primate's embrace, developed depression. Since when? Since

six months old, a year old. So, when Jimmy Carter hears this he says, "Good gracious, then we need a hundred thousand more psychologists." And the adviser tells him, "No. We need to de-professionalize psychology, so anyone can make a diagnosis." Then the DSM, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual*, appears together with managed care, which is the care taken of patients in the United States by people with sixth grade or less. Are the mental health professionals the psychologist and the psychiatrist? Not anymore. Now they are the case managers, those who manage the case, who can be persons with sixth grade, thanks to what? Thanks to the Diagnostic and Statistic Manual, which now is in its fourth edition. In 2012 it'll be the fifth.

How curious: above a trillion dollars are being spent in defense (actually military *attack*), and trillions of dollars are being spent in what is called war. A war that has become permanent, and governments can't spend in mental health professionals.

Diagnosis is made in five axes, that's very intelligent:

In Axis I, you put the clinical disorders.

Axis II is reserved for Mental Retardation and Personality Disorders.

Axis III for medical problems.

Axis IV, for anything that is stress in the last year. That is, if the person was hospitalized, for example a schizophrenic person was hospitalized six months ago, in a scale from 1 to 5, he has to have 5, because six months ago he was hospitalized. I.e., if during the last year a schizophrenic person was hospitalized, then in Axis IV, which is stress, he has a number 5, the maximum. If in the office we're seeing a person who has gone through divorce and who's had to move to a new house -he's the husband, for example- the woman keeps the house and the husband has to move to another house, he has 100 points of stress from the divorce and another 100 points from the stress of moving to another house: that's 200 points of stress, and in Axis IV, which is stress, what should the psychiatrist or

psychologist put? Five, which is: too much stress. So, this is one of the good things of the five axes diagnosis.

Axis V is, let's say, the way the person has behaved from 1 to 100. A score of 100 is for the person who can carry out his work, family relationships of all kind, and a score of below 30 is for the person who gets into a psychiatric hospital, for example, or into a hospital for disability. In the United States, if you are below 40, you can receive State assistance, but if you have more than 40 you don't receive State assistance, it means you're capable enough of feeding yourself with your own work, which isn't always true, but those are the current canons.

Stress is, let's put it this way, ubiquitous, omnipresent in Psychology and Psychopathology. A depressed person has lots of stress. A child with attention deficit has lots of stress. A person with mental retardation has lots of stress. A schizophrenic person is different because he lacks affection. But the mentally diseased in general, if they aren't schizophrenic, have much stress, above all the depressed ones. Everything becomes more stressful, more difficult. Stress is the same response to cold, fatigue, radiations, infections, intoxications, trauma, excess of work, lack of sleep, and so on. All of that produces a glandular response, the hypophysis and the adrenocortical glands, in the organism, and that stress (the only response to many causes) brings innumerable complications. I can tell how long a person has been under chronic stress by asking, "Are you suffering gastritis?," because gastritis is the first complication of stress. He tells me, "Yes, I have heartburn," then I have an idea that this person has been stressed for at least three years.

"Do you have arterial hypertension?"

"Yes." It means he's been stressed for at least five years.

"Do you have arthritis?"

"Yes." He's been stressed for at least ten years.

"Do you suffer from many flus and many colds?," because of

the low immunity, another complication of stress.

“Yes.”

That can happen at any moment in stress. And final complications are: metabolic syndrome, which is diabetes' threshold, and in the end, not at the beginning, suicidal and homicidal ideas. A depressed person rarely has suicidal and homicidal ideas. That is, depression doesn't bring suicidal and homicidal ideas unless stress is very chronic and it's been there for at least ten or twenty years without treatment, for the patient to start thinking in suicide and homicide.

Then, one has to do an initial assessment of the patient. You're going to receive the study material to see point by point how to assess a patient. What does one have to do? To take personal details, e-mail, phone, address, some ID so that person doesn't pretend to be another, as it happens many times, to obtain economic advantages in some way.

After taking down details, ask him why he comes, that is, the reason why he comes. Then, the history of the reason why he comes. “I come because I haven't slept since my wife left me.” Divorce insomnia, presented problem. History: “How long ago did you stop sleeping? How long ago did you split up or divorce?” History of the presented problem.

Then comes the *Personal History*: asking where he was born, where he was educated, for how long he was educated, whether he has primary, secondary, tertiary education, whether he's been in military service or not, whether he's been hospitalized or not, for any reason, from a fracture to schizophrenia, and so on, and so on. Personal History: Whether he's married or not, how many times he got married, if she's a woman, how many children she's had, and so on.

After that comes the *Mental State*. To see how the person is, to see how the person behaves, his aspect: fat, thin, attractive, not attractive, how he's dressed. If he comes dressed with an

overcoat, at this moment, we would say something is wrong with his judgment, because it's close to 122 °F, then, is he dressed properly for the occasion? ...for his gender? A man can come dressed as a woman. Is he dressed properly for his age? Is she an old woman who comes wearing a miniskirt? That's to say, is the person properly dressed?

After that, how he talks; whether he is coherent. Whether verbal expression is solid, clear, concise, coherent, I insist. Whether he completes his thoughts or leaves them unfinished. And then it's good to ask whether he knows other languages, and then intelligence, approximately make some questions about intelligence to have a gross idea of his intelligence, his memory. "Repeat these numbers for me: three, five, eight, six, nine, seven, zero, two," for example.

Memory, attention, does he pay attention or gets distracted?

"Are you oriented? Do you know who I am? What am I?"

"You're a truck driver." He isn't oriented, I'm at least a professional who is interrogating him. He can be an antisocial cynic.

"Who am I?"

"A thief." He's mocking me.

"Who am I?"

"You're a physician, you're a psychiatrist." He's oriented.

"What day is it today?"

"July the 25th." He's oriented.

"What year?"

"2010." He's oriented, to time, to person... and to place?

"What place is this?"

"Mexicali. New Mexicali."

Orientation, memory, intelligence, attention.

After that comes the *Diagnosis in Five Axes and the Treatment Plan*.

That's the initial assessment of a patient, in a few words. You're going to receive, in paper or by e-mail, the complete initial assessment. That one which has a little exam at the end, which you don't have to do, but that's the assessment we have.

There are two words that are very used in Psychology, which are *transference* and *counter-transference*, they're Sigmund Freud's words, and they're used above all in the psychotherapeutic session. Transference is everything the patient feels for the therapist. Why is it called transference? Because it's the way he learnt to feel with his mother, with his father, with his teachers, do you understand me? In that way as he learned to feel, with hatred, with love, with whatever, that's the way he's going to feel with his therapist. Then he transfers the way he learned to feel or she learned to feel to the therapist. That's called transference. Transference of feelings to the therapist.

The therapist knows how that person learned to feel thanks to transference. Is he a hostile person? Is he a kind person? Is he a superficially kind person and hostile deep down?, and so on. Or, is he an hostile person but deep down he's a kind person?, and so on.

Counter-transference is the same, but it's what the therapist feels for the patient. Do I feel repulsion for this patient because he doesn't get better with the treatment I gave him? Do I feel affection for this person? Do I feel attraction for such a beautiful woman?, and so on. That's the therapist's counter-transference. Transference, counter-transference.

Another very important thing if you're going to do therapy, is that everything that happens in the office is confidential, i.e., it can't go beyond the walls of the office. If the patient is less than eighteen years old he must be told, "Everything you tell me is confidential, but if you tell me something that I think is going

to put your life in danger, or your health, or somebody's life, I'll have to tell your parents," but it's still confidential. The same for an adult.

In the United States there's a law called Tarasoff-Mavroudis. Why? Why was that law born? Because Tarasoff was a very attractive girl. Her boyfriend goes to see the psychologist and he tells the psychologist:

"I'm going to kill Tarasoff, the girl."

"Why?"

"Because she's with another man, and she didn't tell me anything."

And the psychologist doesn't do anything about it, and the boyfriend goes and kills this girl, Tarasoff, and then her parents left him completely out of a job, without license, without anything, and from there, the Tarasoff-Mavroudis Law is born: the psychologist has the obligation of informing the authorities if the patient shows suicidal or homicidal ideas, or if they put their life in danger. And all that is called confidentiality, with the exceptions I already mentioned.

Then, another thing about confidentiality is how the receptionist must behave. We're going to do an example with the great receptionist we have here, a volunteer, in the CPH. I'm somebody who calls you and I tell you, "Hi, is this the CPH, Ms. García?, is this the CPH?"

Audience: "Yes, it is."

RFG: "Are you looking after Marta Pérez?"

Audience: "We can't give you that information."

RFG: That's confidentiality. We can't give you information about whether we're looking after Marta Pérez, because otherwise, we're breaking confidentiality.

"But I'm her husband."

She would have to say: “I can't tell whether you're her husband. And if you come with your documentation and show me you're her husband, I can't talk to you about Marta Perez either, because we have to keep confidentiality. So you'll have to ask Marta Pérez to know whether she wants to share the information you're looking for with you.” That's called confidentiality.

It means that before attempting to go from C to B in the psychotherapy, I have to ask many things, right? To know whether the person is schizophrenic, depressed, whether he has attention deficit or mental retardation. If I have doubts about mental retardation, it is best to do the *Revised Wechsler Test*, to find out the intelligence quotient before starting therapy, in order not to make that patient lose time and money. There are other things he can do, but not Unitary Perception, in case he's one of those four things. Even so, schizophrenia is 1% of the population, mental retardation is 3% of the population. It means that 96% of the population benefits from Unitary Perception. 96%.

Unitary Perception isn't a technique; it's a form of brain functioning. It isn't a technique and it doesn't have the laws I already mentioned, which are the laws of Precinct C: repetition, cyclicity, duality, incoherence, unconsciousness. Because thought, memory and “I” have what is called the unconscious. There's an unconscious “I”. 99% of memory is unconscious. Thought: 99% is unconscious, just like the “I.” But Unitary Perception is only conscious, Unitary Perception is only conscious.

Now, is the unconscious the implicate order? No. The unconscious of Precinct C, the unconscious of memory, thought and ego, is still explicate order, don't confuse implicate order with unconscious, be very careful.

Then, how does the brain function in Precinct C? How is the perception of the brain in Precinct C? If you take a little wire, put it on the eyelid and make a very soft galvanic current flow over the eyelid, then “bzzz” -the current flows and they ask the person what they felt. “I heard a buzz, I heard *bzzz*,” when the

current passed. The ear registers that electric current. So, how did electricity turn into sound? We aren't going to go into it, that's for Physics, let them make their lives hard, here we're going to make it simple. How did electric energy turn into sound? There are explanations, but here we're not going to give them.

“Bzzz.”

“I heard an electric current pass. A buzzing.”

“What else did you feel?”

“I felt heat on my eyelid.”

How did electric energy turn into heat? We aren't going to explain it here, here we're going to make things simple. But it means an energy turned into heat on the eyelid. Why? Because here [in the ear] the energy receptor is the sound receptor, and here [on the eyelid] the energy receptor is heat or pressure.

“And did you feel anything else?”

“Yes, I saw a flash of light” -which is called a phosphene.

Because electricity reached the retina, and the eye has light receptors, which when stimulated, give light.

The eye doesn't have electricity receptors. Receptors in the ear register electricity as sound, and receptors in the eyelids register electricity as heat, and that's how the brain functions. What do we call that? In Holokinetic Psychology we call it fragmentary perception, because there isn't a perception of electricity. Electricity kills you but you don't perceive it. A lightning bolt kills you. At the most, you can perceive the heat. If you grab a conductor of electric energy you can get electrocuted and die, but there aren't perceptions of electricity in the organism, then, that little cable shows there's a fragmentary perception of the energy in the brain, and the only energy, which is the energy of Holokinesis (remember that the energy of Holokinesis is only one), which explicates itself in the explicate order as electricity, electromagnetic energy, as

sound, as gravitation, as weak force, nuclear force, and so on. Then, how does the brain perceive it? It perceives the only energy in many ways, and that perception is fragmentary, and that perception is the perception of thought. That's why thought is 99% unconscious and its perception isn't reliable. Why? Because it fragments everything it perceives. It fragments everything it perceives, and it imagines a world divided by nations, divided by religions, and divided, divided, and divided, because that's what thought does: fragmentary perception.

What instruments does thought have to get in contact with reality (let's call it "external" to the organism)? The weighing scale and the lens, the great instruments of thought. The scale and the lens. And how does thought explain the external world? With Cartesian coordinates: abscissa and ordinate, do you understand me? So: duality, and that duality is seen in the way thought creates instruments to get in contact with the environment. The scale: here the kilogram, here the potato, until it becomes stabilized and we have a kilogram of potatoes. The lens is also duality, because if we use lens, what happens? Here what the lens does is that it has a focal point and the object has a focal point that is dual. The object and the image, the lens plays as an intermediary to improve the image of the object, to increase it, enhance it, and so on. And cartesian coordinates. The way we learned to experiment in science is through Cartesian coordinates. [As an example] How incoherence decreases in the vertical axis of the Cartesian coordinate (coherence) –the horizontal is time. We're using a medicine. How does incoherence decrease in time, as we see it decreases, with the proper treatment of the schizophrenic person? We use Cartesian coordinates. Once again duality, a characteristic of thought, same as the lens, same as the scale.

But what opens the door to the understanding of what Unitary Perception is, and to the understanding that mankind has functioned for almost a million years without Unitary Perception, is an instrument that appeared in the seventies called *the hologram*. The hologram is an instrument which gives us an image...

This is the common photograph, which we take of a person and

the negative shows him inverted: head, arms, legs.

This is the holographic photograph, the negative shows only spirals of light interference, spirals and stripes of light interference. Where is the person? The person is implicit there, because if one passed a laser beam, the person appears as a statue back there in the focal point. A statue of light. It means that in the common photograph we use light, and in the hologram we use laser, which is coherent light. In photography we use a lens, which inverts the object and makes the right foot correspond with the right foot of the object, so there is point-to-point correspondence with the object, point-to-point correspondence with the object. In holography there is no lens, there is no lens and there is no point-to-point correspondence with the object, because every point of the object is in every point of the hologram, it means that in this point is the foot, the hand, the arms, the head, the other leg, the foot, everything is in a single point of the hologram, and in every point are all the points of the object, the object is implicit. So we have two things we learn from the hologram. We learn two things from the hologram:

1. There's an implicate, not visible reality.
2. Reality is indivisible, every point of the object can be found in every point of the hologram.

Then, conclusions from the hologram, holographic technology which appears in 1960 thanks to Denis Gabor, who'd said if he had a very big dot of light, he could take photographs as light statues, using Leibniz's Differential and Integral Calculus from 1780, around the time in which Copernicus starts being known.

But only in 1980 is this known. Two hundred years passed since Leibniz, very slow, as you can see, for this notion of the hologram to be made known, and the hologram shows us at least two things: there's an implicit reality, the object is there but we don't see it, and reality is indivisible: every point of the object is in every point of the hologram. It isn't like here [the photographic negative], in which the nose of the photographed image corresponds with the nose of the object, point-to-point, a

point-to-point correspondence. The nose is just in one point of the negative. The nose in the hologram is in all the hologram. Then indivisible reality, conclusion from the hologram, and an implicit reality besides the explicit one. An order of reality which is implicate, besides the explicate order. In the hologram the explicate order are the spirals of light interference.

Questions...Blanca?

Audience: A question, in the human being, does the brain function as a holographic plate, of the universe?

RFG: Of course, I mean, what does the hologram tell us? There's an implicate order of matter, mind and energy in all the universe. It means the implicate order is in each one of us, in each point of the universe and Holokinesis, which is the movement between the implicate order and the explicate, from here to here, is in all the universe and it's *the* energy, the energy of the universe which explicates itself in electromagnetic, gravitational, weak force, nuclear force, and so on. Then Unitary Perception is the only way the human brain, the human nervous system has, to establish contact with Holokinesis, and consequences are seen immediately. Peace, a tremendous peace.

Audience: Contingencies.

RFG: What did I say?

Audience: Consequences.

RFG: No, no, sorry. *Contingency*, it isn't a consequence; it's a contingency, something that happens without the necessity of being cause-effect. Contingency, not consequence.

Any other comment?

Audience: A question. Now that you commented the universe is mind, matter and energy, my question is, then, the mind can't be defined as thought, as it's been done?

RFG: The mind can't...?

Audience: Be defined as thought, as it's been done.

RFG: Of course, the mind isn't only thought. Well, the example I put is that of the wasp and the orchid.

Audience: Can you repeat the student's question so it gets recorded?

RFG: What Karina says is there's much more than thought in the mind, not as it has been believed until today. Much more than "I," much more than memory. The mind is much more than that. We're saying the mind is more than memory, more than thought, more than "I," it's also Unitary Perception. There also has to be something in the person's mind, that makes contact with the sacred. The sacred as something concrete.

I was in Cologne, Germany, and my friend Jungmann takes me to see the remains of a person who remained intact, without rotting, without corrupting. I was surprised and then he tells me, "How do you explain it scientifically?" I tell him, "It doesn't have a scientific explanation, yet." Even Bohm didn't have a scientific explanation.

[Disk change is made for the recording].

[The class is resumed with the subject of medication in psychiatry].

RFG: What will that substance do in the child's organism, that transforms him so quickly? It stimulates the brain and makes him capable of learning something, for those three or four hours the medication lasts. What does it mean to last three or four hours? That it's an impeccable medication, in the sense it won't leave a mark, it won't produce damage if the proper dosage is used.

Audience: But if you teach him in that four hours, when those four hours end, he can attempt Unitary Perception.

RFG: Well, also what happens is that the learning process for the child with attention deficit, has to be special. Unfortunately, today there's the law of "respecting diversity," which means

“let's put all the kids together.” In a class of forty, “Let's put the one with attention deficit, the retarded, the schizophrenic one, let's put them all together and let's see what they learn.” That's a scandal, that isn't education. Then we have the education we have, which is a disaster. That's why things are as they are. A disaster, not only in Mexico. From Argentina to Alaska and from the United States to China, the world is a perfect disaster.

But in the particular case of attention deficit and medication, one has to individualize and one has to repeat the teaching so it gets assimilated, under medication, which needs, what? A special class for the kid with attention deficit, just like the retarded one needs a special class for retardation. Now the trend is to respect diversity and put all the kids together, and they even tell the teacher what she has to do. It's the new education, if that can be called education. I don't know if I'm answering you.

Audience: Also it seems incoherent to me, besides gathering all the children who have attention deficit, depression, schizophrenia, it's an incoherence, if the DSM was made to de-professionalize, but with the five axes they could say, “This child has depression or attention deficit, we can't put him in (a school).” It's an incoherence.

RFG: Well, why isn't the diagnostic of schizophrenia made with the frequency it deserves? It's 1% of the population, very frequent. Nevertheless it's diagnosed 0,1% of times. Why is schizophrenia so under-diagnosed? Because society is schizophrenic, society is incoherent, yes sir. We have in the United Nations the Security Council. Look, Security Council, which are five countries: China, England, the United States, France and which one am I missing? [Russia]. Well, the United Nations Security Council is made of those five countries. Those countries are the countries that produce most weapons and the ones that benefit the most from selling weapons. It means they have to be inventing enemies to sell weapons, and they're the United Nations Security Council. That's the biggest incoherence I've seen in my life, the one that has surprised me the most. But there are many more incoherences. The sole fact of calling the United Nations *United Nations*, when they're

actually divided. That is, there isn't a world government and there isn't a union of mankind, so the United Nations is an idea, but it isn't a reality. It's an incoherence, just like "Security Council". It's an incoherence! Because it's made up of the countries that sell most weapons and the ones that make the most money from selling weapons, so they need to be inventing enemies to keep the business going, and they need to have a permanent war, which doesn't cease, to keep that big business that is selling weapons.

War hasn't ceased since mankind began. The Chaldean, the Akkadian, and the Persian started writing, and up to 2010 some are still writing (most of them don't know how to write) (laughter), what happens in those five thousand years? Permanent war; war has never ceased. And now that it was discovered that selling weapons is a big business –there's already famous people like Leonardo da Vinci, who earned a livelihood making weapons, selling weapons– but now it's been discovered that it's the most profitable business, and war doesn't cease. There's always a new war. If the Korean War ended, well, it has to be started again, because then we'll be able to sell weapons. That's what's happening in Korea, what is happening in Afganisthan, in Irak, and what has happened in the whole history looking back. Vietnam and all we've seen. That's called incoherence. Incoherence. Are those countries heretics, which don't know religion, who don't know anything about JesuKristos? No! They're all Christian countries, all Christian countries. Those Christian countries are invading the "heretic" countries, which are the Muslims. Then we find Kristianity, which is talking to us about living in peace while Christian countries are the ones that are invading. Incoherence present in human thought wherever one looks, wherever one looks.

Audience: Beginning with oneself.

RFG: Beginning with oneself. With oneself, of course. The violence there is in all of us, it has to be seen in Unitary Perception. It has to be seen, it has to be seen.

Any other comment or question?

Audience: Me, a question. Would pregnancy be below 40 or over 40? Pregnancy in the five axes. Because it seems to be stress, doesn't it?

RFG: Oh, for pregnancy I put 5.

Audience: 5 in stress and, 40 in functionality in Axis V?

RFG: In functionality, pregnancy, 40, sure. That is, pregnancy is the great calcium thief. Pregnant teenagers in the United States, whom I saw in the office, didn't have teeth. Teenagers as young as fourteen in the United States start having children, what for? The State gives them a thousand dollars for each children, per month. Then at fourteen they start getting pregnant, to take from the government the monthly thousand dollars. At sixteen they already have three children. I saw them in my office. They didn't have teeth anymore, because they're still growing; growth ends at age twenty one. And if they even get pregnant, all the calcium of those bones and teeth goes to make up the fetus', the baby's bones. Then: a dental catastrophe in the pregnant teenager, whose number is growing geometrically, not only in the United States, I find out that in Argentina pregnancy in teenagers has increased geometrically, and one talks to one of those girls and the first thing one notices is the bad breath, and the second thing one sees, if one looks, are teeth completely rotten, completely decalcified. They are depleted of calcium.

Audience: A question, Rubén. Now that you mention it, the person who has depression and has a treatment, can benefit from Unitary Perception, right?

RFG: The person with depression and treatment. One has to wait for the treatment to restore sleep and energy. If I diagnose depression, I tell the patient, "You're going to come back to see the therapist, when you start sleeping well and start feeling with energy, at least sleeping well." Generally in thirty days, at most, the person starts sleeping well. Sometimes in a week. In a week, two or three, he can come back to the psychologist to do the therapy, to go from C to B.

Audience: My question is this: have you ever had patients who have bipolar depression and who've had the process you say, have they taken the attempt of Unitary Perception to their lives?

RFG: The good patient, who takes it seriously, is going to feel very good, once sleep is regulated with antidepressant medication, or the necessary medication for bipolar depression, which may not be the antidepressant. The last update tells us the bipolar patient, at the beginning of the treatment doesn't need antidepressants, but well, those are subtleties. Once the patient starts sleeping well, he goes to the psychologist, and the psychologist finds the good patient and the bad patient, the one who takes it seriously and the one who doesn't. In general, what overwhelms me the most in my life is that there are very few people who take Unitary Perception seriously. Why does that happen? I don't know. I think it's because C is an enemy of B. I say C is the enemy of B, so all we are is an enemy of Unitary Perception. So, we don't take Unitary Perception seriously, or we do it when we remember, but it isn't our life. At most, it is one more thing in our life, which means nothing. Or it's our life. If it isn't your life, you won't find the benefits of Unitary Perception, undoubtedly. Did I answer your question?

Audience: Yes.

Audience: There's a question.

RFG: Do you have questions over there? [*To Buenos Aires*]

Audience: Hi Rubén, I'm Graciela.

RFG: Hello Graciela.

Audience: I wanted to ask you a question: a clinical disease that we as physicians see a lot and which has four stages, and it's Alzheimer's disease. In the first stage the patient suffers from a deterioration of thought, and he uses deaf sign language as a replacement. I wanted to ask you whether you have experience in having treated anyone and whether they would benefit in this stage.

RFG: Here, in Mexicali, I have three patients with Alzheimer's disease. They're three female patients the ones we have here in Mexicali, and we've started the treatment in the first period, with much benefit with a combined treatment that includes estrogen (no matter how ill-spoken of estrogen may be), that includes, you know, the appropriate medication, and we've seen that progress stop at least for two years, and after two years the disease starts progressing again.

Any other question or comment in Buenos Aires?

Audience: No.

RFG: We have a question here. Go ahead.

Audience: I have a comment about what Karina said. I'd like to add that abandonment of the treatment is the most common diagnosis..

RFG: Yes, it's said here that abandonment of the treatment is the most common diagnosis, and it's true. Why? I think there's only one reason: the therapist, the physician or the psychiatrist, lacks the conviction to persuade the patient to take the medication until death, because in general he isn't updated or he's anti-medical, and it's a blot on society to still have anti-medical thought. Why do we have an anti-medical thought? Anti-medical thought is what makes abandonment of medical treatment the most common diagnosis.

Where does anti-medical thought come from? It has origin in the Gospel. In the Gospel there's a part where it reads "one doesn't have to follow *pharmakias*." In Greek, in the Gospel in Greek, *pharmakias* means sorcery, that is, magicians' stuff. Jesus himself recommends his disciples not to visit Simon, who was a *pharmakio*, who was a sorcerer, a magician, who was a shaman, and Jesus recommends them no to mess around with that garbage. Peter says, "But he flies and all." Jesus says, "No, let him fly, but don't go to his house (laughter). Let him fly."

The truth is the word *pharmakias* has been a disgrace, because when the pharmacological science appears, which is one of the

greatest gifts of God to mankind, the current pharmacological science which has progressed so much and which does so much good to mankind, has a bad name: *Pharmacy*. Why a bad name? Because when the word *pharmacy* appears, the ignorant Protestant ministers appear in the United States, comparing the word *pharmacy* as a science, to the word *pharmakia* from Greek, which means sorcery. They connect both things and they think the pharmacist is a sorcerer, a magician, like Simon was, whom Jesus prohibited his friends from seeing. He tells his friends, “Don’t go to Simon’s house, because he’s a *pharmakios*.”

Well, I think that is where it comes from, unfortunately, that anti-medication attitude, anti-medical. It has a very remote origin in the Christian Gospel, misunderstood, badly translated, badly interpreted, like it really is. But if we understand that a person with depression or a schizophrenic person needs treatment for life, and that his life will be a much more satisfactory life and much happier for his family, then we’ll persuade him to take his medication for life, we won’t tell him, “Don’t come back with that criminal of a doctor.”

[To a participant] What are you saying?

Audience: It’s a question about one of the delicate points of what has been talked, which is the hypnotic nature of thought. Then, it’s difficult to understand that the nature of thought is hypnotic, when thought has produced for example Pharmacy. How is this explained, please?

RFG: Talking to David Bohm about this, which we talked a lot about, David Bohm tells me, “I’ve brought out the theory of Holokinesis mathematically because I’m standing on Newton’s and Einstein’s shoulders,” that is, the fact that hypnosis can invent doesn’t mean it isn’t standing on previous hypnosis. That is, “I’m standing on Newton’s and Einstein’s shoulders.” If that hypnosis is about Physics, it’s standing on previous hypnosis and because of that, it can produce new things. I mean, the unicorn. I always put as an example the unicorn, in order to denounce the illusory nature of thought. The same thought that produces the “I,” that invents the “I,” is the thought that invents

the unicorn. “The Blue Unicorn.” That is, we don't invent the white unicorn only, but we can also make it blue (laughter), and we don't invent the “I” only, but we can also invent the “superior I,” and the “observing I,” to complicate things. That is, the fact that there's a latitude in hypnosis doesn't mean it isn't hypnosis. There are things that are frankly illusory, like the unicorn, and we say, “Yes, I know what the unicorn is, but I know it doesn't exist.” But we don't say the same about the “I” and much less about the “superior I.” I don't touch your cult and you don't touch mine (laughter). Don't speak ill of the superior “I.”

Well, but those are inventions of thought, illusory ones, which give us security, a false sensation of security. But where there is the “I,” there is horizontal conflict, which is the division between the “I” and what it observes, and we're going to talk about that when we talk about horizontal conflict, which is one of the main concepts of Holokinetic Psychology. It's important to talk about both of them, about Unitary Perception and horizontal conflict. Horizontal conflict is based on the idea of the divided “I.” The divided “I” is an invention of thought. That doesn't make thought wonderful, it makes thought a source of illusion. That's what happens.

We have around five minutes, I don't know whether you want to add something in Buenos Aires.

Audience: No, everything is fine here.

RFG: Any question or comment from you? We have five or six minutes. *[To the Audience in the CPH]*

Audience: In relation to schizophrenia, I heard, I don't know if it was so... from Spitz, I think.

RFG: René Spitz.

Audience: About lack of affection with children.

RFG: Sure, he was talking, not about schizophrenia, but about depression.

Audience: That's what I was about to ask.

Ultra-early depression in the breast-fed baby, which he called Hospitalism, but it actually means "ultra-early depression," but it was called Hospitalism originally by René Spitz, in which the baby let himself die, it stopped eating, why? Because he didn't have the affection from the maternal breast, not even the nurse's breast, because the nurse put him in a device with a bottle to drink cold milk, then he never felt physical contact. When this was reproduced in monkeys, the same was seen: baby monkeys let themselves die too, if they didn't have the mother's embrace and they didn't feel the heat from the mother's breast.

Audience: Could there be another cause for depression? Because depression is genetic but personal problems aren't, now we're talking about depression, or is hospitalism a different...?

RFG: Ah, no! Hospitalism is a form... He didn't call it depression precisely because of that, because depression is genetic, he called it Hospitalism, but it can be said that it is a very early depression, in this case epigenetic, which means we can see depression from a very early age. In 1940 depression started at forty years old. In 1970 we saw depressions that start at ten years old and are genetic, they aren't from Spitz's Hospitalism, which is epigenetic, but they're genetic and appear increasingly earlier, they express earlier and earlier because the child's loneliness is increasingly bigger, the child's stress is increasingly bigger.

Imagine an isolated society where to see your friend you need to take a car... do you understand? To go to school you have to take a car, in an isolated society, it isn't the small-town-type society, which is the European society, which is our culture, where you always walked to your friend's house or some relative's house, you went on foot. As this has been lost, loneliness in human being has increased. It's said in Psychology that one of the biggest problems of human beings in big cities, above all in the United States, that are immense cities, is loneliness.

Well, that brings all kind of stress and stress complications: gastritis, arthritis, high blood pressure, metabolic syndrome, low immunity. Because of that, the great epidemics. Let alone AIDS, the great epidemics of flu, and so on, and on. Ultimately, suicidal and homicidal thought, of the lonely person. The great loners: Jeff Dahmer, Ted Bundy, they were great loners and serial killers.

Audience: As a comment, then, a society that lives in Unitary Perception, can ease that in a person who comes genetically predisposed to depression, maybe it doesn't detonate or maybe it is deferred a lot.

RFG: I would say yes, of course, I mean, why is it that since 1940 the appearance of the genetic disease known as depression begins to accelerate? Because stress increases. People my age tell me, in the United States, when they went to primary school... -I played football at recess. In the United States, children my age went to the fallout shelter. Cold War against Russia had begun, against the Soviet Union, then the seven-year-old kid who was in first grade went to the fallout shelter, he was already waiting for the Soviet atomic bomb. An entire production to sell weapons. What was I doing in Argentina? I played football. That is, an entire generation that was brought up in fear. "To the fallout shelter." What kind of education are they giving to children?

Audience: That's why the army now is so big (in the United States).

RFG: That's why it has the biggest army in the world.

Audience: I find a relation to metadepression too. One month after birth, two months after the baby is born, the baby is left in nursery because his mother works, and it's normal, as if it was normal but it isn't. A child must be in the care of his mother.

RFG: As I say, the world we've made is not suitable for children, and they get angry at me (laughter). They get angry at me, and for me it's a fact. We're in a world that isn't suitable for children, please. I don't think it's suitable for adults either, but

we manage as we can.

Do you want to have a break? Let's try to make it fifteen minutes long, does it seem good for you?

[Fifteen minute break].

RFG: What other reason do you see to understand we're hypnotized? What do you think about music as an example of hypnosis? If one goes into the supermarket, one gets crazy with the music, and leaves humming the same music that drove him crazy.

Audience: A posta, Made *a posta* [on purpose].

RFG: *A posta?* What's that?

Audience: Intentionally.

RFG: Intentionally, yes, of course. Then one leaves with the song's chorus, whether it's from the supermarket or from any place, because now music is ubiquitous, it's everywhere, one can't escape from music: in the supermarket, in travel agencies, in the shoe store, wherever.

Audience: In doctor's offices.

RFG: In doctor's offices.

Audience: No, there are TVs there (laughter).

RFG: Not yet here. Here maybe we could put a TV to play the videos if someone waited. What happens is that in the CPH patients don't wait, do they? They don't wait. The CPH functions professionally, which means it isn't made for patients to wait.

Audience: Or to despair (laughter).

RFG: Or to despair. It isn't professional to make a patient wait. The professional has to be punctual. If he isn't punctual, he isn't professional. That is, here patients don't wait.

So, forgetting the fulfilled order is also an indication that thought is hypnosis.

“Tell me, Goering, why are you a fascist?”

“Well, because I have thought it's something very good. It isn't by hypnosis.”

“You tell me why you are Muslim, Catholic, Protestant or Orthodox. Why do you belong to one of the five thousand Christian sects? Why do you belong to one of the five hundred Buddhist sects?” There will always be an explanation, because the hypnotic induction has been forgotten, then now one has to save face, as Bernheim says, and give an explanation. Why am I hypnotized?

Audience: Or to say, “Not me, I'm not a fascist.”

RFG: Of course, “I'm not what you say.”

But let's say a chorus is stuck in our head. That's a sign of hypnosis. The single fact that we're repeating a chorus and it doesn't leave us, is hypnosis. And music is the strongest form of hypnosis, the most powerful, because it's more powerful than words to hypnotize.

Audience: One doesn't listen to music with impunity.

RFG: One doesn't listen to music with impunity.

Audience: Very good phrase, and it's a fact.

RFG: It's a fact. I have the anecdote when we founded the International Academy of Sciences of RSM, Mexican Branch. We did it in Guanajuato, and the organizers from Guanajuato brought a string trio from DF [Mexico City]. I don't remember the name, do you remember, Ceci? A very good string trio.

Audience: Quartet.

RFG: Quartet, sorry, string quartet from Mexico City. Excellent. They played Bach (I say Bach because he's one of

my favorites). What I mean is they played music that one likes to hear. Suddenly they play a piece composed by the director of that string quartet from Mexico City. I felt a tremendous anguish, and after that they played Bach. I said, "What a relief, they played Bach (laughter)." Behind me, in a seat behind me there's a gentleman who tells me, "I'm the brother of the author of this piece. Would you like to talk to him?" I tell him, "By all means." Then they introduce me to him and I tell him, "Look, I felt such a big anguish when you played that piece you wrote in Bulgary."

"Yes," he tells me, "I wrote it before leaving Bulgary. I wrote it the day the woman from Bulgary with whom I had fallen in love left me. What you've just told me," he tells me, "is the highest compliment I have received in my life." Of course, because I told him I had felt the biggest anguish, which he knew how to transmit as a good artist does, in an excellent way. It was a deeply distressing song, which comes from the author's anguish.

Now, when I go out I say: "One can't listen to music with impunity," that is, without a punishment. Why? Because if I sing, "*Moon that breaks under the shadows of my loneliness,*" I can't hope to feel very happy when I finish (laughter), do you see it? Because the author's anguish passes on me. It hypnotizes me, it doesn't pass on me. The author's anguish hypnotizes me.

How much music is written with anguish? 95%. How much music is written with joy? Some of Bach's pieces. But generally, music transmits sorrow. Why? Because of hypnosis. Is this understood? That there's hypnosis, that thought is a form of hypnosis and we're hypnotized by literature, metaphysics, philosophy, belief, ideology, and nationality? Is this understood? It's obvious that we're hypnotized, that's very clear, very clear.

Now, Jeff Dahmer killed eighteen Afro-American men, he was white, homosexual, and after having sexual intercourse with eighteen Afro-American men, he kills them and eats them. He kills them and eats them. And he kept pieces of the bodies in

the freezer. He was killed in jail. An Afro-American killed him in jail, in the gym. He threw a five hundred kilogram weight on his head, that was his end. But before dying, he said he never wanted to have those sexual intercourses or to kill. Then, what kind of hypnosis did Jeff Dahmer, a white serial killer of Afro-American men have? What kind of hypnosis did he have? Is it possible he had a genetic hypnosis? A genetic hypnosis, supported by a very weak relation with the father, very weak with the mother. Just like Ted Bundy, who was an heterosexual murderer who killed more than forty beautiful young women. None of the two wanted to do that. Why did they do it? Because of hypnosis. In each one of them, hypnosis was genetic, reinforced by the stress of a childhood without affection. Distant father, distant mother.

Then, it's obvious there's hypnosis. Now, is it easy to get out of hypnosis? No. Will Unitary Perception set us free from hypnosis forever? Maybe not, but we'll have a more clear idea of what hypnosis is and we'll be less prone to hypnosis. We'll be able to act with a little bit more freedom, a little bit more freedom. That by itself would be a great advantage if, besides, that Unitary Perception gives us a profound, immediate peace. From that peace comes the sacred, from that peace comes love, compassion, a wonderful lucidity and coherence.

That is, Unitary Perception itself, although it doesn't free us completely from the hypnosis of thought, it helps, it helps to end the hypnosis.

In the case of Jeff Dahmer, now they are seeing that homosexuality is part of a genetic cluster called "obsessive-compulsive," which ranges from autism (genetic too) to homosexuality on the other end, and in the middle is *anorexia nervosa*, obsessive-compulsive disorder and gambling (playing for money). All those are obsessive-compulsive phenomena that are part of a genetic cluster with which one is born, and the person who has that problem comes genetically hypnotized. He comes genetically hypnotized.

I recommend you to read the first two chapters from *The New Paradigm in Psychology*, which is going to be very easy after

this class, and I recommend you as a homework to read the "Introduction to Unitary Perception at the University of Guadalajara." We're going to ask some questions about that homework. To read the introduction in Guadalajara, which is one of the many introductions that exist. And an introduction in Lima which is very good.

Well, who can tell me what confidentiality is?, which used to be called *professional secret*.

Audience: Confidentiality is the right the patient has regarding the therapist, that what is said in therapy won't be disclosed.

RFG: And is there any exception in the adult and in the person under age eighteen?

Audience: When what is being said causes harm in other people.

RFG: Can cause.

Audience: It can cause harm in other people.

RFG: Or in the patient himself. In that case, the therapist comes and tells the patient he is free from that confidentiality, to protect the person or the patient. In the case of the minor, tell his parents, in the case of the adult, tell the police authorities.

Well, in the United States the one who doesn't take it seriously, i.e. the therapist who doesn't do that nowadays, loses his license, he can't work anymore, because there's the *Tarasoff-Mavroudis* Law.

Let's take Yolanda. What can you tell us about transference and counter-transference?

Audience: Transference is what the patient feels for the therapist.

RFG: That's transference.

Audience: What the patient feels for the therapist. The

emotions. Counter-transference is what the therapist is going to feel for the patient, depending on, if he's attracted by or he likes him or her.

RFG: Let's suppose, Yolanda, (a real case) that a therapist tells a colleague he has fallen in love with a patient. The male therapist fell in love with his patient. By the way, he was my supervisor in the University of Pittsburgh and he told it to all his students, "I've fallen madly in love with my patient." What does that therapist have to do with that patient?

Audience: Stop being her therapist.

RFG: Of course, but he has to do one more thing: he has to refer her to another colleague. Not to abandon her. By the way, he married this patient.

Doctor Oshino, a great supervisor I had. Japanese, from a Japanese family, piloting a US plane, bombing Japan, land of his ancestors, while his parents were in a Japanese concentration camp in California. This for you to see what this man went through, who also fell in love with his patient, who was his wife later.

Who remembers the laws of Precinct C? Javier?

Audience: Dual.

RFG: Dual, which means thought, memory and "I" are dual, which means, what? Give me an example.

Audience: At first, it means that person feels divided.

RFG: Yes. The groom who is getting married tomorrow and tells his father: "Dad, I don't want to get married," and the father tells him, "Well, you can't leave that girl a day before, you can't do that." He says, "But I don't want to get married." "But you got very far, you got to the day before the marriage." So, is there duality there, also called ambivalence? Of course there is!

And he got married, and one year later he is on his own

thinking, “I want to be with her and I don't want to be with her.” Does it happen frequently?

Audience: Are you talking about me? (Laughter).

RFG: “I want to be with her and I don't want to be with her.” Is it common? Of course it's common, because thought is like that, because of that we don't have to condemn, justify or compare all this, because they're laws. Thought is dual.

Audience: “I want and I don't want.”

RFG: “I want and I don't want.” I want to be with her and I don't want to be with her.” “I want to get married and I don't want to get married.” “I want to study Medicine and I don't want to study Medicine.” How beautiful Architecture is, because you can be creative, Medicine won't allow me to be that creative, and so on and on: duality. It chases us from birth to death, because it's a law of thought. One of the laws of thought: duality.

What other law?

Audience: Cyclical.

RFG: Cyclicity, the same thought repeats itself. “Why did he talk to me like that, who does he think I am?” And now, within five minutes and within ten minutes, it repeats, it repeats. And when they see each other, the physical fight because of the couple breaking up, and so on, all caused by the duality of thought that wasn't seen, which is hypnotic because you don't see it, you have to be in Unitary Perception in order to see all that process of thought.

Duality; cyclical repetition.

Audience: Cyclicity itself is hypnosis.

RFG: Of course.

What other law? Thought, “I” and memory are 99% unconscious. That is, usually I don't know what is happening in

my memory, or in my “I”, or in my thought. I don't know.

And it's incoherent, because if you do what Freud did, record yourself in free association, you'll see there is an enormous incoherence in what you are going to say. “How is this related to that?”

So, the laws of Precinct C: duality, cyclic repetition, incoherence, unconsciousness.

Eduardo, do you remember the instruments that came out of fragmentary perception of thought to investigate the environment? The instruments or means that human thought used.

Audience: Creation of the “I.”

RFG: It creates the “I,” who feels separated from everything, “me” and “you.” It creates the “I.”

What other thing does thought invent to get in contact with the environment, which reflects its dual nature? The lens (object-image), and the scale, and the Cartesian coordinates, do you remember? They're all products of the duality of thought, which came into science as we know it.

Audience: Someone added [*from Buenos Aires*] temporality as a law of Precinct C.

RFG: As a law of Precinct C, or rather an invention of thought.

Audience: It's a product, isn't it?

RFG: Of course, thought invents time and the “I.” It invents time and the “I.” In language we have to free ourselves from egocentricity, temporality, and hypnosis, which are the fundamental elements of the language we use. In the language of Holokinetic Psychology we have to free ourselves from those three things: egocentricity, which is very emphasized in Gestalt –in Gestalt they force you to say “I,” you can't talk without saying “I.”

Temporality: “I’m going to reach Unitary Perception,” that’s a wrong expression. Hypnosis: “Sit down,” “relax,” “think positively,” is it hypnotic or isn’t it hypnotic? Any order is hypnotic. “Behave properly,” “sit straighter.” Does it sound familiar to you? (laughter) It sounds familiar. It’s what our parents have done to us. “Don’t walk with your feet pointing inwards,” my mother said, and that’s how they hypnotize us.

Now, “relax” is very used in psychotherapy. It’s hypnotic, it’s hypnotic. Unitary Perception comes with relaxation, but we never say “relax,” never. Never hypnosis, it’s rather de-hypnosis, do you remember? To go out of hypnosis.

Do you remember the four ways of defining Unitary Perception? Psychological, epistemological, neurological, and physical. I don’t know if you Lorena remember any of them.

Audience: To feel at the same time the weight of the body, that would be, the holokinetic, the psychological one!

RFG: The psychological one. To perceive.

Audience: To perceive everything perceptible right now...

RFG: What is missing? At the same time. You’re missing “at the same time.” If it isn’t at the same time, it’s sequential in time, and it stops having the character of irrelevant time. In order to be in irrelevant time, it has to be at the same time to listen, to feel the weight and to see all of the visual field. To perceive everything perceptible at the same time, that’s the psychological definition.

Epistemological definition –who remembers it?

Audience: It’s the perception in which the act of perceiving is the relevant thing and the perceived... and the subject who perceives, the subject dissolves in the act of observation.

RFG: That’s it. A perfect epistemological definition.

What other definition is there? Neurological, do you remember? Do you remember, Lénica?

Audience: Yes, the neurological one, the three ways of functioning of the brain: A, B, and C. [*The anterior brain is aware of the energy reception that is happening in the posterior brain; light, sound, gravity, etc.*].

RFG: And the definition in Physics? Karina, from the point of view of Physics. No matter how small you try to look, I see you, I see you (laughter). I'm kidding.

Definition in Physics.

Audience: It's [conscious] contact with Holokinesis. Unitary Perception.

RFG: Well, very good. And there we have the four more common definitions of Unitary Perception. And it can be defined from any human discipline.

Very well, so, the objectives. The objective of a course, Eduardo, do you remember it?

Audience: To go from Precinct C to Precinct B.

RFG: That's the objective of psychotherapy, from C to B. But, what is the objective of a course, Javier?

Audience: To learn the clear, concise, coherent and concrete language of Holokinetic Psychology, that's one, and to read the written work, to start reading the written work.

RFG: To facilitate the interest in and study of the written work. Yes.

The objective of psychotherapy? Second time I ask you.

Audience: It's to help the patient to attempt Unitary Perception and be free from conflict.

RFG: Of course, to go from C to B.

The exam. Many times they tell us: "Why do you take exams?" Do you remember why we take an exam, Jesús?

Audience: To know whether the person can properly transmit the message of what Unitary Perception is.

RFG: Good. Is it to know whether the person is in Unitary Perception?

Audience: No.

RFG: No!

Good. Back to Eduardo. Do you remember the four diagnoses which don't benefit from Unitary Perception? DSM diagnoses.

Audience: Mental retardation, schizophrenia. I don't remember the other two.

RFG: Attention deficit. ¿Javier?

Audience: Depression.

RFG: Very good. Depression...?

Audience: And bipolarity.

RFG: Depression and bipolarity, bipolarity is a form of depression, but you can call it unipolar or bipolar depression. With what qualification? Without...

Audience: Without medical treatment.

RFG: Of course. Under treatment and sleeping well, he can benefit from Unitary Perception.

Audience: Rubén, one of the clarifications that is worth doing in this question is that they don't benefit directly from therapy, but...

RFG: The patient doesn't benefit directly (as Blanca said), but Unitary Perception is going to benefit the family, who will feel peace, and the patient will feel much better with a family in peace in Unitary Perception, than in a desperate family, like the family of the child with attention deficit or the schizophrenic's family, which drives the couple into divorce, or the retarded

child, in which there's a desperate family. The family in peace will favor the patient too, in an indirect way. Is that what you meant?

Audience: Yes, thanks.

RFG: Yes, that's it. Thank you, Blanca.

[To another student] Could you tell us what was the intention or intentions to create the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual*? Whether it's the I, II, III, IV or the one that comes, V.

Audience: To make the diagnosis of mental disorders easy, with the aim of allowing non-professional people to do the diagnosis, to approach the dramatic increase of those disorders during most of the 20th century.

RFG: What does the DSM have which is actually an advantage and which is something that has been a step forward in diagnosis, Natzio?

Audience: It doesn't follow any specific discipline, it's a...

RFG: A-theoretical, without theory. What else?

Audience: Could you repeat the question?

RFG: What is the great advantage, which other diagnoses didn't have and that the DSM now has?

Audience: It's a-theoretical, and a non-professional can diagnose.

RFG: A non-professional, which can be an advantage or a disadvantage. But there's one thing that is only an advantage.

Audience: It helps to see the patient's state in the course of, for example, a year to now, one can see how the patient is.

RFG: And how does one reach that you've just said?

Audience: Diagnosis in five axes.

RFG: Diagnosis in five axes, of course. Is that what you were going to say? Diagnosis in five axes. That's one of the greatest advantages. [As an example:]

Axis I: Schizophrenia.

Axis II: No diagnosis, because it's for personality and mental retardation.

Axis III: If he doesn't have any physical problem, no diagnosis. He can have diabetes or arthritis, in that case one has to put it.

Axis IV: He has stress, how much? 5, because he has schizophrenia.

Audience: From 1 to 5.

RFG: Of course, and the schizophrenic, because of the diagnosis in I, in Axis I, we already know it's 5.

The last one (Axis V): if he has been hospitalized last year: less than 30. If he hasn't been hospitalized, no more than 40. What happens in the United States if one puts more than 40? Do you remember?

Audience: The state doesn't pay his treatment.

RFG: The state doesn't pay benefits.

When B functions, is C inactive? What do you think? No. It's at least functioning unconsciously, and it's inventing images, which is its function. C is inventing images while B functions. Now, if B notices some of those images... There are people who tell me, "You know, Rubén, when I attempt Unitary Perception, I feel heat in the left arm and suddenly yellow lights that appear at the right side of space." What happened? C is producing those images, which B notices. Because B is pure peace. When B functions, images from C are something in life. That is, if I'm in Unitary Perception and I see a yellow light floating here, that yellow light is something. But if I'm not in Unitary Perception and a yellow light appears here, that's my life, you see? That illusion is my life. That can be philosophy, it

can be music, it can be literature, it can be art, it can be philosophy, ideology, belief, nationalism, and so on. That which thought has invented is all that my life is without Unitary Perception. But if I'm in Unitary Perception and a yellow light appears here, it's one more thing within all that I'm perceiving, I'm not swept away by that yellow light, do you understand me?

It means that when Unitary Perception doesn't function, the images of thought, memory and "I," are all in life. What kind of life is that? Imaginary life, with all the personal and collective past on one's past. It's not True Life; it's imaginary life, with all my past and mankind's past. Jung already said that: collective unconscious and collective conscious.

Audience: Doctor, a comment. In relation to now, when it was mentioned that music was hypnotic...

RFG: What do you say?

Audience: Yes, Yes. I wanted to ask how it enforces that collective unconscious.

RFG: Of course, of course. Yes, it happens to me. It happened to me when I was fourteen years old, I listened for the first time to Wagner's prelude of Tristan and Isolda, and it seems I had an avalanche of images from collective unconscious. An extremely strong music and at the same time very emotional. That music can do to one what it wants, because it's a very well made music, without a doubt, and it drags you hypnotically. I'd already started with images of the collective unconscious, which I'd never had, in that Prelude of Tristan and Isolda, which was the first time I cried listening to music. I remember my mother coming in and telling me,

"What's going on with you?"

I tell her: "Just listen."

My mother left angry, and I tell her: "Why did you get angry?"

"Don't you know Wagner was a fascist?" (laughter).

Audience: Is that so?

RFG: Yes.

Audience: Not only sorrow, also war, like the national anthem, drugs, vandalism.

RFG: “The sonorous roar from the cannon.” I don't want to pick on other nations' anthems. Obviously, what are anthems? They're war songs. In Argentina: “Hear, mortals, the sacred cry: Freedom, freedom, freedom!” What does it mean? It means you'll have to pick up a gun when we tell you and you have to go to fight against the Chilean, the Uruguayan, and the Brazilian on behalf of freedom. It's always for freedom, for God, for the king, for the president, or for the country. There's always a reason to go to kill another one, and it's in the anthem, of course. If we don't believe in hypnosis after all these examples, then we don't believe in hypnosis at all.

Then, this is important: when B functions, although Unitary Perception is functioning, let's not believe C is quiet, it keeps producing images, and one has to see those images while one listens to all the sound. Those images in Unitary Perception are something else in life, but not our whole life, which is what happens when there isn't Unitary Perception; those images are our life because they're hypnosis and they drag us. They drag us to war, to division, to fear, to anger, to sorrow, to jealousy, all the things that make human life very, very difficult.

Now, I'm in India... We're going to do an exercise. You're me, you're Rubén, I go to India and give a talk in India, where I felt very important, because people knelt down before me, they touched my knees, which is something very Hindu: worship. Hindu people have... The monkey is a god, the elephant is a god. Everything is a god in India.

Then they came close to me and they knelt down. I give the talk and one of them asks me, “Why don't you talk about breathing?,” which is very important in India. All the gurus teach breathing techniques. Let's leave pranayama yoga aside, out of the different breathing techniques. If you'd been Rubén,

what would you have answered? For example Javier, what would you have answered? Why doesn't Holokinetic Psychology talk about breathing? What would you have answered?

Audience: Because the foundation of Holokinetic Psychology is in the attempt of Unitary Perception, not in something that's natural, regulated by the nervous system, as breathing is.

RFG: But they can tell you, “Yes, but breathing is part of the nervous system, how could you miss that? How could you forget that, not saying one has to feel the breathing when attempting Unitary Perception? I'm saying it with the face with which the man talked to me. “You have to feel the breathing, why did you miss the breathing?” (laughter). In India they talk that way and they move their head this way [*moves his head*]. “Why did you miss the breathing? How is it that when one attempts Unitary Perception you don't say one has to attempt breathing?” Or to try a technique.

Audience: Well, something I've read from you comes to mind, where you mention one can't be for a long time that way, aware of breathing, because it even...

Audience: It produces acidosis.

RFG: It can produce a medical problem. But, where have we put emphasis when we talk about Unitary Perception from the point of view of Physics and Psychology? Where is the emphasis, Jesús?

Audience: In the brain.

RFG: Of course, all this is a brain function. B function. The brain functions in three ways, A, B, and C. When B functions, Unitary Perception, the Hindu tells you, “Why don't you put breathing there? Did you forget?” What would you have said? It seems you don't dare to say much.

Audience: Is it perhaps because he mentions breathing as a technique? Unitary Perception is not a technique.

RFG: First thing, very good, very good answer.

Audience: It has to do with energy.

RFG: Because the emphasis has to be on energy. Perception of all the energies at the same time, that's Unitary Perception. Not the perception of breathing, which is something that occurs automatically and is produced by a product of the brain, of Precinct C. Breathing is a product of Precinct C: repetitive, sixteen per minute. Only thought, sleep and hunger are more repetitive than breathing.

Audience: And blinking.

RFG: And blinking. Taking breathing, blinking, sleep and hunger out. Repetitive, Precinct C. Being so repetitive, it isn't Precinct B, no matter how valuable it is. Now...

The emphasis is in energy. Perception of all the energy at the same time. What energy? Gravitation, forget about inventing. "Chi" energy, "Ka" energy, no! (laughter). No, don't invent energy.

Audience: Which you can't perceive.

RFG: Which you can't perceive, which are the energies they talk about in India above all, and which they have brought here. Chi energy, which they're still looking for (laughter), Ki energy and Ka energy. Now, emphasis in energy, but it isn't we're looking for it. It's in the energy of gravitation, the one that makes the dish your wife throws at you fall on your head. That is, the energy that makes everything go towards Earth's center, the energy of gravitation. You have to feel it under your buttocks at this moment, there is gravitation. It isn't an abstract thing, it isn't Chi, it's the energy one feels under one's buttocks at this moment, and the energy of sound, which is that car or whatever is passing there, at the same time I feel the weight and at the same time I feel the light, that blessed electromagnetic energy that allows me to have contact at distance with the visual field. That light that brings all the information from the universe, perceived together with the

weight and the sound. And the peace. Emphasis is in energy, not in breathing. Breathing? Bye bye baby. Why? Because it's from Precinct C, repetitive and cyclical. Breathing is a function of Precinct C, not of Precinct B, which we want to promote and teach for the sake of a united and peaceful mankind. Do you understand why we don't talk about breathing?

Neither do we say: "I'm going to achieve Unitary Perception," because that would be falling into Newton's absolute time, or "I'm going to manage Unitary Perception," as it's said in Psychology. Right? Yolanda, Lorena? "I'm going to manage this," "I'm going to manage that."

Audience: To control.

RFG: "I'm going to control." No, no, you aren't going to manage or control Unitary Perception. Sorry, sorry. That's not controlled or managed. It occurs, it occurs when you do what you have to do: to get in contact with all the energy at the same time. Simple as water.

"Doctor, when I attempt Unitary Perception, I can't stop thinking about my wife who left me. She left me for a man who is much worse than me. I'm a factory owner and he's a cyclist who is out there earning a living as a painter. My wife left me for that man. I can't stop thinking about that. I attempt Unitary Perception, I listen to the sound and the thought of killing my wife comes to me, because she left with that man." What do you tell him? "That thought of my wife leaving me for that man is with me most of the time. Sometimes I can't even listen to the sound."

Then the answer is this: If it's all about perceiving everything perceptible at the same time, then the answer is in the definition. When you have doubts, come back to the definition, because the answer is there. Psychological definition: to perceive everything perceptible at the same time. "You're perceiving sound, weight, light (the whole visual field), at the same time, at the same time. Suddenly any thought comes, "I have to buy bananas," "I have to kill the cyclist," whatever, whatever thought it may be. That thought, is it part of

everything perceptible or not?

Of course, then, how do I perceive that thought? As a part of the perceptible! As if it were one more sound, as if it were one more color, as if it were... as something else perceptible. Then I listen to the sound, I feel the weight, "that cyclist son of a..." (laughter). Sound, weight, sound, weight, sound and weight perceived honestly, profoundly, with perceptual honesty, which is the foundation of all honesty. The perceptual honesty of actually listening, not thinking about listening, actually feeling the weight, not thinking about feeling the weight, and the memory of that man [the cyclist] at the same time, that memory has less energy, it disappears and peace comes back. This will be repeated, because thought is repetitive, the cyclist will come back, then it's necessary to be constant in the attempt of Unitary Perception, very important, above all with that kind of problems, which are homicide and suicide, ultimately. Because when the "I" is working and it repeats itself, be careful, because if a thought repeats itself, there is the nucleus of the homicide and the suicide we all carry inside. Then be careful with thoughts that repeat themselves. See them in Unitary Perception.

Then, are they hearing well in Buenos Aires? Are they hearing well in Buenos Aires?

Audience: Yes, very well.

RFG: Great. Do you have any comment or question?

Audience: No, I don't think so. We were saying during the break the course is very good, the class is very good.

RFG: Great, thank you, thank you. Any comment to improve it is welcome.

And here, do we have comments, questions?

Audience: It occurred to me that the person who has AIDS, who are generally about to die and who aren't in good health, can't be taught Unitary Perception either. But the relatives benefit, don't they?

RFG: What happens with the person who has AIDS? In AIDS there's "AIDS dementia," which is memory loss, then he's a person who is unfit for Unitary Perception too, for the reasons already mentioned. Then there's a loss of all the functions. Are we going to abandon that person? No. We tell the relatives: "You're the ones who need help. Come."

It's like the child with attention deficit. Dad's version: "I don't think this kid is my son (laughter), because if he were my son, he wouldn't be as he is. I'm about to leave home, all my house can go...," you know what follows. Mother: "I'm desperate, I don't know what to do with the child, it pains me very much to see my husband, who gets more distant every day. It seems to me we're going to end up in divorce." You see the child and you can't see the child, because he's like the Holy Spirit, he's everywhere in the office (laughter). He's like this, he stands here, he stands there. Then, what do you do? "You, madam, and you, sir, need the help of Unitary Perception, you two are the ones who have to come here, and the child has to be treated with a stimulant. Don't believe in the Greek Gospel's *pharmakias*, which doesn't mean "pharmacy." Watch out. Don't be anti-medical, don't be anti-psychiatric. Treat that child, be compassionate enough to treat that child as it must be: stimulant medication until the age of fourteen.

"You two, mom and dad, don't even think about leaving this here, because you need Unitary Perception therapy, first for you to find peace, individually, and secondly, to see whether it's possible to save the marriage, and third, if you don't come to the therapy, or if you fall into any of the 32 psychotherapies which will take you to entertainment and torture, nothing else, what will happen? You'll end up divorced. Then do something for yourselves, for the child, who will see you with more peace, and discover peace, which is being in Unitary Perception. Come, because the best help you can give the child is peace, besides giving him the medicine at seven o'clock in the morning and at noon, nothing else, from six to fourteen years old. Peace." Those two parents will be able to save the marriage or not, in many cases they will, and they'll give the child what he needs: peace, peace, which only comes with

Unitary Perception.

Is there any question about this? It's a very common subject, very unfortunately because people misinterpret it, they interpret it with an anti-psychiatric attitude, anti-medic, anti-medication attitude.

Audience: It would be the same for alcoholics and drug addicts, wouldn't it?

RFG: If an alcoholic or a drug addict comes, we all agree (Lenica herself, who works as receptionist) to tell him,

“How long ago have you been without drinking?”

“Two days.”

“When you've been three months without drinking alcohol and three months without taking amphetamine,” which is in the last patient who came, who has crack, which is pressed amphetamine, crystallized, also called crystal. “After three months with no crack, that is, no crystal, no amphetamine, and no alcohol, come back. If three months don't pass, you'll be fooling yourself and we don't want to steal money from you. I could tell you, 'Come here tomorrow,' but if you come tomorrow, you won't receive any benefit from us or from anybody. You have to come here after three months of complete abstinence and with your body clean, and then you'll benefit from Unitary Perception.”

That's the truth, and we've decided to act with the truth, not with commerce, not with *profit forever*, profit, prestige, and power, no, no, no. We're going to do things right. Some day it'll be known and we'll be better than now. That's what I hope.

That's what we have to tell a person with a dual diagnosis, who has alcoholism for example, or any addiction. Not to give him therapy immediately, wait for three months until he's clean, why? Otherwise, all we tell him will fall into the addiction, it'll be one more reason to come back to alcohol or drugs. “Then three months of relief, three months of abstinence, and come back, because any thing that is made at this moment will be

stealing money from you.” We tell him, that's what I tell him, “I don't want to steal your money. Come in three months, when you're clean.”

Audience: And with autistic patients?

RFG: That's different. Another case in which mom and dad need therapy first; mom and dad, give the kid behavioral notions, in that case, behavioral notions, because behavioral Skinnerian therapy, where does it work better? In the child with mental retardation and in the autistic child. Where else? Nowhere else, because in all the other cases Unitary Perception is a thousand times better. So, there are two indications for behavioral therapy: retardation and autism. For the parents, Unitary Perception. Am I answering you?

Audience: I have a doubt about therapy. Actually, therapy is an approach to the experience of Unitary Perception through the personal problem. That is, the one who comes to a workshop (I want to expose it, maybe I'm wrong), the one who comes to a workshop, he approaches the experience or he approaches therapy because he has a problem he wants to solve, and that's why he comes, to solve a problem. Has there been anybody who's been a patient, who's come as a patient to a session, to Holokinetic therapy sessions, and has continued in his life taking Unitary Perception seriously?

RFG: I think there are a few, unfortunately not as many as we would like, but there are a few, yes, who are the ones doing well, they're the ones who are doing well. The first patient who has taken it seriously. She had a psychotic depression, the husband was ready to leave her then, and he keeps coming. The first patient we had three years ago. In September the 27th the CPH Mexicali is turning three years old, and it isn't because we haven't had problems, but as we're doing things right, we're fine.

This patient, sitting over there, tells me:

“I don't trust my husband, I don't sleep, I haven't slept in twenty years,” I haven't slept in twenty years! “and my

husband tells me he's leaving, my husband sitting here. Well, and that's all.”

“Sir,” to the husband, “and what can you tell me?”

“I don't say anything anymore” (laughter).

“Well, but your help... anything you tell us is going to help, because sometimes the patient has her own vision. Is it true she hasn't slept for twenty years?”

“Ask her, doctor, I don't want to intervene in this.”

“Madame, why do you think your husband doesn't want to intervene?”

“Because he's my enemy, that's why I punch him whenever I can.”

She was punishing him every day.

Well, then, that was in 2007. 2010: they come like two little lovebirds, they leave like two little lovebirds.

“How are you sleeping?”

“Like a saint,” the husband says. “Begging the pardon of saints” (laughter).

“I'm sleeping very well, doctor, I feel very well,” she tells me.

“But the recommendation you gave her of walking half an hour per day, she's not following it,” the husband says.

“No, but that's because she's overweight,” I tell him, “let's be patient, even if they're five minutes she walks every day, she has to walk at least thirty minutes, but begin with five minutes,” I tell her.

But she's in a better mood, more energy, she gets on better with the husband, she sleeps after twenty years without sleeping.

Audience: Her physical appearance.

RFG: Her physical appearance. She seems like another person. When she just came, it was really a pity to see her. It was a pity to see her, and now she looks fine, she looks like a lady of her age, she's in her sixties, but she looks like an attractive sixty-year-old woman, who takes care of herself. Regarding the treatment, we can't complain about how we're doing, doing things as God intended, with sincerity, Unitary Perception, the appropriate medication.

Audience: Rubén, a question, why in the cases of depression one doesn't sleep well? Is it because of the lack of energy?

RFG: That's a very good question. Well, there are three monoamines: serotonin, dopamine, noradrenaline, that stimulate the brain, and these three monoamines stimulate all the centers. Sleep has its center, which is activated by these three monoamines: serotonin, dopamine, norepinephrine [synonym for noradrenaline], and sleep doesn't work, you don't sleep if the three stimulating monoamines of that center aren't acting.

The depressed person is born with a gene that makes the enzymes or ferments that destroy monoamines too abundant. Then the genetically depressed person's ferments destroy monoamines, then there isn't stimulus for the brain or for the center of sleep. With the antidepressant, we stop the ferments that destroy monoamines. Natural monoamines in the organism act where they have to act: better sleep, more energy, more concentration, more calm.

Did I answer to you?

Audience: Yes.

You answered us.

RFG: Ah, you had that question too.

Audience: I don't know whether Natzio's question refers a little bit to a patient or to a person who has the desire to be free from a problem, could that transform into the desire to be free completely from the human condition?

RFG: Well, I talked about that. I talked about that with JK.

Audience: That's the question I meant.

RFG: The question I asked JK, because I was so tired of everything, because I left Argentina with a hundred thousand missing people. JK said, "Unitary Perception won't be taken seriously by anyone who doesn't think he's lost everything." I came devastated from Argentina, and luckily I saw him right away, recommended by Biascochea, whom I saw in Puerto Rico and so on, who'd been a childhood friend of him and he sent him a recommendation letter, Krishnamurti didn't give any more interviews, but he saw me in March the 23th 1975.

I see him and one of the first questions was this: How can one, in life, be free from human condition? He says: "The most difficult part of desire is to be free from desiring." The most difficult part of desire is to be free from desiring. "Then," I tell him, "as we're talking about desire and being free from desiring, why don't we talk about sexual desire?," which always gave me nothing but trouble, in my youth... and in my old age (laughter). Well, let's talk about sexual desire in a generic way. I tell him, "What happens with sexual desire? What should one do with sexual desire, which like every thing from Precinct C, repeats with higher or lower intensity, either daily or whenever? He tells me (I'm going to say it in English, because it has its poetry in English), "Do not express and do not repress," which means, "Do not express and do not repress." I tell him, "That's impossible, how can one do such a thing? Either I express it or I don't express it, and either I repress it or I don't repress it." "No," he tells me, "try this: do not express it and do not repress it."

So, well, I'm in an hotel in Chile giving a seminar, –I was already married to Cecilia– I was alone in the hotel and good-' sexual desire appears. It came with intensity. Then I remembered Krishnamurti. Do not express, do not repress, do not express, and do not repress. Do not express. "Do not express" means I can't call a prostitute, I can't masturbate, I can't express it, "do not express it." Now, "do not repress it." So, what do I do? I don't express it, I don't repress it. I don't

express it, very well.

Now, what do I do to not repress it? Unitary Perception: sound, weight, visual field, and I see the desire, I see the desire, I see the desire. Intense. Sound. I forgot sound, again: sound, weight, there were dogs barking in Santiago, “Arf, arf, arf,” and I was seeing desire. Sound, weight, visual field, desire, “arf, arf, arf (dogs in Santiago), arf, arf.”

That's all I remember. I fell asleep and the next morning I felt I'd go flying through the hotel window if I jumped (laughter). That is, I had such a big energy. Nowadays sometimes Cecilia tells me she sees me with energy, and it's true, there's an energy that is very big, and one says, where does this energy come from? It comes from seeing desire, not only sexual desire, for example, the desire for going downstairs to talk to Perlita, my favorite dog (I have five little dogs). I want to go downstairs to talk to Perlita. “No, I'm not going to express it and I'm not going to repress it.” I stay still. I don't talk to the little dog. Every desire, to look at it that way, without expressing it and without repressing it. Then, what happens to one's body? Stillness. You see? There's an incredible stillness of the body.

I never thought I could get to be so still as I'm now in the last year. A stillness that -I hope this is not seen by my cardiologist, because he tells me, “You have to walk one hour every day,” and I'm completely still, seeing, seeing, seeing, and, what happens? I go to bed and I wake up with such an energy at five o'clock in the morning, I approach emails, by eight o'clock I finished a part, the work I do in the computer comes in many parts, because I'm also in translation, grading assignments in DPI [*now ICHP*], and so on. I feel a tremendous energy, an energy that makes you feel you're going to fly without moving your arms. That's the ecstasy of Unitary Perception, it's the ecstasy of energy, which I wouldn't change for anything. I think what my cardiologist would say is this, “If you keep living that way (sometimes he calls me “Santa Claus”), if you keep living that way, Santa, you'll end up dead, because you aren't doing the minimum exercise.” What I answer to him is, “I want this stillness, I love this stillness, this stillness of Unitary Perception, which is pure Unitary Perception, pure energy, it's

the ecstasy of existence, I wouldn't change it for anything, I wouldn't change it for anything.”

That's why, I invite you to try it every now and then. The one who's married, well, give expression to sex. The one who isn't married, try not to express and not to repress while you listen to all sound. Not to express sexual desire and not to repress it, that is, see it in Unitary Perception, while you listen to the sound, see the desire. See what happens for yourselves, see what happens for yourselves.

When Krishnamurti tells me... –“What is Unitary Perception for?,” I tell him, “what do I have to listen for?” “Do it and see what happens,” and you'll see what happens just like me. That is, it's something not transferable because of its beauty, its energy, the tremendous peace, a stillness in which nothing in the body moves, only if there's wind and the hair moves, but nothing in the body moves.

That peace, that ecstasy, that joy for no reason, that's the essence of True Life, the essence of beautiful life. That's why I don't want to talk about anything but this, because I think it's the most important thing in life.

Regarding desire, not to express and not to repress while Unitary Perception acts. Very important, very important. At least as an alternative to expression, every now and then not to express and not to repress, see what happens. It's tremendous.

(Short pause).

I don't know whether it's related to what you wanted to say about desire. All this began when you touched desire.

Audience: And does desire stop appearing?

RFG: No, unfortunately not, but if one always sees it that way, energy increases enormously. Then energy can take sleep away from you, it's a tremendous energy, tremendous.

Audience: Regarding the other point that has been talked before, that B is pure peace. Then it's difficult to understand

that the human mind can encompass peace when there's sorrow, anger or desire at the same time. This is something difficult to understand.

RFG: I said, a pill that's hard to swallow. But it's true, it's for example what happened to me with sorrow: I left Argentina with seven “disappeared” friends, from the hundred thousand missing people there was. I left emotionally devastated and started seeing. Krishnamurti tells me, “Don't even think about escaping,” when I tell him that sorrow is killing me. I told him, “My name isn't Rubén Ernesto Feldman González, my name is Anger.” “Ah,” he tells me, “finally someone who doesn't come with the mask of a saint. Well, your sincerity will save you.” I also tell him, “I'm sorrow. I'm anger and I'm sorrow.” “Then,” he tells me, “don't even think about escaping.” The first thing he told me. I say, “From what? Escape from what?” “From that anger and from that sorrow, because don't think sorrow and anger are separated. Don't think sorrow is different from anger. Anger and sorrow are the same thing with a different name, seen from a different angle, but it's the same thing. And don't even think about escaping, that is, going to the cinema, wine, beer, sex. Don't even think about escaping from that anger and that sorrow.”

That night when I was free, I was walking through Hanford, California. I used to take two-hour walks. Now I don't walk at all, but I usually walked for two hours every night. I was walking, and suddenly I heard the crickets in the street. It was summer and the crickets, “chirp, chirp, chirp,” all those crickets. I realized what profound Unitary Perception was, and until today the sorrow that was killing me hasn't come back. I thought the sorrow I brought from Argentina was going to kill me from a heart attack. That day it disappeared, June the 21th, 1978. It disappeared.

This has to be taken seriously, because when Krishnamurti says, “Do it and see what happens,” he doesn't tell you, he didn't tell me what happens, because if he had told me, I was going to get angry with him and I was going to leave. I would've considered him a charlatan.

That's why what I'm saying is little compared to what happens. What I'm telling you is a little part of what happens. Take it seriously, take it seriously, because it can be seen in desire, it can be seen in sorrow, it can be seen in anger, but above all in sorrow and desire, to see them in Unitary Perception, see it, see it, see it. Very important, because of course, energy increases. Energy increases, you can do more things.

Yes, last year I wrote four books, besides running Internet Course [*ICHP*], besides translating twenty three books to English, I had to review them, and so on. Many things can be done, many things, with that energy.

And one can also do nothing, which is something I'm learning, which is staying completely still, enjoying the energy and the joy for no reason, of a life that has nothing of imaginary, there isn't any imagination, any blue unicorn, any blue unicorn, any product of a song, anything. It's the beauty of not imaginary True Life. Its stillness, its peace, its love, that's what keeps one with energy.

Take it seriously, this is really very important, what we're saying. It isn't a Tibetan tale.

Any question or comment?

Audience: His question... he talked about desire. I don't know if you meant the desire for searching Unitary Perception to improve some disorder, some discomfort.

Audience: Yes, for example, "my grandfather died." I feel very sad and I want someone to help me to get over that sorrow of my grandfather's death. Then, we were asking before whether that desire for solving a problem could transform into the desire for being free...

Audience: But there's still desire in that case.

RFG: Of course, it's what we said, the drama of ending the desire for desiring.

Audience: Yes, because desire is always egocentric, it's always

egocentric and it's in time, in absolute time.

Audience: The question was born from the fact that, evidently, if someone comes to a workshop or this Course, it's with the intention of understanding and taking it seriously. The question was about those who come to therapy, even though its benefits are obvious, as you have explained extraordinarily in the case of the couple who sat here, could those people understand at the same time that they aren't only being given therapy, but that this teaching goes much beyond and it can transform their lives completely? This is the question: can someone who comes to therapy transform his life in the same way as someone who comes to a Course?

RFG: Of course, because here we don't fool them. I tell them, "Look, I'm going to give you Peter's key," I learned that in Argentina from a friend who made a workshop in Cordoba, Argentina, with me. Painter father, a good Argentinian painter, from Cordoba, and his son. His son tells me, "Let's go have a coffee." He tells me, "Rubén, I think that what you said in the workshop is Peter's key." I tell him, "What? What's that of Peter's key?" He tells me, "Yes, Peter's key, it's the door to open the Paradise." I tell him, "I'm stealing that from you, I'm stealing that (laughter), I'll say it wherever I go."

I tell people, "What you're going to have is Peter's key."

It's the door to Paradise in life, in life.

I met a very beautiful priest, Raffaele Angelisanti, and he told me, he spoke Italian and he told me, "You're talking about Adamic consciousness." I say, "What's that?" "Adamic consciousness is Adan's mind that knew Paradise, it isn't like Kristic consciousness, which is the consciousness of Paradise, or human consciousness, which forgot Paradise. You're talking, Rubén, about Adamic consciousness, that is, about recovering the consciousness of Paradise, the peace, the joy for no reason." That is told to me by the second to the Pope in Jerusalem, Raffaele Angelisanti, who told me my books were written by the Holy Spirit, by the way, if truth be known. He says: "These books aren't yours, don't believe it." Like Italians,

who make jokes to break the “I.” “Are you telling me these books are yours? No, they aren't yours, they are the Holy Spirit's, you have nothing to do.” After telling me such an encouraging thing (laughter), he tells me, “You're talking about Adamic consciousness.” When he explains Adamic consciousness to me...

In the Bible there are three consciousness, Kristic, Adamic and human:

Kristic, it knows Paradise.

Adamic, it remembers Paradise because he was expelled from it.

Human, it forgot Paradise. It has no idea of what it is.

I say Kristic consciousness can be very simplistically called Precinct A, Adamic consciousness Precinct B, and human consciousness Precinct C. I think it replicates correctly that conception that Angelisanti had, who was a Catholic Franciscan priest, chief of that order that is taking care of... he was the Custodian of the Holy Sepulcher, chief of the Franciscan order that takes care of Jesus' grave in Jerusalem, he was second to the Pope. I met him in Venezuela and he tells me, “You're talking about Adamic consciousness.” Angiolini in Córdoba tells me, “You're talking about Peter's key (notice the comparisons people do), you're giving them the key for them to open Paradise door.” Of course, Adamic consciousness, to remember Paradise. That's Unitary Perception.

And that's saying little, because when saying this we're using metaphors, we aren't talking about the fact. The fact itself is peace, joy for no reason, it's communion, it's to be able to tell your wife, “I feel your shoulder hurts,” for example, and she confirms it. Things like that, the communion that is established, that you can tell somebody, “I feel you're this way,” and he tells you, “Yes, I'm that way.” A communion and a peace appears. Peace, communion, joy for no reason.

Because one is... I'm almost seventy years old, and I tell

Cecilia, “I’m already in the final path, from here I go right to death,” I tell her, “but joy for no reason and the energy don’t disappear. Communion doesn’t disappear.” It’s thanks to Unitary Perception. Am I afraid to die? Not at all. Why? I think it’s because one is living True Life, not imaginary. That is, one is completely here enjoying life, in peace, in all the possible communion. Sometimes I feel that if there isn’t communion, it’s because they’re not allowing you into communion. The one who’s understanding this and lives it will find that, when he wants to get closer, they put a wall in front of him; that’s also true. Because when one gets closer, for example, this was said to me by a girl in Argentina:

“You’re caustic. You burn.” “Caustic” means “that burns,” “holocaust” means “to burn completely.”

“You’re caustic.”

“Why?”

“Well, the things you say, for example, that we don’t have to have children.”

“No, I don’t say you don’t have to have children, I say the world isn’t suitable for children.”

“Well, that’s caustic!”

“Well, but it’s the truth as I see it. What else is caustic?”

“For example, the other day you told me I don’t want to see.” She told me, “You told me, Rubén, last time, that I don’t want to see.”

I tell her, “And I repeat it again, you don’t want to see. When you want to see, I’ll stop being caustic, because what I tell you are facts. This is a white sheet that has black letters. If that is caustic, it’s because there’s a problem in you. This is a white sheet, a white sheet, and if you get angry about it, it’s because you don’t want to see. Look to find out whether this is a white sheet or not. The only thing I ask you is to look.”

[Short pause].

Audience: I think that's precisely the difficulty of most people.

RFG: Of course, they don't want to see.

Of course, if I tell her, "you don't want to see," she takes it as an offense. I was saying what I was seeing. She was arguing something very obvious, I don't remember what it was, a very obvious thing, like the world isn't suitable for children, which to me is obvious. Somebody could differ, but to me it's very obvious. That there's a permanent war, which is a wonderful business, is obvious to me. That there's a growing misery is obvious to me, and that it's produced by a human planning of a few privileged ones, is obvious to me. And if you don't want to see it, then don't see it.

What is the solution? Only one, which is obvious for me, but not for everyone because they even get angry when I say it. There's only one solution, which is Unitary Perception. A very dear friend tells me, "Well, what about socialism?" I say, "Just Unitary Perception is enough, because you've already seen what has happened to Soviet socialism, which was bought for five dollars, and to socialism here, to socialism there, it doesn't work because there isn't Unitary Perception, because they are still with the same mentality of prestige, profit and personal and national power, which is the same." Then there can be no progress of mankind if we keep tied to those same partisan, dividing ideas. No. Either all of us are saved or none of us is saved.

Audience: Another idea that is difficult to understand is perceptual honesty, because normally *perceptual* is a term associated with a purely physical activity, which can never take you to transcend or transform the human condition. Then, to talk about perceptual honesty as the ground of honesty is difficult to understand. Could you explain it a little bit more?

RFG: Yes, it's like the story, I don't know whether I told you, about the secretary who tells me,

“Doctor, I saw you in Costco.”

“Oh, really?”

“Yes, Yes.”

“What, while I was having pizza?”

“No, no, I saw you in the aisle.”

“Really? Why didn't you say hello?”

“No, I didn't mean to bother you.”

“Good.”

“But I didn't like one thing.”

“What?”

“They way you look at girls (laughter), as if you wanted to eat them (more laughter).”

I tell her: “One moment. I don't look at girls as if I wanted to eat them. I want to eat them! I want to eat them.”

Then, I think when one comes to that level of honesty, it's beautiful. It's very funny.

Audience: And what happened with her? (laughter).

RFG: She laughed and finally didn't get angry, she found it funny. But what I want to tell you is that is a form of honesty that is funny because...

Audience: Truth sets us free.

RFG: Truth sets us free and brings grace.

But there's also an honesty which is greater than that. I think that honesty comes after perceptual honesty. First the perceptual one and then this honesty to which I referred before: I want to eat them, not “as if I wanted” to eat them. So, you're

talking honestly. Now, how does one come to that honesty? With perceptual honesty. That is, this is a piece of paper, it isn't a unicorn, do you understand what I'm trying to tell you? If you want to tell me this is a unicorn, I tell you: no, it's a piece of paper.

The same for all the tales about the "I," like: the "I" has to be handled, controlled, favored, supported, and so on and on, those are all words from the 32 previous psychologies. It's like saying the unicorn must be supported, favored. Do you understand me? The same, there isn't perceptual honesty. If you tell me, "I breathe," I have to tell you, "The organism breathes, you're a spectator at most. Don't tell me you breathe." It's a form of speaking. Don't tell me you grow, "I grow," no, no. Let's be sensible and let's have the perceptual honesty to realize that what grows isn't the "I", it's the organism, with luck, that grows, and you notice it if you're lucky.

In the same way, it seems to me that that perceptual honesty can take you to honesty. But it begins with perceptual honesty. That is, the "I" is a product of thought, the "I" doesn't think, the "I" doesn't think; there's thought and among the things thought produces is the "I", but it isn't that the "I" thinks. When I say, "I think," I have to realize I'm talking with the egocentric, hypnotic, temporal language, which isn't appropriate, but of course, we have to use it because there isn't another, but at least I realize I'm saying something silly when I say it. "I grow," "I look for personal growth," "we have to think positively." I tell them, "Well, I'm going to give you the best positive thinking there is: *everything is fine*." "Everything is fine. There's nothing, nothing that isn't fine: Bush, Iraq, Afghanistan, the misery, the crisis, everything is fine." If you keep telling me about positive thinking, then it's not possible to talk to you. You're still without perceptual honesty, you're not seeing what's happening, then you can say everything is fine, positive thinking and the whole Tibetan tale that comes later. But don't come to me with Tibetan tales, Tibetan tales aren't lucky with me. I stick to perceptual honesty: what I see, what I see. What I see is that the only way out mankind has is Unitary Perception.

(Pause).

I don't know whether you want to make a comment from Argentina.

(Pause).

Well, if you want to make a comment. If you want to end the class.

(Pause).

Is what we're saying clear? Yes, clear, concise, concrete.

Audience: That thing you said about the genetic cluster with which one is born, you mentioned five things, could you explain it a little bit better? That about autism, homosexuality.

RFG: It's a concept that is at least five years old, that the whole obsessive-compulsive cluster has the same genetic origin, and that cluster goes from autism, let's say at the left, up to homosexuality at the right, and in that field between the two hands, there can be obsession itself, compulsion itself, *anorexia nervosa* (a *misnomer*), and also gambling-ludopathy- (compulsively playing games for stakes). All those elements constitute now, in a very smart way, even for the treatment... –it seems Fluvoxamine is a good treatment, not in the case of autism, because it seems Growth Hormone is having a good effect in autism- but all these elements are elements of the obsessive-compulsive cluster, which have a similar or equal origin from the genetic point of view. I don't know if I'm answering to you.

Audience: Yes, I wanted to know that.

RFG: They've been talking about obsessive-compulsive cluster as a unity for five years now, a unity which could possibly be seen in DSM V, and which could have a common treatment, taking autism out, I insist, but it could have a common treatment, so it brings hope, for example addictions would be part of all this cluster, and it would bring hope for the symptoms of *anorexia nervosa*, for example. *Anorexia* in Greek means “lack of appetite,” something that never exists in the disease, but it's a *misnomer*, it's a wrong word. But it means

it would be a common or similar treatment for *anorexia nervosa*, homosexuality, obsession, compulsion, gambling, which is addiction to games of chance. Drug addictions and alcoholism itself could get into this cluster called obsessive-compulsive.

Audience: And the cure, you said it would be the recommended drug. It isn't a cure, but a treatment.

RFG: A useful medicine. Yes. The treatment with Fluvoxamine helps in the case of obsessions and compulsions, but I haven't seen improvement, for example, in cases of homosexuality or in some severe cases of *anorexia nervosa*. Fluvoxamine hasn't worked. Maybe not Fluvoxamine, but another product that found the common factor of all these elements could appear, and there could be a common treatment too. It's a theory, but the interesting thing is that all of these diseases that I've just mentioned have something in common: they look like obsession and compulsion.

Audience: Yes, fine, thank you.

RFG: It's necessary to put the proviso that homosexuality has disappeared from the *Diagnostic Manual* (DSM), because there was a political movement to take homosexuality out from diseases, then I don't know whether the word *homosexuality* can be used inside this cluster, but the fact that it has obsessive and compulsive elements, nobody can discuss it, can they?

I don't know whether you want us to finish. If there are no comments or questions, we can finish.

Homework: to read "Introduction to Unitary Perception at the University of Guadalajara." We're going to ask questions about it to begin.

Audience: And the first two chapters of *The New Paradigm in Psychology*.

RFG: And I also recommend you to read the first two chapters of *The New Paradigm in Psychology*. (Actualized with the name "*Holokinetic Psychology*.")

To our friends in Buenos Aires: thanks for being with us. Good luck.

Audience: Yes, thank you, everybody here is happy with how the Course is going. Really, we find it beautiful, and we're glad the reception was good.

RFG: See you next Sunday.

Audience: Chao, thank you, hug. [*From Buenos Aires*].

TOPICS - CLASS 2

- INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 2 AND REVIEW (81)
- METADEPRESSION (87)
- COMMENTS ON METADEPRESSION (91)
- WATCH OUT FOR HIDEOUTS (96)
- LET'S TALK ABOUT THE TREATMENT (97)
- QUESTIONS ABOUT DIAGNOSIS IN PSYCHIATRY (98)
- WORDS NO LONGER USED IN DIAGNOSIS (109)
- THE TRUTH SETS US FREE (118)
- FEAR OF DEATH (121)
- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRECINCT B AND A (121)
- STRESS (83) (122)
- PSYCHOSOMATIC MEDICINE (124)
- THE NARROW DOOR (130)
- QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS (134)
- REVIEW: THE M.E.T.A. PROCESS (136)
- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE HUMAN MIND AND "MIND PERIOD"(139)
- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEPRESSION AND METADEPRESSION (142)
- OTHER WORDS THAT WERE REMOVED FROM THE DSM (145)
- ROBERT STOLLER AND THE PARAPHILIAS (109) (145)
- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRECINCT C AND B (147)
- TALKING ABOUT JK AND THE WORD MEDITATION (149)
- METABOLIC SYNDROME (83) (151)

CLASS 2

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, August 1st, 2010.

RFG: Good morning. We're in the second class of the Sunday Presential Course, it's August 1st, 2010 and, as always, keeping in mind that we're in a very divided mankind and that we're presenting the solution: Unitary Perception. And if the factors that keep mankind divided, like permanent war and growing misery continue, we can still embrace Unitary Perception individually for our life to stop being imaginary and start being true life. The life of Unitary Perception is true, non-imaginary life.

The homework was to read the University Introduction at University of Guadalajara, and I think that's a good introduction.

Let's start with Eduardo. Is listening something important in the introduction of this topic -Unitary Perception?

Audience: I don't think it's more important than any other sense.

RFG: Right, it's not more relevant than any other sense, Eduardo says.

And is effort necessary in Unitary Perception?

Audience: No, it isn't.

RFG: It's not necessary.

And, what happens if there is an expectation like “with Unitary Perception, I'm going to stop doing this, or achieve That? What happens with expectation in the attempt of Unitary Perception? Is expectation of any help?

Audience: No, it's of no help.

RFG: It's of no help; it's an interference.

Audience: Counterproductive.

RFG: Yes.

Lorena, did you have time to read the Introduction?

Audience: I read the two chapters [of *The New Paradigm in Psychology*], and the Introduction.

RFG: Good, good. Good.

In the Introduction we alluded to stress in two ways. What happens in a stressed person who attempts Unitary Perception? Do you remember?

Audience: They start feeling... psychosomatic discomfort.

RFG: Right. Careful with that word “psychosomatic” in Holokinetic Psychology. We'll see why. We'll have a class about that.

There's tachycardia, there may be headache.

Audience: Dizziness.

RFG: Anyway, why? Is it because Unitary Perception causes headache or tachycardia? No! It's because the person is stressed. Not sleeping well, working too much, and when Unitary Perception is attempted, stress is denounced.

Yolanda, do you remember what the complications of stress are? When you don't take care of stress by sleeping more, getting more rest, less work. What happens to a person who stubbornly continues in stress? What are the complications of stress?

Audience: Cardiovascular problems appear, escalating up to metabolic syndrome. Right?

RFG: That's true. Do you remember what the first complication is?

Blanca?

Audience: Gastritis.

RFG: Gastritis! The first of all!

Audience: Then high blood pressure, diabetes.

RFG: High blood pressure, metabolic syndrome which can lead to diabetes, fall of immunity. And, lastly, suicidal and homicidal ideas, besides arthritis.

Well, what do we say in the introduction about silence in everyday life? Taking moments of silence in daily life?

Audience: That there should be spaces of silence in daily life.

RFG: Look for silence. Moments. Spaces and moments of silence.

Audience: Like Krishnamurti said, that there should be a room in the house that is only for silence.

RFG: Yes, he reminds us that JK said (in Brockwood) that the Brockwood school should be built with a place for silence. And there is such place, which is a beautiful place. Only to be in silence, and you can't enter that place without being in silence, and as long as you're there, you have to remain in silence.

Well, silence is very important for Unitary Perception.

Alright... Any questions, Chuy? Did you have time to read the Introduction?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Any question about that Introduction?

Audience: Hmmm..., no.

RFG: None? Do any of you have a question about the Introduction?

Well, then, we have to clarify some things, since they've asked me some questions today. *Initial assessment of the patient* means the same as *clinical history*, and the same as the so-called *patient's record* or the *patient's file*. Initial assessment is the beginning of the patient's file or record, and it is that patient's clinical history as well, the beginning of the clinical history. All those words are related. Don't get confused!

Initial assessment, clinical history, record, file, all those words referring to the patient mean more or less the same.

Yolanda, do you remember why we say thought is hypnosis? On what grounds do we say thought is hypnosis?

Audience: Because of the conditioning we carry, isn't it?

RFG: Sure. And, is there any experience or experiment that proves this?

Audience: Yes, every minute with TV commercials (laughs).

RFG: Yes.

Karina?

Audience: With Bernheim's experience.

RFG: Bernheim's experience proves it. Bernheim, a friend of Freud's, proves that thought is hypnosis with the experience that carries his name, Bernheim.

Why, Eduardo, do we say that breathing, or thinking about breathing or any breathing technique is not important during Unitary Perception?

Why do we insist on that? Do you remember?

Audience: [No response.]

RFG: Karina?

Audience: Because there has to be more emphasis on energy. You were talking about giving more emphasis to energy last class.

RFG: More emphasis on energy!

Audience: Aha, and breathing is innate, actually, and also it has the laws of conditioning, the laws of C, mental Precinct C, which are cyclicality, repetition. Therefore, the emphasis is on energy.

RFG: And, being repetitive, to what mental Precinct does breathing belong?

Audience: C.

RFG: Precinct C! It is the “A” en M.E.T.A process, right? That which is autonomic, vegetative, from the sympathetic and parasympathetic nervous system. The center of breathing, which regulates breathing, is around the carotid, in your neck. Neurons in your neck, and that is part of the unconscious Precinct C. It (breathing) repeats itself sixteen times per minute, regulated by carbon dioxide.

If we use a breathing technique, we make breathing conscious and cause a mess, because the brain knows nothing about breathing, and breathing gets completely unregulated.

That's why we insist: breathing has no importance, but that is what the gurus from Tibet, India or wherever emphasize. There's one from Korea, too.

Audience: Oh, Rubén, I forgot to mention: You were also saying that the emphasis is on energy, but without looking for it, i.e., without searching for that energy, but right now, in the attempt of Unitary Perception itself...

RFG: Sure. Without expectation. No expectation, and perceiving everything perceptible at the same time. We mean, above all, energy: to perceive gravitation, sound, light. Energy, perceived at the same time. That is the base of Unitary Perception: to perceive at the same time all the energy from

cosmos reaching the brain. And it reaches the posterior brain, as we know.

Well, I received a question from a student, he doesn't want his name to be disclosed, but I thought it was a good question to introduce the topic of metadepression.

Let's talk about metadepression.

Javier, did you have time to read the Introduction?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Good, any questions on it?

Audience: Well, not right now.

RFG: Okay. Here's the student's question:

This great, unprecedented world economic crisis will make love disappear from the whole humanity. You cannot compare the “Himalaya” of this crisis with the “bean” that the opium war was, and the complete plunder of China by England in the 19th Century.

They are saying the opium wars and the plundering of China by the English was a “bean” compared to the “Himalaya” of this current crisis.

And that the moral results of the crisis will be completely seen only in five or ten years from now.

My answer is this:

We don't need to wait five years; mankind is in the moral bankruptcy, which I call metadepression. After the deregulation of the market begins in the seventies, it gets worse, reaching its summit under president Reagan, who idolizes economic deregulation, frees the banks from not investing in the eighties, and in the beginning of the 21st century this is completed with the world's biggest fraud and biggest plunder in the

written history of humanity. Plunder, unbelievably subsidized by the government sector. This increases international electoral fraud, misery, drug traffic, the desperate, homicidal and suicidal terrorism and street crime, while suspicious indifference, racist xenophobia, the silent fear, a disdain for excellence and justice and the biggest personal irresponsibility grow in each human being. A psychological prostration in front of the impotence of doing anything against the crisis, against misery. These are the symptoms of the love that went to the market and hasn't returned. In 1950, the difference between rich and poor was of twenty-five dollars to one; today it is of three hundred dollars to one. This is sustained with permanent war and planned misery, also by drowning cities with beer. This leads to religious and moral bankruptcy, and to the lack of love. And to the few people who are perplexed with this growing horror, I talk about the only way out, which is Unitary Perception.

*[Taken from Questions from Students to RFG,
By Rubén Feldman-González.]*

You should come over, Ceci, to use this microphone.

Audience: To read?

RFG: To read “Metadepression.”

Metadepression is the name I propose to the American Psychiatric Association for a form of depression that is not genetic, and which is acquired during life: the psychological prostration that this student is already seeing clearly, that we can all see clearly, right? It's the carpenter who doesn't keep his word, it's the architect who gives you a building with no roof or with a lousy roof, it's the lawyer who gives poor advice, the physician who's not updated; a psychological prostration that you can see in every human activity, which I call metadepression. Go on.

[The reading begins]

PREPSYCHOTIC METADEPRESSION

Metadepression: A great unperceived problem

There is an unperceived individual problem occurring in a planetary society that has been decomposing for quite a while.

I call it metadepression, because it doesn't fit within the psychiatric definitions of "depression".

It involves bizarre or erratic acts and words that do not fulfill any apparent function. Also a great psychological prostration or discouragement is perceived, or an individual apathy to undertake relevant actions with the object of perceiving and curing the origin of the problem.

Problem without historical precedents

The entire humanity is living, at the start of the 21st century, a social, political and economic crisis that has no precedents in its nature or consequences.

Before anything else, we say that because of this multiple crisis, humanity and all of the mammals could disappear. This is a consequence with no precedents.

The nature of the crisis is the legacy of the "Cold War" and the disappearance of the Soviet Union.

At present, State Fascism is confronted with Terrorist Fascism to gain complete control of humanity and in that way enslave them.

This takes the emphasis off the extreme problems of stress that the individual lives in whatever part of the planet, including metadepression.

The problem: trivialized or ignored

The confrontation between the two forms of Neo-fascism (state and terrorist) causes public **national resources** not to be canalized towards social welfare, like public education, public health, public housing, public transport and roads, clean water, air and earth, early and dignified retirement from the area of work, holidays, vacations, etc.

National resources now go towards the production or buying of weapons that are used in the confrontation between “State and Terror.”

Great emphasis is put (and wasted) on secret agencies of “national security.”

The meaning of Social Welfare or “individual problems” is trivialized.

The confrontation between the two new enemies is emphasized.

And terrorism is still an undefined enemy.

Its function is to maintain the production and selling of weapons.

The consequences of this permanent confrontation on the individual is trivialized or ignored.

What is “important” is the confrontation. Its consequences are “not important.”

The individual feels impotent when faced with inflation, recession, lack of access to costly therapeutic and medical services, growing unemployment, big electoral frauds, big

banking and corporate frauds, legalized plunder, sudden family breakup and his growing isolation and loneliness.

Then discouragement, incoherence and the symptoms of something that he and society either do not know or trivialize set in: metadepression.

Depression is a genetic problem.

But Metadepression is an epigenetic (“environmental”) and unrecognized problem.

Then the loneliness, isolation and discouragement of the individual grow.

The frequency of pain grows, as does constipation, aggressiveness, irritability “for no reason,” growing vulgarity and brutality in language and the rest of human interactions.

Then stress grows and the consequences of stress:

Easy fatigability or “boredom”.

— Gastritis

— Arthritis

— High blood pressure

— Obesity and metabolic syndrome as the threshold of
Diabetes, etc

— Suicidal and homicidal thoughts.

“Difficult solutions”

Those of us who have lived Unitary Perception, as a way of life, as the basis of any action, while all of the perceptible is perceived at the same time, know what the “golden road” to individual peace is.

Without that individual peace, the confrontations between human beings will not end.

Without that peace, there cannot be a compassionate and healthy society.

[The reading ends]

RFG: Okay, any comments about Metadepression? I believe anyone with eyes can see that this is a fact, right? It's not theoretical.

Audience: Yes, I wanted to say that in these two last years, we have lived a frightening aspect of metadepression: that the myth of western democracy as a shelter for our way of living has fallen with the plundering of the states, and that plundering of the states, which has already reduced pensions in rich countries, social services and all benefits, is known by all the population, but the population turns a blind eye to it. The dramatic thing is that nobody believes in western democracies as a way of living anymore. Everybody knows there is an economic power that is plundering and destroying mankind's way of living, but they look the other way: they watch the Soccer World Cup, they keep watching political parties... then, this is like being asleep when burglars break into your house, and you pretend to be still sleeping. It is a most grave, almost terminal symptom of metadepression, right? Which has been, or is being produced through these last years.

RFG: Clearly. And metadepression complicates what begins to become visible after World War II: the possibility, for the first time in five thousand years of written history, of mankind disappearing completely, together with all mammals, in an atomic scenario, or an epidemiological scenario, or an ecological scenario -sudden glaciation caused by global warming, etc., right? There are multiple scenarios for the end of mankind, aggravated by metadepression, which does not help, because no one is doing anything, as Natzio says, and in many cases nobody can, because the conditions don't let many

people do anything, then the danger of mankind's disappearance is a fact. A fact of today that hasn't existed in the history of mankind before, in the last five thousand years. So, that's what metadepression means.

The problem is that it has no medical treatment. Meaning, you can't give an antidepressant to a person with metadepression, because it is not a genetic, metabolic problem that can be, not cured but treated, as you treat diabetes, which can't be cured either, but treated with insulin. In the same way, depression can't be cured but it is treated with an antidepressant, because both are metabolic, genetic diseases. But in the case of metadepression, there's not an easy treatment, as in those two mentioned disorders (diabetes and depression), which are typical examples for me, right? Metadepression cannot be treated with a prescription. I believe the only way in which metadepression can improve is with a complete transformation of human life. And that complete transformation of everyday human life cannot exist without Unitary Perception. Honestly, it cannot exist, that's why I believe that metadepression, which complicates and increases the possibility of mankind's disappearance—mainly due to the great irresponsibility and psychological prostration it implies, which is seen, as I said, in every human activity—has only one treatment: Unitary Perception.

Any comments about all this?

Audience: Just a comment. Curiously enough, in the Introduction to Unitary Perception at the University of Guadalajara, you also make emphasis on how we can escape, through this context of different kinds of stress (at work, in the economic crisis...), from everything that might affect us, how we can also escape.

RFG: From reality, sure. We escape constantly, Karina says, from reality as it is, which is painful, which is, as Natzio said, frightening, horrible, then we try to escape from reality, and first of all, no one speaks about reality. Nobody's talking about this! We're talking about it here. But, where do you hear people

talk about this? Nowhere. Not even in political parties. Political parties are another hideout from reality, to believe something is being done. Organized religions are another hideout from reality. Family life, when there is one, when the family hasn't been destroyed (for there to be more consumers), when family hasn't been destroyed, family itself can be a hideout from reality. Then “nothing's wrong here, nothing's wrong”, and on top of that we have movies, chats, promiscuous sex and a thousand ways of escaping from reality, right? i.e., everything we know that exists as a part of reality, and which is the escape from reality. That's what you were saying, Karina.

Audience: Yes.

Audience: Rubén, they are asking from Argentina: what percentage of the population do you believe suffers from metadepression?

RFG: Okay. The first time that we spoke about metadepression in front of an audience was in Lima, Peru. A colleague, a psychologist from Peru told me: “Rubén, Peru is psychologically prostrated,” and I tell him “And you think that's only in Peru?” -I said that to him.

He tells me: “No, but you don't know Peru.” So I tell him: “Well,”—back then I would visit Peru every two or three years, so I tell him: “I know Peru quite well, because each time I get here, I take a cab and talk with the taxi driver. I don't keep quiet, I ask the driver how things are, and he tells me the tragedy of his life. And I go to the public market, where retailers get their supplies, and I ask both wholesalers and retailers how things are; and I also ask the boy selling newspapers: how's things? Is your house well? Do you eat well? So I know, because I do that wherever I go (I've been around the world, and I do it wherever I go), and I know that's happening, metadepression is happening throughout the planet! And the economic crisis, as we all know, is happening in all the planet. I like to listen to the RAI channel, to practice my Italian, and I'm surprised to see that in a country like Italy, people are in the streets, waving red flags to express their discontent, their despair, their misery. Then, jeez, if they are

protesting in Italy, what's left for Bolivia? Do you understand? What about Nicaragua? What about Guatemala? And don't get me started on the African countries, the Asian countries. What about them? We can have an idea. Prostration is global too, just like the crisis; it's not only in Peru.

I don't know if I'm answering you. Am I?

Audience: Yes, they're saying: yes, thanks.

Audience: So, a 120% (laughter).

RFG: Yes, I believe metadepression, except for that little group of human beings, which is between 5 and 10% of humanity, who believe they're safe—they believe they are safe!—I believe that between 70 and 80% of people have some form of metadepression. And in Mexico, for example, we know there is a 40% of destitution, that is, out of a hundred million people, forty million people are in what you may call extreme poverty, right? I know that because they have good statistical reports. I wonder what's happening in Argentina, which doesn't have those statistics, how's Bolivia, how's Nicaragua, and then, if Mexico, which is in many aspects one of the most advanced countries at least in Latin America, and in many aspects more advanced than other countries in the world; if Mexico has so much poverty, we can be sure there's at least forty million meta-depressed people in Mexico only.

And making those calculations, with a strict statistical precision, that we know poverty in Mexico reaches 40%, which is forty million people, if we assume Mexicans are only a hundred million people. Even though we know it's more, closer to a hundred and ten millions, and we have to think about the Mexicans living in the US, right? Which are, supposedly, twenty million. So, there are more Mexicans than we think. And, how are the Mexicans in Arizona doing now that they passed a racist law against Mexicans there? And how will a child from Mexicali, from the Northern border of Mexico, grow up, seeing an iron wall built by the United States, more than three thousand five hundred kilometers long? And yes, it's because of terrorism, but there is a Northern border of the

United States, this is the Southern border, but there is a Northern border seven thousand kilometers long (twice as long), which has no walls. Because this is a racist wall, whether we like to recognize it or not. It's a racist wall. Then, that is the reality we are clearly living here in Mexicali, right? We only need to drive to Colon Avenue to see that Wall of Shame, as they call it. A thirty-five hundred kilometers steel wall that continues into the sea (five kilometers into the Pacific Ocean, I think). And how does that influence the child that is growing up in Mexicali? Or the child growing up in Mexico's Northern border? Or the child growing up in the North American Southern border? How does that border influence humanity?

Do we believe the permanent global war will not influence us? If it's not in Viet Nam, it's in Iraq, or Afghanistan, or Congo, or Colombia, or in the large cities, to sell drugs, women and guns. That permanent war that exists, won't it affect humanity? Doesn't it affect the children? Of course it affects them! It affects them with what I call metadepression. Less love of excellence, more irresponsibility, and students—this is what my friends who are teaching in big universities tell me, when I visit them to give conferences and seminars about Unitary Perception, the professors tell me: “Students run this place. The world is upside down.”

We also have a University professor here, who can tell us how students run the class. That the students evaluate the teacher. The world is upside-down, the teacher is no longer the one to evaluate students, now students evaluate the teacher. Then, of course, the world is upside down, and you can see the results. Education has fallen in its excellence, its quality, and is now a total mess, right? A complete disaster. And it's not that people don't see it, but there is a kind of impotence, which is what metadepression increases: the psychological prostration that makes you feel you can't do much about it. Which is not true, because we can still maintain inner peace, which is the largest contribution. The contribution of Unitary Perception that brings us to inner peace, to a great physical energy, to communion with loved ones and not loved ones; Unitary Perception is the way out, because the greatest contribution we can make as

individuals in a society which is in complete decomposition—I don't mean Mexico, I mean the entire humanity—, a planetary society in complete decomposition... what is the best contribution we can make, I (Rubén), Lorena, Javier, Eduardo, all of us present here? Unitary Perception! Because it enables us to be in peace, and with that peace we contribute more than, as some believe, with a machine gun, with a cross or a Muslim crescent. No, we will make a greater contribution to society with inner peace, which only comes with Unitary Perception.

Any comments about all this?

And watch out for the hideouts, right? In Unitary Perception you see things very clearly, and realize that organized religions are hideouts, that a *mediocrized* family can be a hideout to avoid seeing reality. That birthday parties and weddings are many times, more than celebrations, hideouts for us not to see reality. And political parties are, undoubtedly, mere hideouts to avoid seeing reality. So, we are alone, and in that alone-ness, Unitary Perception.

Any comments?

Audience: Then, an individual in peace is more valuable than peace treaty between two countries.

RFG: Of course! Well, how many peace treaties, to take an example of two poor countries (poor because they are in constant war) between Palestine, which isn't a country yet, and Israel? How many agreements so far? I think they are over twenty! And neither of those countries respect them. So, that deal about peace treaties is rather laughable, sadly, right?

Audience: A circus.

RFG: Yes. It's a circus, because, what peace agreement was there among the two Koreas? “Well, we will stay divided.” What kind of a peace agreement is that, right? Not to mention that now a sunken South Korean ship appears and nobody knows who sank it, and there is an obvious intention to renew the Korean conflict, between the two Koreas.

We can see it everywhere. We're not blind; we can see it. Then, we are alone and our contribution is Unitary Perception. Not the treaty papers, no. It's like matrimony: I think it is very adequate to have a paper that socially supports the human couple, right? Marriage, for the protection of family, for the protection of women, no doubt about it. But we also know that paper is worth nothing if love ends, if affection ends between those two people. The same is true for peace agreements and those endless speeches of the politicians that take us nowhere. In Mexico there has been electoral fraud, in the United States too, and it seems to be repeating in Africa. So those papers have lost all importance, even the voting ballots from the so-called "democracies." Our contribution is Unitary Perception, and in alone-ness is the best contribution, inner peace.

Any question or comments?

Audience: I think that if people don't know Unitary Perception, and they can see the metadepression that exists, they will only see hatred, anger, sadness, and that's no contribution, because it is metadepression too.

RFG: Right.

Audience: Then, if somebody can see it, but his contribution is to attempt Unitary Perception...

RFG: Of course, and that's what I was telling the guys at Peru, right? A group of psychologists who invited me, and I was telling them:

–When you get together, what do you talk about?

–Well, we talk, almost in tears, about the situation of Peru—and I say:

–What about the situation of Latin America? What about the world?

–Yeah, that too, that too.

–Almost in tears too?

–Yeah, almost in tears too. (Laughter)

So I tell them: “Why don't you stop talking about the diagnosis? Forget the diagnosis. The diagnosis is done! Humanity is moving towards its own disappearance, that's the diagnosis.” That's the diagnosis! And let's not fool ourselves, humanity is going right to its own suicide, its own extermination, out of its own stupidity, and religious and national divisions, and all the atrocities man has invented.

So, what is the contribution? Let's talk about the treatment, only about the treatment, when we meet! Because if we speak about the diagnosis, we will all end up crying out loud! Then, let's not talk about the diagnosis, because that will take away our energy. Let's talk about the treatment: let's talk about Unitary Perception. And live it! While we talk about Unitary Perception, what it is and what it isn't, because it's not easy, it is something very serious, it's not easy. It's a mental function that was discovered recently, from JK and David Bohm, right? Then, I have been lucky enough to be with them and discover it too, but we all have to discover it individually: what Unitary Perception is and isn't, and get together, of course. JK would say:

–Get together, get together!—and I said:

–What for? I don't like meetings.

–No, no, get together.

He insisted on the importance of getting together. I notice when there is a good meeting about Unitary Perception, what it is and is not, not to discuss the diagnosis, not to speak of the ecological or epidemiological end of humanity, or the possibility that a terrorist buys an atom bomb—no, no, no. To speak about what Unitary Perception is and is not. Because that is the way out. That's the only cure.

Any comments or questions?

So... nothing?

Yes, don't hide, don't hide in organized religions and political parties. We are alone, and let there be communion among those who are alone if we know what the exit is, so we can spread this teaching, which is the most elevated of humanity: Unitary Perception, and the only exit that mankind has.

We're taking an exam next Sunday, because the connection with Buenos Aires will start half an hour later, but we will come here always at ten, and next time, we will use those thirty minutes with no contact with Buenos Aires, or rather, before the contact with Buenos Aires, to take a short quiz of twenty-five questions. Exactly what we need, a thirty-minute wait.

But we won't waste our time, and, what will we talk about?

Chuy, what is depression? These things are important, to know a bit about diagnostics, to know when not to use Unitary Perception with a person who has a diagnosis, like a depression without treatment. How can you tell a person is depressed, Chuy?

Audience: Because he or she sleeps badly.

RFG: Because they sleep badly.

Audience: And has a bad diet.

RFG: Well, they can have a good diet.

Audience: They have low energy.

RFG: Low energy. Two things! With those two things you know if a person is depressed. Bad sleep, either too much or too little, and very little energy, unless there is a bipolar disorder, in which energy is disastrously increased.

Depression: how can you tell a person is depressed? Sleep and energy. Period.

Karina, what is the most common diagnosis in psychology?

Audience: Not following the specified treatment.

RFG: Not following the specified treatment. Why? Because doctors don't take the time to explain the patients why they need antidepressants, or why the schizophrenic needs the anti-psychotic. They don't take the time, everything's rushed. Thirty patients a day, ten minutes per patient. No time to explain to the patient "why you need this blessed antidepressant" -right?- which will take him out of that emotional misery and out of that misery of not sleeping and having no energy. Which will prevent the complications of stress: gastritis, arthritis, high blood pressure, fall of immunity, metabolic syndrome and, lastly, suicidal and homicidal ideas. Depression does not present with suicidal and homicidal ideas. You have to ask about them, but that's not important. The important things are: sleep and energy.

If a three-month-old baby is in the living room with the family while they watch TV at full blast, is that abuse? What do you say?

Audience: Of course it is.

RFG: It's abuse! To have the baby in its cradle next to the TV, *boom boom boom boom*, because that is what the baby hears. The baby will not get the meaning, he only hears *boom boom boom boom*. During hours. That is hidden abuse, hidden abuse. And it implies lack of sense in the parents, it implies metadepression in the parents, who don't care about anything.

And is it abuse to smoke when there is a child present? Of course it is abuse! If a person smokes by a child, or if a person smokes by another person who does not want to smoke, that's abuse.

Javier, a patient with depression stops taking his antidepressants. I will give you options for you to choose the most appropriate one:

I) You nag him: "That's irresponsible."

II) "See the psychiatrist who prescribed that medication you stopped taking, urgently."

III) “Please, start taking that medication again.”

IV) “Are you sleeping well?”

What is the right option? I can repeat them if you want.

Audience: *[No response.]*

RFG: This is common sense. What do you tell him? If you're the therapist, as I hope you will be one day, a teacher of Unitary Perception too, as I hope everyone here will be, I say this from my heart. The patient has stopped taking his or her pills and you have this four options. Which do you choose? I can repeat them:

I) “You're irresponsible!”

Audience: Well, not that one (laughter).

RFG: II) “See the psychiatrist who prescribed that medication you've stopped taking, urgently.”

III) “Please, start taking that medication again.”

IV) “Are you sleeping well?”

Audience: Well, I think it's either “see your psychiatrist” and “keep taking that medication.”

RFG: And which of them is more sensible? Are you a psychiatrist?

Audience: No.

RFG: Then, which one is more sensible?

Audience: Precisely, “see your...”

RFG: “See your psychiatrist! You've committed an irresponsible act against your own health. An act that is, indeed, stupid, but we are all stupid.”

Krishnamurti said, when I told him “What do you think? Can I speak about what you're speaking about?” And he tells me “*You speak.*” I tell him: “But, I have so many defects that I feel I have no right of speaking about something so sacred, so important as Unitary Perception.” Krishnamurti tells me: “What are you waiting for? To be perfect before you start teaching? (laughter) Will you wait until you're perfect? Then you will never teach, sir.” Beautiful, beautiful. Don't confuse this with what he says about the two bottles in his last conference. Careful! Don't confuse it. Don't wait until you're perfect, and, if I'm not the psychiatrist, [I tell the patient:] “Go see the psychiatrist! You did something irresponsible, you stopped taking your medication, go see your psychiatrist, because I'm not one.” It's like, I don't know, Cecilia tells me:

–The car won't start.

–Call the mechanic!

My father was awesome, he would fix the lamps that stopped working, if the lights went out, in ten minutes that was fixed. I'm not a multiple man, I don't know about mechanics. The car won't start? “Call the mechanic, Cecilia.”

If the mechanic is meta-depressed, he may not come (laughter). But... what is metadepression? That's metadepression: irresponsibility, not doing things right, not loving excellence. If you're going to make coffee, do it with excellence, if you're driving a taxi, do it with excellence, if you're a psychiatrist, get updated. Do it with all the possible excellence. Are you perfect? No, nobody is perfect, but we can all teach Unitary Perception.

So, we've seen what the most frequent diagnosis is: abandonment of the treatment, because there was no time to explain the patient, otherwise abandonment of treatment would not be so high. Although sometimes abandonment happens because medications are too expensive. Let's not forget that fact.

Eduardo, what does Bernheim's Experience show us? I'll give you four options:

- 1) That human beings have free will.
- 2) That life begins after death.
- 3) That thought is a form of hypnosis.
- 4) That hypnosis is a good form of therapy.

Audience: That thought is a form of hypnosis.

RFG: Right! Very well, Eduardo.

Well, these are simple, common sense things, which are really important for you to know. And to answer [*snapping fingers*] like this. And spread these sensible ideas with your relatives, with your friends, because people ignore these things.

Yolanda, what is the theory of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual? What is the theory?

[*Not getting an answer*] Lorena?

Audience: It's a-theoretical.

RFG: It's a-theoretical! Why? Because they don't want to compromise to any theory: psychoanalysis, behaviorism, gestalt, nothing. It is purely pragmatic, and what is called epiphenomenal. I.e., what you can see, only what you can see. And the diagnosis is made based on what you see, in such a way that a sixth-grader can diagnose.

Any questions? Have you seen the five-axis diagnosis? Okay...

Blanca, what is Axis 4 for?

Audience: It's to see the patient's stress. The person's stress.

RFG: It measures the person's stress. Do you remember with what numbers?

Audience: One to five.

RFG: One to five. It means that, if a schizophrenic comes to you, before he starts talking (and you already know he has schizophrenia), which number will you give him in Axis 4?

Audience: Five.

RFG: Five! The schizophrenic lives a life of great stress. Let alone the family, who lives a life a hundred times more stressful than the patient.

Very good. Javier, have you seen the five diagnostic axes?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: In which diagnostic axis do you place schizophrenia and depression?

Audience: The first one.

RFG: Very good!

And schizophrenia has positive and negative symptoms. Eduardo, have you read about that? Neither have you? Have you? Have you seen it?

Audience: Me? Positive and negative symptoms.

RFG: Of schizophrenia.

Audience: Aha; abulia, alogia and blunted affect.

RFG: And that is...

Audience: Negative signs.

RFG: Negative! Abulia: too little will to do things. Alogia: they speak too little.

Audience: They express too little.

RFG: They express too little, and blunted affect: they have no emotional expression. Example: “My mom died” [*with a straight face.*] No emotional expression.

What about the positive signs of schizophrenia?

Audience: Incoherence...

RFG: That's the most important one. Incoherence.

Audience: Incoherence, auditory and visual hallucinations...

RFG: Above all...? More auditory than visual or more visual than auditory?

Audience: No, auditory.

RFG: More auditory than visual! Insults: “moron”, “idiot”. And the voice drives the patient to despair.

And third? Incoherence, hallucinations...

Audience: Delusions.

RFG: Delusions! Ideas that just won't change. And those ideas can be: “I see faces in tree leaves”, or “my neighbor's dog wants to eat me” or “my body is rotting”, or the most absurd things.

Or “everything is fine” (laughter). I think that's a form of pre-schizophrenia.

Well, then, a clinical history, an assessment, do you remember what we said? Clinical history and assessment of the patient are synonyms, they will be part of the patient's record or file. What should be take into account for a good clinical history? Personal data: name, phone, email, address, presented problem, history of the problem, the patient's life history, medical history, development, diseases he's had, hospitalizations, military admissions, e.g. if he served in the army, if he went to war, which is no longer something uncommon, and also

everything related to history; and after that comes the diagnosis in five axes.

— Axis 1: schizophrenia, depression, [etc.]

— Axis 2: mental retardation and personality problems

— Axis 3: diabetes, arthritis, i.e., medical diseases.

— Axis 4: How stressed is this person? From one to five.

If he is schizophrenic: five. If he's just divorced: five. Just moved from Spain: five (laughter).

Audience: Just married: five (laughter).

Audience: ...thousand.

RFG: If he just got married, which can be a beautiful thing... at first (laughter): five.

Audience: The first week (laughter).

RFG: No, marriage can be a blessing. It has been for me with Cecilia, and I hope it will be for you. In Unitary Perception marriage can be a blessing. And when you get married, how much stress is that? Five! Good things too, like getting a job: five. Losing your job? Five points of stress.

Audience: Rubén, what is the relevance, in clinical history, of knowing if the patient was in the army?

RFG: No, you simply need to know the patient's history. Imagine this - as a young man from El Salvador who had been diagnosed in El Centro [California]. In El Centro there's a... kind of small concentration camp for Cuban exiles, and among them, for some reason, was a man from El Salvador, and he had been diagnosed with schizophrenia (by a physician, not a psychiatrist). And I tell him:

—Can I speak to the doctor before speaking to the patient?

—No, he's very busy, he comes once a week.

—Okay, I will speak to the patient.

So I come in and say:

—Do you speak Spanish? [*with an Argentinian accent*]

—Yes—

They speak a bit like Argentinians in El Salvador, you know, stressing the last syllables.

—Do you speak Spanish?

—Yes—he says—: Are you from El Salvador?

I tell him:

—No, I'm from Argentina. They say you have schizophrenia. Tell me, why do you think they might be saying that?

—I don't know, I don't know.

After talking to him for a while and realizing he was quite a coherent boy, I ask him:

—They're saying you're a schizophrenic. Why do you think they are saying that? You tell me.

—I don't know. Maybe it's because I told them what happened with my girlfriend.

—Well, tell me what happened with your girlfriend.

—I opened the door and found my girlfriend's head right there, on the threshold of my house.

—Ah, you told the doctor that?

—Yes.

—Now I see why they thought you were a schizophrenic, because the doctor must've thought “That cannot happen in the

world.” Nowhere in this planet can that happen, that they place the head of a man's girlfriend at his door.

It can happen in El Salvador! It *can* happen in El Salvador.

Audience: In Tijuana too.

RFG: Yes.

Blanca, are you ready?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: A sixteen-year old man steals and gets caught by the police and arrested. Which of the following diagnoses is incompatible with him? That's all you know about the patient. He stole something, got arrested. There's one of these three diagnoses I can't give him. Tell me which of these three I can't give him:

I) Schizophrenia;

II) Depression;

III) Antisocial personality.

Audience: Antisocial personality.

RFG: Why?

Audience: Because he's underage.

RFG: Under...?

Audience: Eighteen.

RFG: Under age eighteen. Before age eighteen you cannot diagnose personality

Very good. But, could he be a schizophrenic? Yes, and he stole. Or depressed? Yes, and he stole.

Audience: Is it a Mexican criterion?

RFG: What's that?

Audience: Is that a Mexican criterion?

RFG: No, this one is from DSM. It's world-wide.

Okay, there are words no longer used in diagnosis, like *psychopath*, which is no longer used. Now we use *antisocial*. But people think “antisocial” is a person who avoids other people. No, antisocials are not those who avoid people, but those who lack a moral conscience, who abuse people, who steal, who deceive. Then, antisocial is not one who avoids people; it's the one who steals, who breaks the social rules.

Then, the word to use is not *psychopath*, but *antisocial*.

The word *neurosis*, which Freud used so much, is not used. Why? Because the Diagnostic Manual is not meant to be theoretical, and psychoanalysis is a theory. So the word *neurosis* was removed; the word *sociopath* was removed; the word *organic* was removed because, if we say a problem like depression is organic because the patient had a heart attack, we would be suggesting there are non-organic depressions, and if depression is genetic and metabolic, it's also organic, therefore the word *organic* is not used. The words *Major Depression* are used, and we already know it is genetic and metabolic, and therefore a disease of the whole organism.

Psychogenic is not used for the same reason. Psychogenic Depression, is that produced by a psychological problem? Well, better call it metadepression, not depression, because depression is genetic. *Psychogenic* is no longer used, *organic* and *neurosis* are no longer used, *sociopath* is not used (but antisocial), and perversions, like exhibitionism, frotteurism, voyeurism, are no longer called *perversions* but *paraphilias*.

Robert Stoller (I recommend you to read him) in his book called *Perversions*, defends the word perversions, arguing that *paraphilia* in Greek means “something at the side of love,” and Robert Stoller says: “Perversions come because the child has grown with the hatred of the mother against the father, that's

why perversions exist.” That’s what Stoller says. “Therefore, let’s not call perversions *paraphilias*, as if they were related to love. No, perversions are forms of hatred, because the child grew with the hatred of the mother against the father.” And that’s what Stoller, Robert Stoller says, a great teacher... I had the luck of attending many of his classes at the University of California, Los Angeles—Robert Stoller, I recommend his book *Perversions*- says: “They are not forms of love, but forms of hatred.” Therefore *paraphilia* is not a good word, but that’s the word they use in the Diagnostic Manual.

A woman of age forty-five says she attempted suicide at age nineteen. Where do I put this information?

- 1) personal data;
- 2) presented problem;
- 3) personal history;
- 4) five axes diagnosis;
- 5) treatment plan.

Who wants to answer?

Audience: Personal history.

RFG: Personal history! Of course, it’s not the diagnosis or the presented problem. She said she wanted to commit suicide at nineteen, and she says so at the age of forty-five. Not a diagnosis, it goes to personal history.

Chuy, if I ask somebody about their energy, what am I trying to diagnose?

Psychosis, schizophrenia, depression, or mental retardation?

Audience: Depression.

RFG: Very good!

Blanca? What case won’t benefit from Unitary Perception?

- 1) depression without treatment with antidepressants;
- 2) sexual obsession;
- 3) chronic anxiety;
- 4) bereavement over divorce.

Audience: Depression without treatment.

RFG: Very good! It's the only one among these things that won't benefit from Unitary Perception. Mental retardation, attention deficit without treatment, depression without treatment and schizophrenia don't benefit.

The treatment of a drug addict begins...? Karina, do you want to answer?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: The treatment of a drug addict begins with:

- 1) Unitary Perception;
- 2) quitting illegal drugs;
- 3) dietary treatment.

Audience: Two. Quit drugs and everything you're consuming, for three months.

RFG: Here in the CPH we have two or three patients with that problem, which is sadly very common, and we tell them: "When you've been clean for three months, come back. For any medical treatment, if you're, say, depressed, you won't be clean in less than three months. Be clean of the drug that can affect the treatment prescribed by the psychiatrist.

A depressed person:

- 1) presents insomnia and fatigue;
- 2) has lost a loved one;

3) wants to commit suicide.

Audience: The first one.

RFG: That is...

Audience: That is, he hasn't slept well.

RFG: Presents insomnia and fatigue. Very good! Answer one.

Well, then... We were... Eduardo?

In Holokinetic Psychotherapy it is necessary:

- 1) for people to go from C to B;
- 2) to reveal the unconscious memories of the patient;
- 3) to think positive;
- 4) for the patient to speak to an empty chair.

Audience: To go from C to B.

RFG: Go from C to B. None of the other.

The patient says... Javier: "I smoke marijuana, I drink a six-pack of beer a day and I do meth daily." Where in the patient assessment do you place this information? "I smoke marijuana, I drink a six-pack of beer a day and I do meth daily." Where does this go?

- a) Personal details;
- b) Personal history;
- c) Diagnosis;
- d) Treatment plan;
- e) In b, c and d, i.e., Personal history, diagnosis and treatment plan.

"I smoke marijuana, I drink a sixpack of beers and consume amphetamines every day." Where in the patient's assessment do you place that information? I insist. In details, in history, in diagnosis or in treatment plan; or in history, diagnosis and treatment plan -in all three of them?

Audience: In diagnosis.

RFG: In diagnosis, sure. Would you put it in history? Is it important for the patient's history?

Audience: Yes, of course, because... we don't know for how long he used it.

RFG: And is it important to have a treatment plan for that?

Audience: Of course.

RFG: Sure, then, where would you place that information?

Audience: In personal history, in treatment and in diagnosis.

RFG: Very good.

The depressed patient stops taking his antidepressants:

- 1) you scold him;
- 2) you send him urgently to the psychiatrist;
- 3) you tell him to return to the medication; or
- 4) you ask him if he's sleeping well.

Audience: You take him to the psychiatrist urgently.

RFG: You tell him to go [to the psychiatrist]! Because, of course, all treatments have to be voluntary. It cannot be by force. It's a law. Yes, it's terrible for a psychiatrist who's working in a hospital (as I have been, as a resident), to see someone who looks like... may God forgive me, like a mad dog, that's to say, biting, punching, screaming. If he doesn't restrain himself, he might cause a lot of harm to himself and

others. And if a person arrives in that extreme state of agitation, generally caused by amphetamines or heavy doses of cocaine, then they came in that terrible state of hostility, great danger to themselves and others, and the law says you cannot treat that person if they don't want to be treated.

—"We can give you a sedative. Do you want us to give you a sedative?" (laughter)

—"F... you!" (laughter)

So even the law has its own little holes!

Audience: I want to comment on that, which is dramatic for the families of schizophrenics, because when there is a crisis, of course the person needs to be taken to a psychiatric hospital, and they won't take them in, you have to take them home, they run out, they come back and it's a terrible mess.

RFG: That's why I said, patient with schizophrenia: five points of stress, and the family: fifty-five points of stress. Terrible!

Neither can they be treated unwillingly. How do you convince a schizophrenic in the middle of a psychotic episode, to take his medication? It is an ordeal for the psychiatrist and the family! All because of a senseless law. There should be a sensible law with exceptions.

Javier, it is not convenient to begin psychotherapy:

- 1) if the patient says he doesn't need it;
- 2) if the patient is a psychologist;
- 3) if the patient is not sleeping well; or
- 4) if the patient is taking medications.

Audience: If the patient isn't sleeping well.

RFG: Very good! Why?

Audience: Because energy is required to attempt Unitary Perception.

RFG: Very good, very good Javier.

And these things are common sense, as you see, but it's very important that you know them from the beginning, before moving on.

A lady of age twenty-five, who was always healthy, is saying her neighbor's big dog is going to eat her, and that she sees human faces on the tree leaves.

I repeat: a twenty-five-year-old lady is saying her neighbor's big dog is going to eat her, and that she sees human faces on tree leaves.

- 1) the therapist begins quickly with Unitary Perception;
- 2) the therapist hospitalizes the lady;
- 3) the therapist sends her to see a psychiatrist;
- 4) the therapist recommends *ginkgo biloba* and *Saint John's wort* (laughter).

Audience: The therapist sends her to see a psychiatrist.

RFG: The therapist sends her to see a psychiatrist. Of course! Only psychiatrists can handle that, because they have three, four or five years of training, seeing people like that.

And finally, Chuy, the length of each session:

- 1) should be indefinite (it may last for an hour, or four, or five);
- 2) shouldn't last for more than three hours;
- 3) the patient decides when to end it (it could be after five minutes, ten minutes, three hours, four hours); and
- 4) should be of forty-five minutes.

Audience: Forty-five minutes.

RFG: Very well, why? Why does it have to be forty-five minutes and not what the patient wants, or three hours, or ten minutes? Why?

Audience: The physician is the one to manage time.

RFG: Sure. Why? Because then the therapist, or the psychiatrist, or the psychologist can then have a schedule and see Mary at eight, Peter at nine, John at ten. He can see eight patients in a day, do you understand me? O'clock! Without making them wait. Because in those fifteen minutes, he has time to catch some peace, go to the bathroom, drink a glass of water, you follow me? Then, it's not insane to have forty-five minute sessions. It's professional, as it should be.

Any question or comment about all this? Do you agree, Yolanda, with all this? I meant Lorena.

Audience: Yes, it's okay. The same is true for both psychiatric and a psychological consultation, right?

RFG: The same, because, if you have a schedule with eight patients, —yes.

What were you saying?

Audience: If you can repeat what Lorena said.

RFG: That it is as important for the psychiatrist as for the psychologist, or for any professional, to have each session last forty-five minutes, in order to have those free fifteen minutes, which are for the professional to use personally, as he or she wants. He may need to use the bathroom, or go have a glass of water, or just be, sensibly, at peace for fifteen minutes, to see the next patient as it must be seen: in peace. To give them peace. How can I give peace to a patient if I'm not in peace?

Audience: Yes. I have a question.

RFG: Let's start with Blanca.

Audience: In the question of “Someone who consumes marijuana, drinks six beers a day and consumes amphetamines.” I noticed that you place that in personal history, diagnosis and treatment. In diagnosis, is the question in axis III? In which axis is this diagnosed, III?

RFG: No, in I, because that's substance abuse. Goes to axis I.

Audience: Isn't it drug addiction?

RFG: Well, you have to ask him. He tells you that, and to know whether it's addiction, you have to ask him: “amphetamine, every day?” You can already call that addiction, but not yet regarding the use of marijuana and six -I think- beers, it's an excess, an abuse. If it's addiction, if it's alcoholism, well, if that's not alcoholism, it's already on its way to it.

Well, I'm sorry, Natzio!

Audience: In diagnosis, we have seen it in relation to Holokinetic Psychotherapy, but let's suppose you're giving a seminar in a city you don't know, where people have registered before you got there, and there are twenty people in the room, among them two cases, a person who seems, judging from the questions he's making, maybe schizophrenic, and you're probably hurting him when you teach him Unitary Perception, which he won't be able to reach.

RFG: Ah, no! Truth sets us free!

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: What Natzio suggests—I don't know if you'd finished but...

Audience: No, I wanted to add a second case. That we find an antisocial attending a three-day workshop in there, and he'll be boycotting [*the workshop*], and he's there maybe because he likes a girl who's there, attending too, so, what to do in that case?

RFG: Or he's been paid by a religious organization to sabotage the class! It's happened to me, in Caracas.

The schizophrenic needs to be told:

—“You're schizophrenic.”

—“Well, then, can't I begin with Unitary Perception?”

—“You will only lose time with Unitary Perception. If you want to get deceived by me, you're in no luck, because I'm not telling you anything but the truth.”

And that earns you a little confidence from the patient, if the patient knows you're telling him the truth, especially the schizophrenic, who has such a hard time trusting people, because there is paranoia. He sees “moors with knives” (that's a Spanish saying, right?), i.e. he sees *enemies* everywhere, then it's difficult for him to trust others. If you tell him the truth right from the start, he will trust you more, although it's not easy for a schizophrenic to trust people, ever. If you tell him “You won't benefit from Unitary Perception; what you need is just an anti-psychotic medication. For how long? Let me tell you right now, so you know it until you die: that anti-psychotic medication is from now until your death. And now you're most likely to feel hostility toward me. Why? Because I told you the truth. You can go somewhere else and they will tell you some lie, but in this place we will only give you the truth.”

And it usually works. If you take the time, not the ten minutes they give you at the social security, where physicians are forced to see thirty patients, and they only have five or ten minutes for each patient. If you have the time, the forty-five minutes, you use them to tell that patient why he or she needs the treatment, that it is a genetic disease, a metabolic disease, which needs treatment for life just like diabetes, that he's not an exception, the diabetic must also take his medicine for life, that the diabetic doesn't cry but rather thanks God and the physician for having insulin. And I tell the schizophrenic patient who's come: “And I beg you—just like the diabetic—to thank God and humanity for having something that will bring relief to

your life, and make your life more normal. Thank God, don't get mad at life or God. Thank god for the existence of the treatment,” and so on. The treatment doesn't cure the disease; the schizophrenic must know this.

And with the person who's only there to cause trouble, or to show off, or because he's an agent of an institution and was paid to make trouble, all of which has happened to me, then I had to ask the audience: “You decide if you want to waste your time with these questions, which are not genuine, which don't come from the heart but from the brain, and which have nothing to do with the topic. You decide what we will do with this person.” Generally, they tell him “Go away”. People who are really interested, if there are some, will say “No, ignore this person, or have him leave.” You ask the audience for support.

Or what happened in Caracas, when they had told me they rented Room B of the Ateneo de Caracas, on the second floor, for two hundred people, and we were starting at ten in the morning. It was 9:45 and there was no one in there, and I said... This was in Venezuela, in the times I used to give free conferences. Room B of the Ateneo de Caracas would get full, with two hundred people sitting and more people standing, and I said “How come? Fifteen minutes to go and no one's here?” So I went down to the first floor, walked out to the sidewalk and I see people, from an institution I won't name, dressed in their notorious uniforms, telling everyone who came:

—“Are you coming to Dr. RFG's conference?”

—“Yes.”

—“It was canceled because he died of cancer.”

And I saw these individuals, -from a very well known international religious organization!- saying this? So I think “Good gracious, this X institution has sure degenerated.” Then I get close to one of them and say:

—“I would like to attend Dr. RFG's conference” —I say to one of those who were scaring people away, and he says.

—“No, he has died of cancer!”

—“Is that so? How is that possible if that person is standing right in front of you?” —I tell him. “He's standing in front of you. I'm Doctor Feldman González!”

—“Hey, guys!” —They all ran away.

This was in Caracas, 1981. Done by a religious institution! Of course, when you say “If you want true religion, leave all organized religions,” you will get things like this. But it is important to tell the truth. Truth sets us free. And I tell the people who want the sacred, as I want it from the bottom of my heart, “Leave organized religion, leave that little political party, stay in psychological alone-ness, stay in the unknown. You know nothing, you have no direction, and then, if God has mercy, the sacred will come to you. In the same way—I say this in the name of Jesus Christ—that came to me, it will come to you, because it is a law. If you do things like God commands, and God commands that alone-ness, being alone in front of God, no intermediaries, the law is inexorably fulfilled. The sacred comes to you.” And that's a phrase from JK, which I sent by email not long ago.

Audience: I have a question, Rubén, because I remember you once said that David Bohm was constantly attempting Unitary Perception, but he wasn't enlightened because he was afraid of death. Is there any difference...?

RFG: He said “I wasn't enlightened because of one only thing: because I'm afraid of dying.” And he said that to me. And we spoke with JK, and I tell him:

—“Why don't you speak?” The three of us were there, and I tell David: “David, tell him, tell Krishnamurti you're afraid of dying.”

—“Well, I'm afraid of dying,” David Bohm said.

Krishnamurti says: “For God's sake, Sir!” And that was the conversation when he confesses to Krishnamurti that he was afraid of dying: Krishnamurti saying “For God's sake, Sir!”, like saying “you haven't understood a thing.” But it was between friends, between people who loved each other deeply, who could tell each other things with that sincerity, and with that emotional dismay of Krishnamurti about David being afraid of death. So that's what he was up to—that hideout—fear of death, which is the same hideout as all escapes from reality, political parties, organized religion, and so on, the hideout of fear of death, or rage against the Mexican, or rage against the American; the sacred will not enter those hideouts. That's why Krishnamurti tells him: “For God's sake, Sir!”

Audience: The fear of anything...

RFG: Fear!

Audience: The question was: what is the difference between attempting to live constantly in Unitary Perception and living in Precinct A?

RFG: Sure, ideally, the brain should function in ABC. But Precinct A comes suddenly, you can't look for it, it comes without expectation. I think Jesus Christ said it comes “Like a thief comes in the night.” No, no, that you have to be like a thief in the night, that is, attentive, in Unitary Perception, for That to come, Jesus said. But I think the sacred also comes “like a thief in the night.” Unexpectedly! You're not waiting for it to happen. And the first time it happened in my life, I was in an airport, in Frankfurt, and it lasted not more than ten minutes, maybe less than ten minutes, but my life changed forever. It happened in Frankfurt while I was waiting for a Lufthansa flight to Buenos Aires via Cape Town, and when I arrive in Buenos Aires, I tell my wife (you know the story) “I'm going to speak about this until death!” And she tells me “The vultures are going to eat us”, and shortly after she left home. Out of fear of being eaten by the vultures. And after that, I've never earned more money in my life, with my profession, so those are all unjustified fears, which make people fear the sacred, fear living in peace, fear living without hideouts, with no organized

religion, no political parties, no Tibetan tales, no metaphysics, no philosophy, in that alone-ness, but in Unitary Perception, where there is no escape. That is the way! Yes.

Am I answering you?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: I don't know if you have any question or comment from Buenos Aires.

We still have ten minutes before our fifteen minute break, after which we will return for the second half of the class.

Audience: No questions from Buenos Aires.

Then, if you want, we can speak a little about Robert Stoller, whom I mentioned before, about psychosomatic medicine, transpersonal psychology, a bit about Skinner, Freud and Pavlov. And, write this down now, homework for the next class will be... We will have a thirty-five question exam to give time to Buenos Aires to connect half an hour later, at half past ten, and the assignment would be about sleep, Chapter 4 of the book *The New Paradigm in Psychology [today called Holokinetic Psychology]*, and the META Process, which is in Chapter 2 of that book, *The New Paradigm in Psychology*, and we will also do, before anything, the exam, and then review those topics.

What is the importance of stress? Why do we give so much importance to stress? Is it because it is the most common disease of our time? Yes! It's the most common disease of our time! There is no one without stress. Life is stressful, but the life of the current human being is much more stressful. First of all, salt consumption. The primitive man's salt intake, according of analysis of the frozen mummies found in frozen mountains—bodies that are almost five hundred thousand years, and were analyzed for salt, and they consumed no more than 300mg of salt per day. We eat between 4000 and 5000mg of salt per day, i.e., four or five grams of salt, which is a full tablespoon of salt, each day. So that's one source of stress for

the body, salt consumption. Normal salt intake: three hundred milligrams per day, from the primitive man. Today: five thousand milligrams (five grams), a full tablespoon of salt per day. That alone is stress, but not only diet, which can stress the body, which is not the natural primitive diet, but also the stress of work life, unemployment, permanent war, growing misery. All that is a lot of stress that mankind had never lived with before. And the word stress comes from a Canadian genius called Hans Selye, who came up with the concept of stress. Why is the concept of stress important? Because for the first time a disease, stress—which is a disorder of the *hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis*, in which there is too much ACTH hormone from the hypophysis and too much cortisol is being released by the adrenal gland, adrenaline. As if the human being was ready to fight or run away, and that's stress, but there is no reason to run away and no fight, there's no tiger, nobody, but still one is in stress. You have to put up with a sadistic boss: you're in stress (ready for fight or flight), and all those substances, adrenaline, cortisol, etc., are in your blood, increasing heart activity, etc., wearing out the body. That is stress. What Selye says, which makes him a genius and a revolution in medicine, is that a single disease can be caused by many different causes, and it's the first time that was said. That a disease can be caused by many causes! We'd always believed Tuberculosis had to be caused by Koch's bacillus. Excuse me, you need much more than Koch's bacillus for there to be tuberculosis. How do we know? Because 98% of people has Koch's bacillus, but much less than, I think, 10% of mankind suffers from tuberculosis. It means you need more causes than Koch's bacillus to get tuberculosis. But we also know that thanks to Selye, who says stress is a disease caused by many causes: excessive cold, excessive heat (Mexicali is a very stressing city in summer, because the temperature reaches 50° C, and you can see that people are a bit more irritable in summer, that's common!). Excessive cold, excessive heat, all those are causes of stress; blows, traumas, excess of work, lack of sleep, radiation—there's 6 to 10% of radiation in the water (the water we all drink!). The water we drink has 6 to 10% radiation from contamination, and that's a fact and a big source of stress for the organism. Then, cold, excessive heat, fatigue,

excess of work, lack of sleep, radiations, infections (a cold, a flu), -that's a lot of stress- traumas, blows. All those causes produce a single disease: Stress! Which is the *hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis* working, too much ACTH (adrenocorticotrophic hormone) stimulating the adrenal, and the adrenal releases substances to prepare the organism for fight or flight: adrenaline, cortisol, which augment heart activity to be able to run, augments pressure to run, etc., but if you don't run, you have stress, which is the disease that leads first to gastritis, then to arthritis, then to high blood pressure, everything we've mentioned, fall of immunity and then metabolic syndrome, the threshold of diabetes, and even to suicidal and homicidal ideas, and I wanted to say this about stress because it's important. It is a revolution that Hans Selye, Canadian physician, has said that a disease (stress), the most common one in our times, is produced by many causes.

And when we come back, we will speak a little about some theoretical errors in medicine that, luckily, haven't had such a big influence, like Selye with stress, but had some influence. For example, psychosomatic medicine, and so on, and we will see why they are wrong, why they are errors in the history of medicine.

Any questions before the fifteen-minute break?

[*Fifteen minute break*]

We start with the second part of Class 2, Sunday, August 1, 2010.

Okay, Psychosomatic Medicine. It was a very important event, back in 1945-50. A book by Flanders Dunbar [1902-1959] with that name appears: *Psychosomatic Medicine*, and it brings an enormous hope to medicine, and everybody thought it was something as important as Selye's Stress, a revolution about many causes bringing about the same disease, and psychosomatic medicine was basically telling us that if we worry a lot, we will have a bad digestion, and so on, but it goes much further than that, and that was precisely its problem: psychosomatic medicine went too far. With no scientific basis,

they started speaking in a way that continues today, without scientific basis, about emotions being able to produce diseases, for example, sadness can cause diabetes. Just an example, right? I might be wrong in the associations I'm making now, but I'm just speaking about the principle which they talked about: that an angry person might get liver cancer, and things like that. And all this was never proven, not even from the statistical viewpoint. Right? *[addressing a physician in the audience]*

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Sadly, because we were all hoping that this psychosomatic medicine would take us very far, but as it didn't have a scientific basis and was mainly based on wishful thinking, i.e., those things we would like to be true but aren't, like that Japanese doctrine about water crystalizing in a different way, and with Jorge [a Psychologist] we did an experiment and we saw it wasn't true. So it is a case of "wishful thinking," meaning: a wonderful theory that sadly isn't true. On the other hand, we now have the basis of Holokinesis, then now we can say that mind and body are two words to refer to the same thing. Now medicine is truly psychosomatic because mind and body are two sides of the same coin. But now we know that scientifically, thanks to Holokinesis, from the psychosocial point of view, and we know it from every aspect of the mind: psychosocial, molecular, energetic and quantum, and without a doubt in the implicate order, which is only inferable. So, psychosomatic medicine was "a big contribution", with many expectations, but a disappointing one because it was not scientifically based. That is, what was the basic claim of psychosomatic medicine? That diseases had existential arguments, i.e., that things that happen in our existence can cause certain diseases. An attractive theory, that's why everyone was drawn to it. Already in high school, I was interested in studying medicine and reading books on psychosomatic medicine. We all had our hopes up, especially teenagers and young people, and it ended up being a disappointment.

Audience: Then that came after Selye?

RFG: Yes. Of course, the medical corps was getting encouraged to say extraordinary things, like “existential arguments can produce diseases.” And it's not true. It's not true. In general, most of the great diseases are genetic. Stress complicates into gastritis? Of course! That's something mathematical. Is it psychosomatic? Well, mind and body are the two sides of the same coin, they are the same thing. If there is stress, there will be gastritis, we know all the consequences of stress.

Audience: Dosage makes the poison.

RFG: Very good! Eighty-one milligrams of aspirin to prevent an infarction is not the same as twenty-eight hundred milligrams of aspirin. That would be poison already.

Audience: So it's better not to use the word *psychosomatic*, so it doesn't get connected with...

RFG: No! Better not to use it! Why? Because it was a failed hope. It was a failed hope from Flanders Dunbar, another exceptional person who had a beautiful idea which wasn't real. It's like the idea about water having beautiful crystals when you say nice things to the water, or ugly crystals if you say ugly things to it, but it's not true, we've done it with Jorge and we've seen it's not true.

Audience: Brain hemispheres...

RFG: Yes, that the left hemisphere does this and the right hemisphere does that... that was a reaction of Bronstein against Karl Pribram. It was a personal problem. It is better to divide the brain—if we're going to divide the brain, it is more useful to divide it in anterior and posterior than in right and left. Although it has a certain sense to divide it in right and left because there are diseases like agnosia, which is related to the division of the brain in left and right, but those are rare diseases. And that has nothing to do with what Bronstein says about what the left brain is and what the right brain is. That the right one is for art and the left one is for the mathematical

intellect, and it's not true! Because to paint a picture or to make a mathematical calculation, you need to use your whole brain.

Audience: Then, to avoid using *psychosomatic*, we can just say *body-mind*.

RFG: Body-mind. Body and mind are two aspects of one reality. It's like saying fear, anger and sadness are different names for the same thing, which is the “T” activity in the META process. “Fear, anger and sadness,” that's the *T* of the META process.

And before the class, we were saying it is important to recognize that, when we say *thought* and *META process*, the *A* (autonomic) is an anglicism that represents the activity of the autonomous nervous system. We say *autonomic* to distinguish it from the *autonomous functions of the ego* (from Freud and his followers), and that function which is sympathetic, parasympathetic, etc., directs the activity of all the organs, the heart, lungs, intestines, bladder, sex. All that is ruled by the autonomous nervous system which is vegetative, unconscious. All that is unconscious. And that is part of thought, part of the META process. Let's not forget that! So, we're not talking about psychosomatic medicine; we're saying that thought is a process in which there is a memory (*M*), or an *eidetos* (idea, ideology, image), or an emotion —*timos* (fear-anger-sadness)—, inexorably there will be an *A*. Together with *M*, *E* and *T*, there will also be an *A*, which can be tachycardia, which can be tachypnea, which can be... there will always be a vegetative, visceral component with the activity of thought. Is this psychosomatic medicine? No! It's a vision of the mind-body from a very different viewpoint, which has a scientific basis psychosomatic medicine never had. This has to be very clear.

Any question or comment about this?

Audience: Then, Precinct B has also a substrate, I mean, for Precinct B to take place, the physiological aspects of Precinct C have to be functioning.

RFG: They are functioning! They are functioning...

Essentially, the heart doesn't stop because we're in Unitary Perception, that means, the "A" aspect of the META process, the vegetative, autonomic, visceral process, doesn't stop when we are in Unitary Perception. Why? Because B encompasses C. C does not encompass B, that is, if I think about Unitary Perception, I might not be in Unitary Perception. To be in Unitary Perception it is necessary for thought to be encompassed by Unitary Perception, not that we're thinking about Unitary Perception. That is, there is a big difference between thinking about listening and listening. To think about feeling your body is very different from feeling the weight. Very different!

And then, thanks to Selye, we discover that arterial hypertension has many causes. Many! It might be because of the thyroids (excess of thyroid activity), problems in the heart itself, excess of salt, excess of cocaine or amphetamines. Arterial hypertension has many causes too. Now they are saying that Diabetes, aside from being genetic, can have many genes or many causes. And many varieties, central or peripheral, and so on. Central in the pancreas, or peripheral in the cellular receptors.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Thyrotoxicosis, which is a thyroid disease. Many causes, many causes.

Then, all of this is against psychosomatic medicine, which assigned certain "existential dramas" as origins of specific illnesses. It's not like that. Sadly, because it sounded really nice, and it would have been beautiful if it was like that, to ease the treatment of diseases. But it's not true.

Transpersonal psychology. I've seen, to my amazement, that diseases are still seen as punishments. The Bible itself says, in the Book of Job, that Job had a series of diseases and calamities, I think his wife leaves him and he gets ill. Then,

I'm amazed to see that illnesses are seen in transpersonal psychology as a punishment for mistakes one has made.

It's curious to see there's people who smoke through their entire life and live up to a hundred and two years. For instance, George Burns. Who was George Burns? A comic actor, who spent his life making people laugh, and laughing. He lived one hundred and two years. One hundred and two years!

Now, that means —I'm an enemy of the habit of tobacco, of the use of tobacco to smoke, it's something absurd. But, isn't it curious that this man, who smoked his entire life, lived for one hundred and two years? What we're saying is: there are several factors for a person to live long. And despite having smoked, he lived one hundred and two years. I wonder: how long would he had lived if he hadn't smoked? He would have lived a hundred and ten years.

A lady in England has recently died at age one hundred and forty, who also lived her life in a very “light” way, they say she was a light person, and we're going to see that with more and more frequency: with better medicine, people will live longer.

Then, a disease is not a punishment, that's in the Bible, in the Book of Job, when Jesus heals the daughter of a centurion -I think he was Roman, i.e., he does not make a difference with Romans. Romans were the enemy, the imperialists occupying his land which is Palestine, and what does he say? “I'm going to heal that girl too, even if she's the daughter of an enemy, a Roman.”

Okay, don't forget to read Chapter 4 of The New Paradigm in Psychology about sleep, which is, I think, one of the most fascinating things I've written, and Chapter 2 about the META process, so you can ask questions in the next class.

Regarding sleep, I had the fortune of being in San Francisco with William Dement and in San Diego with Laverne Johnson, which are the two greatest sleep investigators in the USA. They said it is necessary to sleep between eight and nine hours a day. Last night I was grading assignments from the DPI [now called

ICHP], it was around eleven PM, and, just as I was about to close the laptop, I get an email from Noe with an article from La Jornada newspaper: “Big discovery about sleep: five or seven hours of sleep are enough”, then I send that to everyone, you will get that with the title “Supporters of slavery pay for research” (laughter).

Audience: Between inverted commas.

RFG: The “research” between inverted commas, because, of course it is convenient for slave owners to say you need to sleep less than nine hours.

But I, thanks to William Dement, a genius of sleep research, and to Laverne Johnson in San Diego, having been with them, I know it is much better to sleep eight or nine hours than sleeping less. It is true that sleeping more is not convenient. Sleeping more won't kill anyone, but what does happen is that your life phases out if you sleep more than nine hours, family life phases out and that's not convenient at all; but at least eight or nine hours of sleep are necessary. And that's been denied, as in that last article that came out in La Jornada. I say that's the “research,” between inverted commas, that the slave owners pay.

Any question or comment?

Once, I wrote this:

Unitary Perception is the narrow door to paradise. It is not a narrow door, it is the narrow door to the earthly paradise! Unitary Perception gives us that peace and that energy that is perceived as paradise.

The “key of Peter” which we talked about last class. And that's why they call it the narrow door, why? It's a saying from Jesus: “Narrow is the road that leads to God, and wide the road that leads to destruction.” Then I chose that saying of Jesus, I stole it from him (laughter), to say that Unitary Perception is the narrow door, because it brings the greatest blessings. I know

because I've lived it and if you haven't lived it yet, you will know too, if you're serious about Unitary Perception. And I'm not talking about anything that's for a few people, I'm saying this is for anyone who takes it seriously, and it's the narrow door, yes sir! Because it has a sacred nature, it undoubtedly has!

The expert who works for political, educational, social and economic changes without Unitary Perception will only bring about more pain and more division on Earth.

[Taken from Rubén Feldman González's book "Beyond Silence"]

No matter how good his intentions are

Audience: It won't go further than legislation, it's the most he can do.

RFG: It's still a product of the human brain, and therefore, fragmentary.

And Unitary Perception, is it a product of the human brain? No! Why not? It is a function, but not a product *of thought*—I'm sorry, that's what I meant to say, it is a brain function but not a product of *thought*. Why isn't it a product of thought? Because listening is not a product of thought, is it? Feeling the weight, is that a product of thought? No! To see all the visual field, is that a product of thought? No! And if we do those three things at the same time: light, gravitation, sound, at the same time: peace! Is that peace a product of thought, of the pacifist? No! It's true, non-imaginary peace! It doesn't come from the imagination of the pacifist, or from the imagination of the fascist or the communist, or the PRI or the PAN, you see?

To go from C to B, and where is the emphasis? Is it in breathing? No! It's in energy. Perceive all the energy from the cosmos at the same time. Gravitation, light, sound.

The word *reality* keeps philosophers very busy, but in Holokinetic Psychology, we say there are two ways in which the word reality can be interpreted:

1. The reality that thought imagines (the unicorn), and
2. The reality that's not imagined by thought. This phone, or this piece of paper!

Then, non-imaginary reality and imaginary reality.

That's the way of seeing reality from the viewpoint of Holokinetic Psychology. The unicorn is an imaginary reality, right? It's not a non-imaginary reality, and what about the "I"? Is it an imaginary or a non-imaginary reality? Of course it is an imaginary reality, a product of thought, a cluster of attributes that the "I" has, in order to give continuity to memory. It has a function that memory created for necessary reasons.

That's to say, in Precinct B, in Unitary Perception, we are in contact with reality (the reality of these glasses, the non-imaginary reality, this phone, this class). We're not in contact with the reality of the unicorn or the "I." That's why we say in Unitary Perception the "I" is not present. Because the "I" is an imaginary reality, simple as water!

In English, David Bohm would amuse himself when saying the words "thing" and "thought." He said "Now, let's make a thought experiment (as Einstein did). Let's say *thing* is a verb. Then, *thought* is the past participle of that verb, i.e., thought is the past participle of reality." Anyway, that's an idiomatic way of presenting this, which is much simpler in English. But we're simply saying this: that Superman is from imaginary life, and true life is the human being.

And we say Unitary Perception is not achieved, managed or controlled. Why not? Because to achieve, manage and control Unitary Perception is something imaginary. It's not possible!

And to see thought in Unitary Perception, what's that? Well, Alba is here, I hope she can hear me now. Alba was afraid of flying. She's listening, from her house in Buenos Aires. And Alba was afraid of flying. One day I go to Buenos Aires and she tells me:

— “Rubén.”

— “What?”

— “I lost my fear of flying.”

— “How?”

— “Unitary Perception, of course.”

So, seeing thought in Unitary Perception frees us from the products of thought: fear, anger and sadness. For instance, Alba, who I hope can hear us now, lost her fear of flying.

I believe Blanca and Karina, and anyone who came to the Saturday meetings and know Cristina Gutierrez, a teacher, what does Cristina tell us? “My whole career as a teacher changed with Unitary Perception. My class put itself in order only with my being in Unitary Perception, in silence. When I saw the class had become a mess, I just stayed silent, while I listened and felt the weight, and saw the disaster, and that attitude, or rather, that Unitary Perception, made the children silent and ordered in few seconds.”

Well, then, of course we've seen many things today, and I hope it's not too much. It's not too much, is it? They are things which are necessary to understand Unitary Perception well, because we need to go very deep into Unitary Perception. In Dublin (in a workshop) I said that Unitary Perception is like tuning into an FM radio station. If you want to listen to FM 100, the 100 station, it cannot be 101 or 99, because the sound won't come out clear in 99 or 101. It has to be 100! FM 100. If you want to listen to FM 100, look for FM 100! Well, Unitary Perception is like that, it has many subtleties that can make it 99 or 101 instead of 100. What we want in a Course like this is to clearly show which are the 99s and the 101s, so we can have a clear

idea of what Unitary Perception is, and the clearer that understanding, the easier it will be for us to enter Unitary Perception and the more beautiful, peaceful and in communion will one's life be. And more energetic! More regenerative! I wonder... Cecilia had two cancers, and she's alive, thank God, and I wonder: is that a bit because of Unitary Perception? And is it that Enrique Rodriguez, also from Mexicali (I name people we can see and touch) got cured of his cancer because of Unitary Perception? He is here in Mexicali. His testimony [*subtitled*] is in our website www.unitaryperception.org How many other examples are there? I got cured of arthritis—because I had taken my career in medicine in a compulsive way: as a pediatrician I didn't sleep, I worked in a city of one thousand people, in Argentina, called Villada, in the Santa Fe province, and I didn't sleep, sometimes I didn't even eat, or I ate very late, at midnight. Of course, I can't say I didn't eat well, I ate very well, but I mean my life back then was not properly ordered, which brought me high blood pressure, that is genetic, and which also brought me metabolic syndrome, and it's important to take care of all that. And I think that prolonged lack of sleep brought that enormous stress and the consequences I'm paying now.

Well, then, any question or comment?

Audience: Is arterial hypertension genetic?

RFG: It's genetic. Although it's true that some substances raise arterial pressure, like cocaine, amphetamines, coffee a bit, tea a little bit, but what happens with coffee and tea? They are diuretic. So they raise arterial pressure by, say, “a point” and then, since they are diuretic, they lower it by “two points,” so coffee and tea are, in the end, good for arterial pressure. Even if they do raise arterial pressure a bit.

Audience: So you have to take them for life?

RFG: Yes.

Audience: Because once diagnosed, hypertension is like diabetes...

RFG: Yes, I notice that, if I take (as I do take) two hours for complete stillness and the second silence of Unitary Perception emerges—we will later see that is the deepest Unitary Perception—and I'm still, still. I'm in love with stillness, as I've already said, perhaps it's bad for my body, but I have that love for stillness, and if I'm in that quietude in Unitary Perception, I measure my blood pressure: 120/65 or 120/70. Textbook! That's to say, a normal pressure.

Audience: Textbook.

RFG: It's a typical normal pressure form a medicine textbook! Normal pressure. 120/75. My pressure when I've spent two hours in Unitary Perception.

So it also depends on the things we do. And I believe Unitary Perception, even for a person like me, who has arterial hypertension, is good. It's not healing, but it's good.

Audience: Rubén, when you say “I spend two hours in Unitary Perception,” I think we should correct that, because I see what you're trying to say, I guess, is that when you don't have a concrete activity to do, which requires that Precinct C also to...

RFG: When I'm done with the ICHP, when I'm done with emails, when I've finished doing everything I have to do...

Audience: Can you repeat for them? Can you repeat what Ceci said for Buenos Aires?

RFG: What did you say?

Audience: Only that you said “when I spend two hours in Unitary Perception.” Unitary Perception is a way of living, really, maybe correcting what could be interpreted from that...

RFG: No, of course, of course! It's not a two-hour technique. No! Unitary Perception is a way of living, and you can be doing the things you do in Unitary Perception. What I want to say is that, when there is complete tranquility, when you're without any direction—“I have to finish this, I have to do that”— and you're in Unitary Perception, in which you have to

live, simply because it is the normal thing to do, not because it's an obligation, then the arterial hypertension I suffer (because of my genes) gets better. It gets better. Yes, and the arthritis I suffered, of which Cecilia is a witness; she saw me lie on the floor without moving for fifteen days. On the floor because that was the only place where my waist wouldn't hurt so much, because even my bed was painful. Cecilia saw the latter part of my arthritis. One day I say to her: "When was the last time you saw me lying on the floor?" She said: "Three years ago," so, you don't notice anything when you're fine. You only notice when you're unwell, and it means that, until today, it hasn't returned [arthritis], although I have two broken ribs and sequels from that problem, I can't sleep in a bed, and so on, arthritis hasn't returned, and there are reasons for arthritis to return, but it hasn't. Does that mean that a complication of stress can be cured by Unitary Perception? As an example, Rubén, as an example, Enrique Rodriguez, etc., and many other examples. I wonder if Cecilia's case, freed from two cancers, has to do with Unitary Perception or not. I wonder, it's not a claim! I wonder.

And I think that living a simple life, religious in the original sense of the word, a Kristic sense (with a *K*), of living a religious, simple life, may contribute or not to the healing. I think it does, or I want to believe it does.

There are many things we could review, of everything we've said, but I'm not sure if a dialogue is better to go deeper into what has been said. Is it clear that thought is also visceral activity? It's clear, right? Thought, which is the META process, is not separate from visceral activity. Which is not psychosomatic medicine; it's only that thought is not separate from that *A*, which is visceral activity. And when we say *mom*, if we have a heart rate counter, we will observe tachycardia, and if a Spanish says *Spain*, heart activity will go up; if a Mexican says *Mexico*, heart activity will go up, or if a Muslim says *Mohammad*, heart activity will go up. There are overvalued words in a culture, an individual, which are obviously related to visceral activity, and the mere word modifies visceral activity, and it's important to take that into

account. Thought is not separate from visceral activity. In META, the A is visceral activity, autonomic activity, vegetative activity, sympathetic-parasympathetic activity. That was an important thing mentioned today.

We've said that breathing is not important, and we know well why. Because it is something unconscious from Precinct C, because the unconscious exists in Precinct C but not in B. Precinct B, Unitary Perception, is only conscious, but in Precinct C, 99% of things are unconscious, including visceral activity and breathing. And if we, with a breathing technique, want to take breathing to consciousness, then we're causing harm.

Audience: But if we're in Unitary Perception, the heartbeats, homeostasis continues, then there is an unconscious activity that goes on, even if Unitary Perception is completely conscious, but...

RFG: The unconscious goes on!

Audience: The unconscious goes on.

RFG: Of course! So the heart won't stop, digestion won't stop, nothing will stop. The whole brain functioning goes on, and I believe that, if there is Unitary Perception, brain functions go on even better, and the whole organism functions better, that's why I think healing happens, and the person's energy grows. And do relationships improve? I think it does, communion with people grows.

Audience: Communion begins!

RFG: Communion with people begins! Yes. For instance, in a married couple, a man and a woman who set out to live in Unitary Perception, ah! Communion might be her saying "You smell bad, it's time to take a shower." That's part of communion, good thing we have that! (Laughter). Or, part of communion is a caress, in intimacy, beauty, but communion is not enough, there has to be that conspiracy to live in communion, to live in Unitary Perception. If my friend who is

on his last legs tells me: “No, Rubén, don't come to me with anything,” he's dooming himself to an awful life, because he doesn't want Unitary Perception. And that, sadly, happens quite frequently. Communion tells you “Get out of there!” and the person tells you “No, leave me alone.” You can see that a lot in married couples, between friends. You have a relative you love and want to get him out of the hole—or help him, sorry, you can't take anyone out of the hole—help him get out of the hole by his own means, and they don't want to! That doesn't mean there isn't communion from your part, but the other part of communion is lacking.

And we've seen mind has to be redefined. If time changes, the word mind has to be redefined. It's not longer just “mind: the capacity to think”, no! Or “human being: the animal that talks,” no!

Audience: “That thinks.”

RFG: “The animal that thinks.” Those are ultra-fragmentary definitions. The mind, in Holokinetic Psychology, is defined again, with all the scientific and existential basis, in this way: mind is the consequence of the interaction, if you want, the contingency of the interaction between the organism and the environment from the uterus until death. The consequence of the interaction between the organism and its environment from the uterus until death (Precinct C). But that's not all; Precinct B is not defined yet. Besides what we said, which is all that psychology has studied, mind is also Unitary Perception, (conscious!) contact with Holokinesis. That peace, that energy that comes with Unitary Perception is the contact with Holokinesis.

Any question about *mind* according to Holokinetic Psychology?

Audience: In another one you said: the reflection...

Audience: ...the reflection of the basic organization of the universe.

Audience: Right, yes, the reflection of the basic organization of the universe.

RFG: Sure, of Holokinesis! The reflection of Holokinesis. Yes, sure.

Audience: Is there a difference between the human mind and the mind, period?

RFG: Well, sure, with that we could even enter the realm of philosophy. There's people who study animals, one great example is this German man who studies ducklings, Lorenz, a great example of a very observant person. And he speaks about a basic duckling behavior determined by the activity of the mother duck, that the duckling will walk in a certain way because he follows the mother duck, after hatching, after leaving the egg, and that receives the name of *patterning* [imprinting/impronta], if I'm not mistaken. Konrad Lorenz. So there are fascinating things in Psychology. Now...

Audience: *Imprinting.*

RFG: That the baby duck will behave in a certain way from very early thanks to its mom, who walks in a certain way, behaves a certain way. So, that is part of a very consensual behaviorism, i.e., which can be seen by everyone, but....

Audience: Difference between human mind and “mind, period.”

RFG: Difference between human mind and “mind, period.” Well, Konrad Lorenz, if you want, talks to us about the little duck's mind. And the question is: does that also happen in the human mind? An unanswered question. But it's answered in Holokinetic Psychology if we know that thought is hypnosis. And in the human being, thought, any thought, is hypnosis. We already said that there's a good hypnosis in the Ten Commandments, rules of conduct for civilization to move without conflict and for people to live a bit happier, without too many problems: personal problems, interpersonal, emotional, international problems, etc.

Now, “don't steal and don't kill” should be enough for there not to be wars, right? Two of the Ten Commandments would suffice. We wouldn't even need the Ten Commandments; “don't steal and don't kill” would be enough. Let's say that's a good hypnosis, but if thought is hypnosis, what Konrad Lorenz says is relatively secondary, not because it is unimportant, but because it is also part of hypnosis in the human being. If that was the case for human beings too, then it's also part of hypnosis, by the mere fact of knowing, thanks to Bernheim, a friend of Freud's, that thought is hypnosis! Which he proves. And I can say “I'm this, I'm that,” but I have to recognize I am (this or that) because of hypnosis. “I'm Argentinian,” “I'm Spanish,” that's how we were hypnotized! In Spain, they won't hypnotize you about being Argentinian, that's crazy. And they won't hypnotize me in Argentina about being Spanish. So I say “I'm Argentinian,” and I even feel proud of being so, and that's hypnosis. If you look at it, you see it's hypnosis. Now, is this difficult to see, if this a pill that is hard to swallow and digest? Yes, it's hard. But we have to see if it's true, to investigate it. Because if we discover thought is hypnosis, our freedom grows. Because, imagine you're listening to an overvalued product of thought, called a *bolero*: “*Moon that breaks above the darkness of my loneliness,*” then you're sad. You already know why you're sad: because you've been listening to the *bolero*. You were hypnotized by the *bolero*, or by the *tango*, or by the folk song, or by anything that hypnotized you, a rap, etc. And if we don't recognize that activity that is hypnosis, we'll be more prone to psychological slavery. Is this clear? The more we understand thought is hypnosis, and that products of thought are products of hypnosis and they hypnotize... Music is really powerful to hypnotize, that's why it seems there have always been, as least since the beginning of written history, dances and songs before going to fights, first. It was the way of being hypnotized, first anger, with dance, with the song, and then going out to kill or be killed. Hypnosis? Hypnosis!

Then, going back to Konrad Lorenz, who is really an author worthy of considering and reading, even if this was true in the human mind, about ducklings.

Audience: That was the one who talked about *imprinting*, following...

RFG: That's it! I said *patterning*, I'm sorry.

Audience: That the duckling took the first thing it saw as a mother, and would follow it.

RFG: I used the word *patterning*. It's the word *imprinting*. I'm sorry.

Audience: *Impronta*.

RFG: Imprinting, yes. It must be *impronta* in Spanish, I learned this in English. Imprinting or *impronta*.

He used the word imprinting, which is the first act of hypnosis that happens to the little duckling (laughter), we'll say it according to Holokinetic Psychology. And does it happen with us? We don't know. That's Natzio's question. Is the mind always mind, or is it something in the duckling and something else in the human being? Well, even if they were the same, we know something of great value: that thought is hypnosis. And if imprinting exists in the human being, which is very controversial because it might not exist in the human being... I have the tendency to believe it doesn't exist in the human being, thank heavens, but there are other hypnoses in the human being. Let's say, the day you were born, they had already given you a name: Rubén. And it turns out Rubén isn't Rubén; they have a good look at him, and it turns out he has a big clitoris and a vagina, he's an hermaphrodite, so we should call him *Rubena*; there are legal problems of all kinds with the fact that you have to be given a name when you're born. Then there is homosexuality, which is a genetic thing, etc. "My name is Ernest, but I'd like to be called Ernestine", you know, everyday common things. Just identity, which is the first thing. The first day they give you a name, now you have a legal identity, controversial in many cases, from the legal viewpoint, from the genetic viewpoint, etc. And after that, they "inject" you with, you know, mass, *puja* in India, whatever it is Muslims do, another injection of hypnosis: belief. And Saint

Paul says “It is more important to wake up than to believe.” This is from the Christian New Testament, not from Rubén! This is from the Christian New Testament, I think it's Romans 13, chapter 13 of Romans. “It is more important to wake up than to believe.” This was said two thousand years ago! By a Christian! And don't try to say this in an organized church, because they will burn you. And it's from Paul, it's a quote from Paul! “It is more important to wake up than to believe,” from Romans 13, I think, so, they inject us with every kind of hypnosis, and divisions; you don't look at a Muslim the same way, if you're white, you don't look at black people the same way, division after division after division, which have taken us, where? To a horror! Which is the current human life, which could be beautiful but isn't, because there is a permanent war and a growing misery that has no justification whatsoever. It has no sense and no compassion.

Then, we've discussed metadepression, I think it's obviously a fact. Not a theory from Rubén; it is something existent that we will see every day. We see it when we call our carpenter, Mr. Piñuelas, who comes two hours late, if he comes. Sometimes he doesn't even show up.

Audience: There's a question about metadepression from Buenos Aires.

RFG: Yes, what's your question?

Audience: Hello Rubén, it's Graciela.

RFG: Hello Graciela!

Audience: I wanted to ask you what would the differential diagnosis be between depression and metadepression, since the treatment for one and the other would be completely different. One would have to include antidepressants and the other wouldn't.

RFG: Right! Exactly.

Audience: And they have similar symptoms.

RFG: Yes, but a person with metadepression, which isn't a genetic disease, doesn't feature bad sleep, that's why the first question I ask is: how do you sleep?

Audience: Nevertheless, in my office I see a great deal of patients with metadepression who have sleep disorders, who take tranquilizers permanently...

RFG: No; what happens, Graciela, is that you're seeing genetically depressed patients, and in Argentina, as far as I know, depression has risen to 30% after a hundred thousand "disappeared" people, and the whole history of Argentina; we have the greatest number, in Argentina, of depressed people, in the world. And this is not difficult to understand when looking at Argentine history. We're seeing depressed people, we're seeing people with genetic depression who need antidepressants, and we don't want to give them antidepressants. I think that's the real story.

Audience: Then metadepression doesn't include sleep disorder. That would be the difference.

RFG: That would be the sign, yes, that it is an irresponsible person, someone who's not interested in excellence.

Audience: Thank you very much!

RFG: On the contrary. Do you have another...?

Audience: But Rubén, if the lack of sleep is due to stress, how do you tell the difference?

RFG: Well, but in that case you ask, right? I ask:

— "How do you sleep?"

— "Sometimes well, sometimes not."

— "Okay, talk to me about the times you don't sleep well."

— "Sometimes I go to bed but I can't fall asleep."

— "Tell me..."

It also depends of the person's age. A twenty-year-old guy tells you:

— “Sometimes I can't sleep” —And I ask him:

— “Does that happen when you go to a club?”

— “Yes.” —Meaning a night club, *antro* in Mexico, *boliche* in Argentina.

Of course, he returns from there overexcited, he can't sleep. But that's not depression, it's due to a circumstance: going to the night club -why? Because he's twenty. But if you have a forty-five-year-old man telling you:

— “Well, sometimes I sleep well and sometimes I don't.”

— “Okay, tell me about the times you don't.”

— “It takes two hours for me to fall asleep.”

— “And do you wake up?”

— “Yes, to urinate.”

— “How many times?”

— “Two or three times.”

— “Do you have prostate problems?” —Dun-dun-dun (laughter).

At age forty-five, if you go to the bathroom several times, you have to suspect you have a prostate that needs to be removed. Removed.

We're talking about depression *in an simplified way*, of course, for everyone to get an idea of what depression is. And that sleep and energy are the fundamental features. But in the subtleties of anamnesis in the medical office, you need to have a psychiatric training of three to five years; I had five years of internship. And all these subtleties or subtle questions have to be asked, and many physicians don't ask them! The first

question I make is about sleep, its nature, duration, etc. I don't know if I'm answering you, Graciela.

Audience: Yes, yes, thank you very much.

RFG: On the contrary. Any other question in Buenos Aires?

Audience: No, not right now, thanks Rubén.

RFG: Well.

Neurosis disappears from the *Diagnostic Manual [DSM]*. The psychoanalysts are eating their hearts out because the word *neurosis* is fundamental in psychoanalysis. And there is a very interesting psychoanalyst, I don't remember her name right now... she was a friend of Erich Fromm's.

Audience: Mahler?

RFG: Margaret Mahler was very important, but this is not Mahler. A very important psychoanalyst who said *neurosis* was the planning of action. Quite compatible with Holokinetic Psychology.

Audience: Karen Horney?

RFG: Karen Horney, yes! She said *neurosis* was the planning of action. Beautiful. Karen Horney, a friend of Erich Fromm's, she was in a conference with Krishnamurti and ended it saying: "Neurosis is the planning of action." Beautiful. That word disappeared from current diagnosis. Why? So it can be non-theoretical, but it is a loss.

Sociopath, possibly also a loss, because the personality disorder might have a genetic component, but it also has a big social component. Serial killers have had a loveless childhood. Proven! The perverted or paraphiliac person has had a loveless childhood. I said I was going to give an example from Robert Stoller, if you're interested, we can get into that right now.

Paraphilia means something on the side of love, perversion, for instance, what perversion can it be? Help me. For instance:

transvestism. Robert Stoller presents a case in the University of Los Angeles, California, UCLA. The case is as follows, I'll try to summarize it: Robert Stoller presents the picture of a boy in his fifth birthday party, dressed as a girl. Why is he dressed as a girl? Because divorced daddy will come to visit him, with his birthday present. And mom knows that daddy is the coach of a baseball team in the US. A macho man! Then, how does mom punish dad? "Come to your son's birthday," and daddy arrives (I'm getting goosebumps) and finds his five year-old boy in his birthday party (I think anyone who listens to this story gets goosebumps). But Robert Stoller was showing us the picture of the boy dressed as a girl! There is no picture of the father arriving. And he sees his son dressed as a girl, and simply, after a moment of stupor, leaves. He drops his present on the floor and leaves. The relationship with dad is broken, which is what mom wanted. Robert Stoller says: "Now look at this kid, at the age of twenty-five." He's dressing as a lady, sitting in a bench at a park. He says: "Did you want to know the origin of transvestism? Well, there you have it, the origin of transvestism is hatred from the mother to the father, transmitted to the son in the form of a paraphilia, but don't name that with something similar to love! It is the product of hatred from mom to dad." Now, Robert Stoller has a book, *Perversions*, which I recommend. The transvestite was produce by hatred. Hatred. Now that boy walks through the park dressed as a woman.

I think it was important to mention Robert Stoller, because he says the word has to be *perversion*, as it was before DSM, and not, as it is now, *paraphilia*, a form of love. No, no, he says, it's not a form of love. It's a form of *hatred*, Robert Stoller says.

Audience: He said something about the genetic origin, also of paraphilia?

RFG: Yes, he said that homosexuality is genetic. But the transvestite might not be homosexual. This boy was a transvestite, but not homosexual. But homosexuality is genetic, and it disappeared from the Diagnostic Manual. Homosexuality today: I heard the two first homosexual couple got married in Rosario, Argentina. I think you must have heard that too in Argentina [talking to the students listening through Skype in

Buenos Aires], I heard the first homosexual couple is getting married in Rosario, with all the pomp and circumstance, and the government secretaries are there, so it's a political act. There were politicians in the wedding and all. It means homosexuality stopped being a disorder in DSM, it stopped being a diagnosis. Why? A political movement from homosexuals, but that doesn't mean it stopped being a genetic problem. That is what Robert Stoller says. And, of course, you have to differentiate homosexuality, transvestism, transsexualism—which is the boy who tells you (I've mentioned this, forgive me those who've already heard it), the thirteen-year-old boy whom I saw in the juvenile prison, at age thirteen, just arrived from San Francisco, where his forty-five year old boyfriend had him locked willingly, and I see him in El Centro's juvenile prison, and the first thing he tells me is “*I am a girl!*”. And I, playing the philosopher, not acting like a psychologist or a psychiatrist, but playing the philosopher, which is a big mistake, tell him: “Well, what I see is that you're a boy. I'm looking at a boy.” And he got very angry with me and told me “You don't accept what I'm saying. I am a girl, and the fact that you don't accept that I'm a girl prevents me from having a relationship with you, and I don't want to see you again.” It was very difficult to resume the therapeutic relationship, because he believed he had a woman inside, that he was a woman in a man's body. That's called transsexualism, and it's the boy telling you “I am a woman,” or the woman telling you “I am a boy.” Transsexualism. All these things have to be differentiated, of course.

The most difficult thing there is, I think, is to differentiate between C and B, between Precinct C and Precinct B. We can say Precinct C has its laws: repetition, cyclicity, duality, unconsciousness, incoherence. Easy! But it is hard for us to believe that the heart activity is part of Precinct C. The heart, that goes thump-thump, for a hundred years, thump-thump, that's repeated. Heart activity belongs to Precinct C, to the META process. It is the A of the META process, we saw that today, but it is even more difficult to differentiate between C and B, because B doesn't have any of those laws (cyclicity, repetition, duality, unconsciousness, incoherence). B is only

conscious. Hard to digest! And what is the difference between C and B? That B doesn't have C's laws, but someone who hasn't read anything will not understand what Unitary Perception is with all this, even if you tell him all this, which is true, that won't be enough. We still need to tune into FM 100, which is not 101 or 99, of Unitary Perception. We still need to define Unitary Perception: to perceive everything perceptible at the same time, without effort, without expectation, and if thought comes in, see that thought with the whole of sound, at the same time as sound, as if thought was another sound. Now we expanded a bit upon the definition. You can expand your understanding a bit, but I've caught myself under the shower, soaping myself and saying "I'm listening to the shower on my head," and I realized I wasn't listening to the shower on my head; I was soaping myself while *thinking* about hearing the shower on my head. Do you understand?

It was an *insight* for me, a surprise, that I believed I was in Unitary Perception, while I was simply *thinking* about listening to the shower on my head. I wasn't listening to the shower! When I start listening to the shower, then peace comes. But while I was thinking about listening to the shower, it was only Precinct C. That's why, it's not easy to differentiate between C and B. Many people think that if you know the definition of Unitary Perception and take it as one more knowledge, you already know what Unitary Perception is. Unfortunately, it's not that way, because they are two completely different functional precincts of the mind which have completely different laws. So, it's very important to see what Unitary Perception is, but more important, to see what it is not. See what it is not.

Any question or comment about this? To think about listening is not to listen. Remember this. To think about listening is not to listen!

Audience: I wanted to comment about Unitary Perception as a brain function, I find it important to say it happens thanks to Holokinesis.

RFG: No! It happens thanks to someone who taught it to you. I had the blessing, the luck, the privilege, and I thank God on my knees, of having met JK, who taught it to me. That's why I thank God immensely. But I didn't take it seriously at first. I thought JK was being delusional. Why should I have to listen? And he would say: "Do it and see what happens." And if he had told me what happens, I wouldn't have seen him ever again. At that time I was very intellectual, and I wouldn't have believed anything about what would happen to me, if he had told me in that moment. Therefore, knowing that, because he lived in the group mind, he told me: do it and see what happens. Don't expect me to tell you. And well, luckily I took it seriously. So, you need someone to teach it to you. And who taught it to JK? Why is it not a consequence of Holokinesis? How does JK know Unitary Perception? Possibly from birth. I asked him:

— "Were you born with Unitary Perception? You had that immense luck!"—He tells me:

He tells me: —"I don't know if I was born with Unitary Perception, probably I was," —he tells me— "but what I know is that I've been like this ever since I can remember."

Audience: For a long time he used the word *meditation*, right? But in the end...

RFG: Yes! And, how did that happen? I tell him:

— "How did you end up using that wretched word, which is, for many people, a technique?" I tell him:

— "Why do you say *meditation*?"

— "Because I spoke Telugu, then the Lutyens adopt me, and Mary Lutyens (the architect's wife,) after a conference, I ask her: "Mama —he called her mama; his mother had died when he was very little—mama, tell me, what is the word in English for what I am speaking about? What am I talking about? All these things I'm saying, what do you call that in English?" She tells him:

—*Meditation*. (Laughter).

And from the age of nine, Krishnamurti uses the word meditation for something that has nothing to do with meditation, which is Unitary Perception. He's talking about Unitary Perception since age nine! And unfortunately, he uses a wrong word which, luckily, before dying, on August 31, 1985 (today is August 1-2010), in Brockwood Park, DVD 4—they're six DVDs—, in that conference in Brockwood Park he says: “The word meditation is a stupid word (he says it!) and we will not use it again.”

You can see the history of the word *meditation*: his stepmother, who has no idea what he was talking about, gives him that word. Because he's a Hindu kid, what could he be talking about? He's said to be spiritual, “well, he's talking about meditation, what else?”

A pity that it was that way, but at least we know he took it back before dying, and he practically gives me his... permission, might I say? to use the word *Unitary Perception*. I tell him:

— “I can't use the word meditation.” He tells me:

— “*You use Unitary Perception.*” I tell him:

— “Why don't you use it too?” He tells me:

— “No, I've been using the word meditation for fifty years. Imagine, if tomorrow I say another thing instead of that, I'll create confusion.”

There was some truth in that, of course, he couldn't change his language two years before dying. Did I answer you, Lorena?

Audience: Yes. There's a question from Argentina, and it's: What is metabolic syndrome?

RFG: What is metabolic syndrome? Metabolic syndrome is the largest epidemic of humanity at this moment. It's an epidemic, worse than AIDS. Worse than AIDS in the number of affected people. How is it diagnosed? It is diagnosed with a measuring

tape, not even with the scales. How do you diagnose it? With a measuring tape, which sounds so unscientific. Well, measuring the waist at the height of the navel. If a man has more than one hundred centimeters, he has metabolic syndrome; if a woman has more than ninety centimeters, she has metabolic syndrome. Period. And what is metabolic syndrome? It is the prelude, the threshold of kidney failure, but diagnosed at a very early stage. That's why if the patient takes the treatment, walking for an hour each day, above all, the main treatment is to walk for an hour each day, and if the patient takes five hundred milligrams of metformin three times a day, that's the whole treatment. He can prevent kidney failure, because metabolic syndrome is the prelude of kidney failure, and the prelude of heart infarction, the prelude of a stroke, [*asks for the Spanish name for a stroke*] i.e., brain infarction...

Audience: Yes, or brain embolism.

RFG: Or brain embolism. Then, a good metabolic syndrome treatment will prevent that person from losing their legs or feet. If it transforms into diabetes, the diabetic might go blind and lose their feet. All of that is prevented with a measuring tape, do you realize? And this is thanks to the computer and statistics. This, the diagnosis of metabolic syndrome, became known few years ago, I think five, perhaps a bit more, which is statistically diagnosed with a measuring tape, not even a weighing scale, and the main treatment: to walk an hour each day.

Audience: And you said to take what three times a day?

RFG: There is a substance recommended for metabolic syndrome, called *metformin*, which is the chemical name for the substance. Generic name, not brand name. And that is what you use to treat metabolic syndrome, which is the largest epidemics, even larger than AIDS, in today's world. Even in children. Mexico is among the first. Mexico and the US are among the first, I don't know how Spain is doing with obese children.

Audience: Not yet...

RFG: Luckily not! But Mexico and the States are at the top of the list with obese children, which are the future adults with metabolic syndrome.

Do you have any other question?

If there are no more question or comments, we can finish here. Next week we will connect with Buenos Aires at 10:30, that is, at 2:30 in Buenos Aires, but here, we will come at ten to take the written exam.

TOPICS - CLASS 3

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 3 (154)
- SLEEP AND STRESS (154)
- THE ORIGIN OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY(156)
- SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (158)
- SLEEP AND ITS VALUE (159)
- THE HUMAN PRONENESS TO HYPNOSIS (166)
- THE SCHOOL OF ESIKIA: STILLNESS AND SILENCE (178)
- QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS - CLASS 3 (167) (180)
- PHYLOGENETIC IMBALANCE IN THE NEWBORN (189)
- UNITARY PERCEPTION IS "BUILT-IN" (194)
- IMAGINARY LIMITS TO THE HUMAN POTENTIAL (196)
- HAMLET, THE SUMMIT OF WORLD LITERATURE (197)
- SANCTITY AND ENLIGHTENMENT (198)
- SUMMARIZED REVIEW OF PREVIOUS TOPICS (200)
- DIALOGUE AND QUESTIONS (202)
- THE ROLE OF THE PRAYER (206)
- COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS AND COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS (216)
- THE IMPORTANCE OF STILLNESS (218)
- FINAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS - CLASS 3 (220)

CLASS 3

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, August 8th, 2010.

RFG: Okay, today we will present the third class, always thinking about our very divided humanity, with the conviction that we're contributing with THE way humanity has to be united in peace, as it should always have been.

This class will be about sleep and other subjects.

But of course, right from the start... When talking about sleep, we have to talk about stress. Because the main cause of stress is lack of sleep. We need to sleep nine hours per day, and new articles are published, paid by people who have an interest in saying that to sleep only five hours is enough, which isn't true.

I had the privilege of being with William Dement in San Francisco and Laverne Johnson in San Diego, they are pioneers in the study of sleep, and both agreed in saying that the necessary hours of sleep for a human adult are nine. For a children up to age twelve, twelve hours of sleep. Until age twelve, twelve hours of sleep.

And stress, we know it's that syndrome described by Hans Selye, the Canadian who says that many things can produce a single homeostatic answer, which is stress.

Which is, let's say it this way, a compromise of the *hypothalamic—pituitary—adrenal axis* with a release of adrenocorticotropin, a hormone from the hypophysis that stimulates the suprarenal cortex in order to release corticoids, inner cortisone, adrenaline, etc., which constitute the fight-or-flight response.

But in the modern man, many things like cold, fatigue, radiations, traumas, intoxications, infections, excess of work, lack of sleep, will produce stress, which is the same response to

all those causes. It's the first time that a sole response of the organism is related to many causes: stress. And we also know stress has complications.

But now, in Psychiatry, the great diseases of Psychiatry, like attention deficit in children or schizophrenia, or depression, bring an enormous amount of stress. Not only to the patient but also to his family. Then, we have to know what the consequences of stress are, because that is the way in which we will persuade the family and the patient to take his medication. Because a depressed person has a hundred times more stress than a non-depressed person, or a thousand times more stress.

Because the depressed person doesn't want to go to the cinema, or the supermarket, because it's stressful for them. The same with the schizophrenic, the same with child with attention deficit, for other reasons, he has a great deal of stress. Lack of acceptance from his peers, the teacher scolding him, his parents not knowing what to do with him, his parents getting divorced because they don't know how to deal with him, so, the stress is immense. Then, what do you tell those patients? "You are under tremendous stress."

Then, what's the solution? The medication.

And if you don't take your medication, what's the consequence? That is, what are the consequences of stress? We should know those by heart, they are six of them:

- first, gastritis, that's the first of all;
- then comes arterial hypertension;
- fall of immunity;
- arthritis;
- metabolic syndrome, leading to diabetes, heart infarction, etc.;
- and lastly, suicidal and homicidal ideas.

Watch out, those six are the complications of stress, and therefore, the complications of almost every psychiatric diseases that bring stress.

Then, it's very important to know this. The consequences of stress.

So, how do you cure stress?

Rest, sleep nine hours, work less. And that will prevent or impede those complications I just mentioned, which are six.

Somebody asked me what is the use of behavioral therapy, right? In which cases should we use behavioral therapy, with a patient. We consider only one case, which is mental retardation. No other case.

Do you remember we've talked about Holokinetic Psychology? The origin of Holokinetic Psychology is not in Psychology. It's not derived from Freud, like all the known psychologies, either because they follow Freud or because they contradict Freud, but Holokinetic Psychology comes from Physics, from Holokinesis. And it brings a much more complete understanding of time than any of the known psychologies.

Then, what happens? We have to use a language that adapts to that complete notion of time, which isn't used in any other Psychology. In none of the previous psychologies.

And then, what happens? The same that already happened in Astronomy with Ptolemy, who, in the year 147 says the Earth is the center of the Solar System. In 147 A.D. And Copernicus, who says the Sun is the center of the Solar System, dies in 1542. We're talking about mankind being astronomically wrong for one thousand and four hundred years.

And when Copernicus rectifies the mistake and dies without publishing his book, out of fear of the the Inquisition, in 1542, the book is published shortly after. And Galileo, who is teaching Astronomy and Mathematics at the University in Italy nearly a hundred years after Copernicus' death, was teaching what? Galileo, who had written a book about Copernicus and

his *Celestial Revolutions*; Galileo had written a book on Copernicus; Galileo knew Copernicus, and what was Galileo teaching? Ptolemy. That is, in the year 1635 [approximately], Galileo was teaching 147 AD Ptolemy. That's the history of science, a horror story.

And of course, by now the Pope had already called Galileo and told him to be "Careful, or else, we're sending you to the stake." And that is why Copernicus did not want to publish his book before death. He prepared everything to have his book published after his death.

Just like Ptolemy (147 AD), who says the Earth is the center of the Solar System, is incompatible with Copernicus, who says the Sun is the center, in the same way, what we are saying is incompatible (with the previous psychologies), because we are using a language that is consistent with a very broad understanding of time that comes from the concept of Holokinesis in Physics. It doesn't come from Psychology. Holokinetic Psychology is born in Physics, not in Psychology. Then, that's why we say Holokinetic Psychology shouldn't be mixed with any of the previous psychologies. Not because we think we're better or superior, with all the respect the other psychologies deserve, we say: don't mix.

Don't mix, because this is a very serious, very deep issue, it's not a whim that the language we use tries to adapt to a more complete understanding of time, which includes Newton's absolute time, Einstein's relative time and David Bohm's irrelevant time. So, not mixing Holokinetic Psychology with any of the previous psychologies is not a whim.

In the same way not mixing Copernicus with Ptolemy is not a whim.

So, it's not the first time in the history of Science that things become incompatible, right?

Very well. It's not a personal whim, it doesn't mean we think too highly of ourselves and all those stories.

Then, how is scientific research done in Holokinetic Psychology?

Scientific research, for instance, in behaviorism, which is where the most research has been done, because you can measure behavior... Behaviorism has had a lot of research done, that's why behaviorism is very respected, especially Skinner, because Cartesian experimentation is employed.

Cartesian experimentation applies to behaviorism, so Cartesian research, what is called *scientific* research, has been done, of behavioral therapy (or Behavioral Psychology, or Skinner's Psychology).

How then, if there is a new understanding of time, is research done in Holokinetic Psychology?

How do we investigate Unitary Perception if we have something that can't be measured?

Does this mean what we're saying is not scientific?

No, no. Let's not forget that Bohm, when he speaks about Holokinesis and completes the understanding of time, also changes the foundations of science itself, of Physics itself, and of course, the foundations of Psychology.

Then, the fact that we can't measure something doesn't mean it's not scientific. Because what matters now—and this is said, qualified and explained by Bohm in his work, repeatedly—, experimentation is now based on consensual facts.

That means if the professor of the International Academy of Sciences we have here today teaches me Unitary Perception, I will find the same things he found with Unitary Perception. That's what we call consensual. That's why we call Unitary Perception consensual, because he teaches me and I, with my own senses, in a consensual way, together with him, in a sensory way—with my senses—I con-sensually confirm, I scientifically prove it, because I'm replicating what he taught me, what he's teaching me. And what he's teaching me can't be

measured, but the mere fact of it being replicable, being exactly equal to what he teaches me, makes it scientific.

I hope this is clear, it's clear, right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Yes.

Then, scientific research under Holokinetic Psychology is not Cartesian, which doesn't mean it's not scientific. It is scientific according to David Bohm's Holokinesis. And you can't measure it, but it is consensual.

And... what is the value of sleeping?

When I was in Moscow, I was very shocked to see the young people don't sleep.

I arrived at three or four in the morning, and speaking with the taxi driver (we managed to communicate with our English), I asked him "What are they doing? All the young people are on the street." And it was a week day, not a Saturday or a Sunday. And he tells me "Well, young people don't sleep here. They say they're going to sleep when they die."

Okay, that means in twenty years, they in Russia will have lots of what? Lots of gastritis, lots of hypertension, lots of arthritis; the consequences of stress. A great fall of immunity.

Then, what is the value of sleeping?

The value of sleeping is determined by the energy-restoring capacity it has, something that happens at a moment in sleep called "S4", we will see what that is.

First of all, Hartmann defined sleep in a masterly way. Hartmann says sleep is a regular behavior.

Why does he call it a regular behavior? Because in the Cartesian study of sleep, which has been done, a Cartesian study of sleep with measurements, that come from the

electroencephalogram, the measurement of the pretibial muscle activity in the leg, and the measurement of eye movements.

Those three records show that, when we measure them in Cecilia, a sequence of events will happen in those three records. And that sequence is the same if I measure those three records in any other person.

I.e., Hartmann says: “Let's start defining sleep as a regular behavior, because the records will repeat equally in everyone.”

It is a reversible behavior. Reversible at six in the morning. It stops happening at six.

Reversible, it is reverted.

Recurring, at 10:30 in the night, or eleven, because we go to bed at that time.

There is some sensory disconnection, but it is different from hypnosis. In hypnosis there is... The Greek word *hypnos*, which means *sleep*, is sadly used for *hypnosis*. But hypnosis has nothing to do with sleep, despite the fact that the Greek word for *sleep* is used to talk about hypnosis.

Hypnosis is sensory hyper-connection. The individual is very connected with the environment in hypnosis. That's the terrible thing about thought, that it's hypnosis, and it makes us believe we are very connected, when actually we're functioning automatically according to the past, and that is well pointed out by JK in his work, and of course by David Bohm too, and of course, by the speaker, in the work he has written, which includes twenty-five books so far [2010].

So in sleep—not hypnosis—, in sleep, which is a regular, reversible, recurring behavior, there is a sensory disconnection that is different from hypnosis, where there is sensory hyper-connection, i.e., a great degree of sensory connection.

It's not a homogeneous behavior, showing the same behavior all the time. No. All the behaviors from wakefulness are present in sleep.

During sleep, people talk, have orgasms and ejaculation, people walk in their sleep, when there is somnambulism. People fight in their sleep, people...

Audience: Cry.

RFG: Cry, etc. Or laugh, laugh.

Yes. So it's not homogeneous, because all behaviors from wakefulness can happen in sleep.

Then, let's define sleep according to Hartmann again. The best definition out there. It is a regular behavior, because it is studied with three records which will show the same thing in any person.

Reversible at six in the morning, because you wake up. Recurring at ten in the evening, because you go to sleep again. There is some sensory disconnection, unlike hypnosis, and it's not homogeneous, because there's not just one behavior. There are many behaviors in sleep.

And now, if we take one of the three records that show sleep is regular, the electroencephalogram, we see that sleep can be divided, as it has been done, in S sleep and D sleep. S sleep is synchronized sleep and D sleep is desynchronized sleep.

And S sleep, which is the sleep mode with which we start to sleep, has four stages. S1, S2, S3 and S4. And if you study what S4 is, you will find it has all the features of Unitary Perception.

It means Unitary Perception is already built into our central nervous system in sleep, with the difference that, during sleep, it is unconscious. But all the features of Unitary Perception are present in S4. How curious that S4 is the most restorative sleep stage. And the least restorative sleep happens when S4 is absent.

That S stage is also called N-REM (non-rapid eye movements), and it happens during the first part of sleep. In the first moments of the night, during the first ninety minutes of sleep.

And that S stage, synchronized sleep with four stages, non-rapid eye movements, N-REM 1, N-REM 2, N-REM 3, N-REM 4, show us all this. That Unitary Perception, absence of thought, exists during stage 4 of S or N-REM sleep.

Duodenal perforations and heart infarction don't happen during that moment. They happen during desynchronized sleep, which is where you dream. Where the thoughts are during sleep, the imaginations of sleep that sometimes can take the patient's life. A nightmare can kill a person with an infarction.

Then, the problem of all this, we've seen... I've seen it with William Dement in San Francisco and Laverne Johnson in San Diego, that it is expensive.

Those three records are very expensive. You need electroencephalogram, pretibial muscle activity and eye movements recorded for eight hours, therefore it's very expensive. And that is why it is used little in consultations with patients. Luckily, it is not absolutely necessary to use that.

The S stage, synchronized sleep, where S4 is, which is the moment of greater restoration or Unitary Perception, I say, during sleep, happens about three or four times in eight hours.

If you sleep less than eight or nine hours, you will have less chances to go through S4, that is, less chances of restoring your energy. That's why it is important, even if the newspaper told us two or three days ago that we only need five hours of sleep; be careful. Where does this information come from? Who pays for it? I suppose it is the slave owners who want people to sleep less and work more.

It takes nine hours for the S4 stage to happen at least four times, each of which will last ninety minutes. Then, less hours of sleep means less S4, less restoration of energy.

When we say *deep sleep*, we have to clarify this, because different authors use those words in two different ways.

The S sleep is called deep sleep out of psychological reasons, but in D sleep (the sleep phase during which dreams happen is D sleep), desynchronized sleep, there is a great muscular relaxation observed in the pretibial muscle. In the record number two, which is that of the pretibial muscle. Great muscular relaxation. And that is why D sleep is also called *deep sleep*, because of that muscular relaxation. But unfortunately, the S sleep is also called *deep*, because of its restoring quality.

So it's better not to speak about deep sleep, right?

Better talk about S sleep or D sleep. It's much more scientific and clear not to use the word *deep* when we talk about sleep. Because it might be confusing, since the word can be applied to two opposing things, two completely different things.

And S4, what percentage of sleep it it? 16% of sleep is S4, as long as it happens four times and the person sleeps nine hours.

The sleep of rapid eye movements, which is the one with the dreams, with the nightmares that might cause a duodenal perforation or an infarction, is 20% of sleep. And the most prolonged stage of all is S2: 50% of sleep.

We've already said that S4 is the Precinct B of sleep. It's the Unitary Perception of sleep. Why? Because there are no dreams, you don't dream during S4. In the S4 stage there are electrodermic storms, which are measured with instruments. Galvanic, electric, storms in the skin. Discharge of galvanic energy in the skin. And release—this is discovered by Takahashi in Japan—of growth hormone (GH) during the S4 stage.

It means that, up to age twenty-one, humans grow during the S4 stage. And then, what happens with GH after age twenty-one? It makes communion easier, it boosts human relationship.

And it's also the most used treatment for autism today, to improve the human relationships of the autistic person. One of

their problems... they're called *autistic* because they don't form relationships.

And GH is the hormone they use to treat autism. Not for the person to grow, but for them to form relationships.

Then, in the S4 stage of sleep there are no dreams. There are no nightmares either, which can cause serious problems to a person with an infarction, or a person with a duodenal ulcer, that might get perforated, etc.

And electrodermic storms, which are discharges of electricity in the skin. All that shows there is a great liberation of energy from the brain during S4 sleep. Just like what happens during Unitary Perception in wakefulness. Great liberation of energy, great regeneration and we know there's a profound peace in wakefulness, that comes immediately.

At the University of Michigan, they used exercise to see what happened with the S4 stage. They had two groups: a group of students who ran in the morning, and another group (with their names, of course) of students who didn't run in the morning.

After six months, S4 sleep in the group of students who ran was 25% of the night's sleep. It had risen by 9%, from 16%, a rise of almost 10% in the S4 sleep stage just because of exercise.

It went up to 25%, not 16%, which is the usual value.

What happens to S4 in an alcoholic person? It disappears. It disappears.

What happens to S4 in a person who takes Alprazolam or Diazepam, i.e., benzodiazepines or sleeping drugs? S4 disappears.

And S4 also disappears after age sixty-five. It starts to diminish, getting shorter and shorter each time.

Audience: And for the depressed person as well.

RFG: The depressed person, we'll get to that now. The depressed person goes right into D, desynchronized sleep, without S sleep. So, to know whether a person is depressed, we should carry out a sleep study with the three records. Few people can pay that, and it's not necessary anyway, because we know the questions that have to be asked, which are very good.

Then: how do you sleep? How is your energy? Enough.

But if we want to verify that objectively, the depressed person goes right into D, there is no S. S sleep, which is the first ninety minutes, disappears in the depressed, so the person enters directly into D sleep, which is where dreams and nightmares happen.

And there's a substance, PCPA (para-chlorophenylalanine), that inhibits serotonin, and serotonin is one of the three monoamines that stimulate the brain cortex, which is inhibited in depression. Now, you can induce depression with that substance, PCPA, para-chlorophenylalanine, because it inhibits serotonin, which is one of the brain's stimulating monoamines. And what happens? S4 sleep is also reduced with PCPA.

Audience: What other functions does it have?

RFG: What?

Audience: PCPA. What is it used for?

RFG: PCPA is used to induce depression. To study sleep, that was done by Laverne Johnson, in San Diego. Harshly criticized for doing it, but he did it. But they learned something from that. What did they learn? That you can reduce S4 sleep with a serotonin inhibitor.

Which means what? What do we know with that? That serotonin is important for sleep, especially for S4. That's why antidepressants are so good. Because we have the new SSRI family, which I prefer not to use in men because it affects libido and erections. For example, Prozac, the first one to appear, but there are many other usable antidepressants.

For instance, Prozac is a Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor. It raises serotonin and the person sleeps better. Of course, men pay a price that I don't think is fair.

For men, there are other medications, there's over two hundred antidepressant medications, that can perfectly replace Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors, e.g. Prozac, which are a very noble family of antidepressants. They are mostly used in women, with much success.

I'm not sure if everyone was given the "Dialogue about consciousness." Okay. That's a dialogue I find useful, because it has exchanges. It's a dialogue I had in Arcadia, with an Italian female Doctor who was the Director of the place.

Audience: Yes, I sent it to everyone.

RFG: You sent it to everyone? Okay. Read that article. It's called "Dialogue about consciousness". It's a dialogue I had with a Doctor whose mother suffered from... Alzheimer's? No, no. She had been in a coma, sorry. Her mother had been in a coma after an accident. So she started to study coma in a very passionate and obsessive way. Her mother spent like a month in a coma. So she studied coma and consciousness, and when she tells me that, I tell her "Let's have a dialogue about consciousness."

We had it, recorded it, and now you have it to read, if you want to. With a person who knows about consciousness. An interesting dialogue, because she would [suddenly] pull things from up her sleeve that I didn't know where they came from.

Well, then, dreams. S2.

What does it mean that S2 takes 50% of sleep?

It means there's a great tendency to hypnosis in those people, which is every one of us. Human beings are very prone to hypnosis. We mammals are more prone to hypnosis than birds. Incredible. I've seen a magician called Taurus do Brazil hypnotize a bird, I had a very nice encounter with him. He took me on a tour with him (I was 14), and he would present me as

his assistant. I felt really good. He'd say "Let's see, Mr. Assistant..." and I would hold his top hat for him to take out the rabbits. And then the girls would come and see me dressed in a tailcoat, and ask "Can you hypnotize too?" And I would say "Of course..."

(Laughter).

So it was a very amusing experience I had with Taurus do Brazil. This man hypnotized birds. He would grab a canary and hypnotize it in front of everyone. He was a good hypnotist. Taurus do Brazil.

But yes, it's possible to hypnotize a bird, but it's much more difficult than hypnotizing a mammal.

That is, we as mammal are very easy to hypnotize, and let's not forget that thought is hypnosis. We are submerged in the hypnosis that thought is, so we have to realize that at least. That's a first step: to realize thought is hypnosis.

Very well, let's open the dialogue here first and then in Buenos Aires. Questions or comments here? Sleep, stress.

Audience: Someone could reject that statement about thought being hypnosis in all cases and say "Okay, in Bernheim's experience you have a hypnotically induced response." But they would say: "But the rest of thought, I think whatever I want, whenever I want it, and I can think new things."

RFG: That is in one of the questions from students [the book "Questions from Students to RFG"]. Yes, and free will. "I am free to think whenever I want and whatever I want."

And apparently it is. It is apparently true, but, with the dialogues we have... we should start recording those dialogues that Ceci and I have during breakfast, about free will and the influences of all kinds that form part of thought. Genetic influences, right?

You can tell that person: “Okay, I know a homosexual man who tells me he doesn't want to be homosexual, but he can't stop being homosexual and goes out every night, etc.”

So, what happened with that person? Is he free of genetic hypnosis?

No, he can't be free. Just like people with depression or diabetes can't be free from their genes. There's a genetic influence right there.

Genetic hypnosis? Why not, if it is conditioning. And, does it affect thought? Yes.

And is a person who is addicted to gambling, in the obsessive-compulsive cluster, functioning like a hypnotized person? You tell me if not.

And is that homosexual I mentioned before functioning as a hypnotized person? Or, is he functioning as a hypnotized person in a recurring way? Each day, or every other day, at the same time, the same homosexual thought appears.

The gambler: Does he want to be addicted to gambling? No, because he loses lots of money. But the repetitive compulsion is there. Does that look like hypnosis? Or is that hypnosis?

The infamous anorexia nervosa: “I'm too fat.” An eighteen-year-old girl who tells you —I think we've all seen them, right? Especially those of us in the health area. “I am so fat,” but it turns out she looks like a skeleton.

And this skinny girl tells you “I'm fat.” Is that hypnosis? Is that hypnotic thought? Possibly, a good part of it coming from the genes? Of course it is. We have tons of examples. “I am Catholic,” is that hypnosis?

—Because, how did you...? What did you do to be a Catholic? How did you choose that?

—No; it's from birth.

—Ah! What did you do in order to be Spanish, Mexican or Argentinian?

—No; that's from birth.

Is that hypnosis?

(Laughter).

You tell me.

Or the Muslim, or the communist, or the fascist, who are singing the slogans from a very early age.

Is that hypnosis?

You think about all this.

And how much of that is free will?

How much time can I be without eating? The mayor of Cork spent seventy-four days without eating. On day seventy-five they took him in a casket. Ireland. They say Irish people are very stubborn. The mayor of Cork, who was on a hunger strike against the English oppression and genocide in Ireland, went on for seventy-four days without eating. He died on day seventy-five.

What is the free will of Cork's mayor? Seventy-four days. Right? It means we are conditioned by hunger and the need for nourishment.

And is that hypnosis? Well, it is a necessary form of hypnosis: organic.

And the need for water and the need to repeatedly drink water. Here we have the bottles next to us.

Is that a form of hypnosis?

Yes, it is a form of biological, benign, repetitive, necessary hypnosis. Drinking water, eating every four or five hours.

And hunger comes, to call us in case we forget. Sometimes I'm working and I forget to eat, and luckily, Cecilia calls me.

But repetitive hunger, is that a form of hypnosis? Yes.

Audience: Is that the functional part of Precinct C?

That is the functional part of Precinct C, of course. In a repetitive way, i.e., in a hypnotic way; that's the functional hypnosis.

And culturally, is there a good hypnosis?

I think the Ten Commandments are a very, very good form of hypnosis.

But, what happened to the Ten Commandments? Why did they disappear from society? They have disappeared.

Audience: Because of hypnosis (laughter).

RFG: Because there are other forms of hypnosis that wiped them. Because, if you read the Ten Commandments, you say "okay, yes, society could function very well with them." And why have the Ten Commandments been abandoned?

Because new forms of hypnosis appear that erase the hypnosis of the Ten Commandments, which is benign, which is very important. Why were they dropped, abandoned? Why is it that nobody gives a damn about discussing the Ten Commandments?

"No, don't bother me with the Ten Commandments." If you try to talk about the Ten Commandments, to analyze them in a psychosocial way, or an economic way, any way you want to analyze the Ten Commandments... see if you find anyone. I couldn't find anyone.

So "don't bother me with the Ten Commandments." Those are the replies I got.

And my grandfather Noe would say “Life begins with the Ten Commandments, and then one starts to live.” My grandfather Noe. He was from another generation, so he had another view on the Ten Commandments, different from ours.

Is that hypnosis? Undoubtedly.

Benign? Undoubtedly.

Forgotten? Undoubtedly.

(Laughter).

Forgotten; sometimes due to a memory problem, hypnosis is forgotten.

Memory is not infallible. That has a lot of value in court. If sometime you're called to go to court and they ask you: Is memory infallible? The answer is: No.

So, all patients have their record. When patient “Mary” comes, give me her record, without which I am lost. I cannot remember everything about Mary, and I need to know the medication dose I prescribed for Mary.

I can't rely on my memory, that's not professional, that's not honest, not sensible and not compassionate, to rely on my memory and try to manage as I can. No, I have to know the exact dose you're taking, and you must keep a record. That's professional, right?

Audience: Of course.

RFG: Memory is not infallible. That's why hypnosis fails sometimes. But, why? Because memory is not infallible, but that doesn't mean there's no hypnosis.

I don't know if I'm answering your question.

Audience: Yes, because there's a notion that... you see, during hypnosis, as a form of therapy, the conscious aspect disappears, right? It's completely unconscious in that moment.

RFG: Sure, then, what is the problem with hypnosis? That it is unconscious, just like 99% of thought.

And should we rely on thought, which has some laws such as cyclicality, duality, repetition, incoherence and 99% unconsciousness? Should we rely on thought, which is 99% unconscious, to solve all our individual and social problems?

That's what you may call "being crazy."

To rely on thought, which is 99% unconscious, to solve the individual and social problems, is crazy. Because it means we don't know what thought is, we don't even have an idea of what thought is, that's why we rely on thought, on formulas, so much.

No, that's not the way, the solution to the many, many human problems is not there. There are so many problems, all of them produced by thought, by hypnosis, which is unconscious and makes us do things unconsciously, without considering the reality that is accessible to our senses.

Hence all the errors. The invasions of a country to other. The misery that was planned to dominate and enslave an entire country, and the whole humanity, now, with the world-wide crisis. That is a product of thought, which is 99% unconscious. Should we rely on that? Watch out!

Audience: Of course, because thought is knowledge, and it gives humans a certain security. The "know-how," to create solutions.

RFG: Yes, but if I have to write a prescription, right? I learned medicine. Then, what I learned is 99% unconscious, and I can bring it to consciousness and make a good prescription. If I'm properly trained, as I am, if I'm updated, as I am, and if I pay attention to the patient, make new questions, as it should be done, and everything you need to do for a good prescription... then I'm using that benign hypnosis in an adequate manner, but let's not forget that it is unconscious.

Now, the nuclear physicists who invented the atomic bomb and used it... Yesterday, August 6th, was the sixty-fifth anniversary of the first atomic bomb, dropped on man by man. Those nuclear physicists, were they acting consciously when they committed that atrocity of dropping the atomic bomb? Six hundred and fifty thousand people died in a second. I don't think they were acting with consciousness. Why did they drop it? Ah, to prevent the Russians from entering Japan, because the Russians were in Kamchatka, ready to disembark in Japan. "We have to drop the atomic bomb," victims don't matter. What for? "To stop the Russians."

So, when you see, you analyze, study and understand what thought is: hypnosis. And most of the actions from thought come from the unconscious. And those attitudes, like "we'll prevent that guy from getting in," "we'll kill six hundred and fifty thousand people," are Machiavellian plans, or as the primitive Kristians would say, diabolical.

But, those are the things with which we have to live. Not us, luckily, but many people had to live that. And thought continues to create atrocities and monstrosities. There are smart weapons that are really diabolical, like, today you can fire a guided rocket into Mrs. Pérez's window, who lives half a block down the street, and you can do it from Buenos Aires. Am I clear? That is, smart weapons, which they can shoot into your window. Tremendous. Is all this conscious thought, or is it the hypnosis of thought acting? The mere fact of thinking of a weapon like that, for what purpose? What is the purpose of that? Power, to maintain the empire. Well, that in itself is absurd.

That comes from a thought that has to be hypnotic in its nature for it to be maintained, otherwise you can't maintain such an absurd thought. It cannot be maintained if you have the slightest compassion or the slightest sense. I don't know if I'm answering.

Thought is hypnosis, that was proven by Bernheim and proven in our life constantly. I see it in myself, not only with the song I

like, that I want to repeat, and then I stop it, like we were saying in the meeting yesterday.

I stopped singing “*Brucia la luna in cielo*” because I realized I preferred to be in peace. Yes. The song is beautiful.

And I recalled the song when writing to a friend who is in love with an Italian woman, and I tell him “This song was made for you.”

I send him the song, then I start singing it. *Brucia la luna in cielo...*

And I realize I'm doing something silly, because when I sing, I'm going away from peace. No! I go back to peace. I go back to peace. If you are aware of hypnosis, then you're free; if you're not aware, you're a slave, just like the prisoner who is sentenced to death, in cell 300. Am I clear? Yes.

Any question or comment about this, please?

It is a tough subject; it's the first time all of this is said in such an insistent way, that thought is hypnosis, after Bernheim.

Bernheim didn't insist much because, it seems, he really valued his own peace and survival. So he didn't insist much on the fact that thought is hypnosis. But at least he said it and proved it.

Audience: I think the biggest resistance comes from there, when you hear what's being said about thought, there's the resistance.

RFG: Well, no, the biggest resistance is to accepting that music has more hypnotic power than thought. That causes even more resistance. Yes.

In Buenos Aires, I said something about music, I don't remember what, but that fell down like a bomb.

Audience: Yes, that there's nothing sacred in music.

RFG: That's what I said, yes. That there's nothing sacred in music, not even in sacred music. (Laughter). There's nothing sacred. No! Nothing sacred about it. It's all a product of human thought. There's nothing sacred in there. It's purely a product of human thought. Yes.

That we like to sing, that we like music, that's another issue. (Laughter).

But there's nothing sacred in music. And music is hypnotically powerful. Perhaps the most powerful form of hypnosis.

Audience: Rubén, language too?

RFG: Language... if I tell you “come,” you know what I'm saying because someone has repeated the word “come” to us until we've learned its meaning, and it's been repeated so much: hypnotically. It must have been an act of hypnosis for us to learn it so good and be able to repeat it: “come,” when we want you to come.

Of course language is hypnosis. Language is the prototypical and archetypal example, and all the “-typicals” you want, including “typical.”

Audience: There's nothing sacred about it?

RFG: Language is the demonstration of hypnosis. Because it is like memory: it repeats itself. Of course, the fact that it repeats itself is hypnosis. Repetition is the basis of hypnosis. The monkey mimicking the monkey. If you go to a zoo, you'll laugh, because a little macaque does this [making a gesture] and the other macaque does exactly the same. (Laughter). Because we primates are very easy to hypnotize, and we imitate a great deal. And what is imitation? Hypnosis.

RFG: Why do we get angry? Is it because it's an act of hypnosis? Why do we feel sadness? Why do we fear? Isn't that hypnosis? Of course it is; thought is an act of hypnosis. And music is worse, yes. Is music sacred? What sacred music? It's all a product of thought. I really like Sebastian Bach. But I don't listen to Bach anymore. But they don't call Bach sacred

music. No, it's music from Bach, and his music, no matter how pretty it sounds to us, is Bach's music, a product of the human brain.

Audience: What do you think about that quote from Krishnamurti: “Either everything is sacred or nothing is”?

RFG: Of course. What we were saying yesterday... My grandfather Noé, when we were in the country, would say—I was six years old— “Look Rubén...” In Argentina, in those times, horse manure, which we called “bosta” (dung) was used as a fertilizer. So my grandfather says: “Look Rubén, this dung is sacred, because it's making the land fertile, the land that will feed us. So you and I are not more sacred than this dung, which is sacred too.”

Such is the thinking of those who believed in the Ten Commandments. Noé, my grandfather, was one of them. That kind of thinking is gone, as far as I know.

Audience: Or, like Bohm would say: “The present I is the unknown.”

RFG: Indeed...

Audience: Let's say that...

RFG: Unitary Perception.

Audience: Exactly. Language, word, action... From that action, i.e., from the present I, which is unknown, where it's not conditioned by the previous, that which is in memory...

RFG: Formulas.

Audience: But you use them because they are functional, there is no problem there. The problem is that we hardly ever live in the movement, i.e., in the fact of Unitary Perception... it is just a means to communicate...

RFG: Yes, and JK proposes that for all of life: “Don't go in any direction.”

It's tremendous, because we have been taught to go in a certain direction or in several directions. And it's too difficult to separate from that hypnotic induction.

I don't know, for example, I was playing, also when I was between six and eight years old... and I would sit down and play maybe with little cars or whatever, and my mother would pass by as she was cleaning the house and go: "Okay now, get up and go do something useful." So that hypnosis gets stuck in your head. "Playing isn't useful; you have to do something useful."

So, I don't know, what useful thing can I do? I don't know, so I *have* to invent something useful, right?

Like the employee who's doing nothing, and when the boss walks by, he grabs a pencil. (Laughter)

And he's not writing anything, but he's pretending to do something useful. That is to go in a direction.

That is, we are taught to go in a direction. "Do something useful. Don't even think of doing nothing."

Audience: Nothing but fear.

RFG: Of course. They hypnotically instill the fear of silence in you, the hatred towards silence, fear of stillness, fear of not doing anything. Yes... please, doing nothing is one of the most beautiful things in the world. But they don't teach us that doing nothing is one of the most beautiful things.

Audience: And it's not laziness.

RFG: And it's not laziness. No, because sometimes, very beautiful things are conceived in that stillness. Yes, yes. Well, most of the time, nothing but beautiful things.

Audience: Or maybe that's the reason beautiful things are not conceived, because...

RFG: Because there's too much occupation.

But the truth is that one is in that peace, and I feel nothing but love. In that stillness, I can't feel other thing but love.

It's true. You fill with love in stillness. I don't know why stillness is so deprecated, why silence is so deprecated. I really don't understand. That's why we have to study that school, the *Esikia*. The school of *Hesychasm* or *Esikia*: the path of stillness and silence, of the first monks who went to Egypt. The first Christian monks who went to Egypt.

The path of *Esikia*, of stillness and silence. What happened, why don't they tell us about those people? Why are we not taught about those people in elementary school? It's forgotten.

Audience: Rubén, I have a question that's not about hypnosis. If a patient is not honest when you ask him a question, what do you do?

RFG: I tell the patient: *“If you try to fool me, you're fooling yourself, because you're the one who's paying for this consultation. If you lie to me, you're harming yourself; if you hide something from me, that's bad for you. If you tell me you're taking your medication and I ask you “Have you ever forgotten it?” and you tell me you never did, but you actually forgot it two or three times, then I will end up making a prescription that is unsuitable for you. Because if you forgot that medication once, for instance, Imipramine, and you don't tell me, I will keep prescribing you that. But if you tell me you forgot to take it once, I have to withdraw that medication, because it won't ever work for you again.”*

So I trust that the patient, after telling him that, will have the intelligence of being sincere, because he might be taking a medication... If I give him the same medication after he's skipped it, he's actually wasting his money with me and the medication.

That is, you expect the patient to be sincere, an intelligent patient has to be sincere with his doctor.

Audience: But, if that patient were, let's say, a compulsive liar, and his brother brought him...

RFG: Yes, there's that problem too. It's a very serious problem. Don't forget that the most frequent diagnosis... you answered that question, right?

You know what the most frequent diagnosis is.

Audience: Yes, giving up your medication.

RFG: Giving up your medication. And well, that's out of hypnosis too. With a very remote origin.

The word *pharmakias*, which means *witchcraft* in Greek, and I think Jesus (or else, John), who said "Depart from witchcraft and witches." Like saying "Don't do witchcraft. Forget about products of thought."

So the trouble begins when the science of pharmaceuticals appears, and they name it pharmacy, based on a Greek word, *pharmakias*, *witchcraft*, which surely was unknown to the pharmacist.

So what happens with all the Christian ministers of the time? They turned against this "sorcerer", this witch, because he's using a word that is condemned in the Gospel.

Like they say in the US: "Gimme a break." Give me a break, let's not be so absurd.

That word, which I think was maybe a bad choice, was used to name pharmacy. But the Christian ministers seized the opportunity to attack on pharmaceuticals until today. Even today, they still attack medications because they associate with the word *pharmakias*, Greek for *witchcraft*. Absurd association, but it's still prevailing.

Human thought is hypnotic, and being hypnotic, it's absurd, and this is just another example. Just another example.

Why is there an anti-medical attitude in society? Because of that blessed word, pharmakias. And the ministers talking against medications, because they are witchcraft, and the Gospel says we shouldn't be around witches. Gimme a break, right? Give me a break.

Yes, but hypnosis is relentless. Hypnosis makes you move like an automaton and keep going in the directions they have imposed in you permanently. That is why we don't like silence, we don't like to be still, because we've been hypnotized to not be in silence and not be still. All of us, all of us.

Questions or comments? There is a lot to be said about this topic.

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* Hello.

RFG: Go on.

Audience: Georgina asks: S4 sleep occurs during the first ninety minutes of sleep, and after that, does it repeat?

RFG: Sure, S4. When you fall asleep, it's normally in one, two or three minutes. If you take ten or more minutes to fall asleep, it means there's a little problem there. Probably too much coffee or too much chocolate.

So, if after one, two, three minutes, you fall asleep, ninety minutes of S sleep follow. And in that S sleep is stage 4, which is the last part of S sleep, say, at the end of that hour and half, which will last around ten minutes, or fifteen; S4 sleep. Am I answering?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: And that is repeated as many times as the amount of sleep you're getting allows it. If you sleep nine hours, it will happen four times, but if you sleep five hours, it may not happen more than two times. I don't know if I'm answering.

Audience: Yes. Nevertheless, you mention that the S2 stage takes 50% of sleep, right? The fact that the S4 stage doesn't

repeat more times, is that the reason of our proneness to hypnosis?

RFG: Well, that is a good question. I don't know how to answer it because research hasn't been done about that. But, why not? Because if S4 is the stage of restoration and energy, and it's missing, I will have less energy during the day, therefore I will be more...

Audience: ...prone to hypnosis.

RFG: ...prone to hypnosis, and to following the instructions of hypnosis.

For instance, escaping from silence, "You have to do something!" I mean, all the things they have taught me. And who teaches you? Like it or not, our parents, which are the closest, dearest beings. They teach us, they hypnotize us. Then, how do you get rid of it? I don't think it's possible to get rid of it, but it is possible to see it. And by seeing it, you are freer to take decisions. A bit freer. Not completely free from hypnosis, but freer.

To see it, like JK says: "The important thing is to see you are sad." Don't get mad at your sadness, just see that you are sad. Don't say "I am a happy person," like Patanjali proposes. Patanjali destroys the original Yoga and invents the yoga of duality, or opposition. "If you feel sad, think yourself happy." And what does JK say? JK returns to the original yoga. He says: "No. If you feel sad, feel sad." Truth sets us free; stay with that sadness profoundly and look at it. And then sadness—he says—will tell you its own story, and if you look at it well, it disappears. If you look at it in Unitary perception, it disappears.

Audience: When you say it's not possible to be free from hypnosis, but it's possible to see it, it's true. But I think that's exactly why Unitary Perception is so important, because in the fact of Unitary Perception, we are free from hypnosis. Then, if we are constant in the fact of Unitary Perception, of course we are free from hypnosis, unless we plunge into Precinct C again,

where Unitary Perception is not, and all that hypnosis, which is always there, accumulated in memory and all that conditioning, reappears.

RFG: Yes. Because, of course, hypnosis, which is thought, becomes unconscious in Unitary Perception; it doesn't disappear, but it goes to the unconscious. Yes.

Audience: We really live more in contact with reality as it is. That's why there is no influence of that past, as there is when you're not living in the fact of Unitary Perception.

RFG: There is no influence, or influence is seen better.

Audience: Or it's seen better each time it appears, so it doesn't last or manifest in actions.

RFG: Right, you have a greater freedom of choosing whether to manifest it or not.

Audience: That's right.

RFG: Like, for example, when you're in Unitary Perception and a sexual thought comes. In that case, you are who decides what to do. Whether you're going to see it without expressing it, repress it, or give it expression. Then you have more freedom of choice, with more alternatives.

Then, that already implies more freedom, because hypnosis is a prison, thought is a prison, or rather, thought has many prisons.

The prison of nationalism, the prison of belief, the prison of “I have money and you don't, so you will do what I say.”

The prison of... so many more prisons. How many more prisons does thought have? Classes, races, beliefs, nations—all of them inventions of thought—, music; there are people with music plugged into their ears, enslaved by music all day long. If that's not a prison, you tell me what a prison is.

Audience: A cell phone with room for four million songs is out.

RFG: A cell phone with room for four million songs is out. There's not enough time in your whole life to hear them all, that's the good part.

(Laughter).

Your whole life is not enough.

But, being attentive is what allowed me to stop singing “*Brucia la luna in cielo.*” I started singing it because I love it. *Brucia la luna in cielo...* What am I doing, while I could be in peace? It's over. I'm not saying it's an ugly or bad song. It's beautiful.

Audience: Or that you shouldn't listen to music.

RFG: Or that you shouldn't listen to music. What I'm saying is: if you see it and you can be in peace... I prefer peace. Yes.

There are times in which you're so exalted—for example, it's happened to me on my way to work in a sunny morning, I sang “*O sole mio*” in my car. But I was aware that I was in hypnosis, but... since I was so full of energy and full of joy, I sang “*O sole mio.*” But consciously, not in an automatic way. I sang the song, which I really love, by the way. “*O sole mio*” is possibly my favorite song, for its simplicity, and I sang it whole, but knowing that, besides hypnosis, I was doing it to express my joy. The joy of the morning, the seagull, do you know what I mean?

It was on my way to work from here to El Centro. There is huge lake with seagulls. Then, the trip to El Centro, the seagulls, the sun and me, singing “*O sole mio*” inside the car. But it wasn't hypnosis; it was the expression of joy while being aware of hypnosis.

Audience: Question [*from Buenos Aires*].

RFG: Go ahead.

Audience: [*Inaudible*].

RFG: I can't hear you. Come again?

Audience: They're asking if too much stress can affect S4 sleep.

RFG: Stress is cured by sleeping. It means that sleep... the worst enemy of sleep is stress. And that is why Unitary Perception's worst enemy is stress. That's why it is important to lead a life of peace if we want to be in peace in the CPH, or lead a life of peace if we want to be in peace with the patient, or in peace between us. It's a life of peace, not that you'll be in peace after you get up. No, you go to bed in peace, and you go to the bathroom in peace and do all you have to do in peace. Otherwise, when the moment in which you need peace with your patient comes, you won't have peace. Then it's like Paul said: "Look for peace and follow it." It's not that peace will come when you want it: "*click*", no.

If you're stressed, you won't have peace. And we know where stress comes from. From all things... life is stress. Cold, fatigue, radiations, infections...

Audience: Thought is stress.

RFG: Thoughts, worries, stress, stress, stress. Of course that affects Unitary Perception. I don't know if I'm answering.

Audience: Yes. The other question I remember from the written work, is: Is it possible that too much stress and too much thought during the day make dreams invade the S4 stage of sleep?

RFG: Well, I asked William Dement that. He couldn't answer.

Audience: And you mention it in your book too.

RFG: Yes, there are conversations with William Dement that I put in the book. And I don't know if that is answered in the book, but...

Audience: Yes, you said that there are occasions in which dreams can invade the S4 stage.

RFG: Yes. Others say it, because William Dement says “I can't answer that.” But he named another researcher who said there was overlapping of stages, merging of stages. Then, for example, somnambulism is said to happen in S2. But in a person who is very, very stressed, somnambulism may invade the S4 stage and destroy it. But William Dement, judging from the way he told me those things, sounded as if he wasn't convinced.

We have to say a very serious thing about what happens in universities. I was in the university, you are in it now, it can be a *via crucis*. What happens in the university? You are forced to write, otherwise, you can't keep your chair.

I wrote an article about a schizophrenic kid in Miami who could recite almost the whole gospel from memory. It was the only thing I wrote, but I think it's lost now, I don't know if Ceci still keeps that article. But they demanded that I wrote more. So, I held on for three years in Miami as a professor of Child Psychiatry. But the pressure to write was so big that... if I don't have something to write about, what will I write? “Make something up.” That is what happens in the university. They are forced to write, and they make things up!

Interlocutor: Or copy-paste what's already been...

RFG: Copy-pasting and changing some words is very common. That happens a lot with behaviorism. Another author comes along and “this” is now called “that”.

They re-name things and make things up. So, what Dement hinted to me was that, probably, that thing about somnambulism invading the S4 stage was invented just to publish an article. Because there wasn't a sure way of knowing if it was true. [They play a lot with S sleep stages.]

University life is a very difficult thing. In Harvard, 1974 — sorry, 1973—, there was a huge scandal. Research projects with conclusions were already written before starting research.

How do I know that? Because I was subscribed to Time magazine in Argentina. And I found out about the 1973 Harvard scandal thanks to Time magazine, before moving to the US. The conclusions of the research projects were made in Harvard, which is a really famous university, before even starting research. What does that tell us about university life? That there's a lot of fraud there too, sadly.

And now we have Joseph Stiglitz, —2001 Economy Nobel Prize— who tells us: What will the 21st century be like? —Ah, that's easy, I'll tell you in two words: *fraud and plunder*.

Fraud and plunder. He said that in 2001. And in these last nine years, we have seen it to be true. And it's also in the universities, politics, everywhere. Am I answering you?

Audience: Yes, thanks.

RFG: Yes, unfortunately, you can't always trust what comes from university completely, and what doesn't come from university doesn't really deserve attention. Right now, there is a person close to us with cancer, and she's taking a product from Ecuador. Okay. In despair you do anything, but saying that that product is scientific is a quantum leap I am not willing to take. If they ask me if that product is recommendable, what can I say? No, it's not recommendable, because there is nothing that tells us it works. Only when all the experiments with—what do you call that? Compared group? What is the word? Research with groups, right?

Audience: Control group and experimental group?

RFG: Yes, experimental groups have a special name. And there is a way of studying this with groups, and the efficacy of this product hasn't been proven, this Ecuadorian product that a close person with cancer is taking now.

And its efficacy hasn't been proven. So, how come they still sell it? You tell me, but, okay. I'm not going to tell this to that person who's now taking it, which maybe has a placebo effect for that person. Telling her “No, don't take this”, would not be

appropriate, I think. But here, we're talking like we should, right? In a scientific way. No, that product's efficacy hasn't been proven, at all.

Any other question? It's already noon here.

Audience: They have a question over here.

Audience: When you say that S4 starts to disappear after age sixty-five, then, would Unitary Perception be what replaces that S4 in those people?

RFG: Right. How curious that at that age, it becomes permanent in Krishnamurti. Unitary Perception becomes permanent in Krishnamurti at that age. I tell him:

—Was it always constant in you?

He tells me: —No, it came and went, like a tide.

I tell him: —And has it ever become permanent?

I don't know if he told me that it became permanent at age sixty-four or sixty-eight. Yes.

I'm answering your question, right?

Audience: Yes.

Audience: Question: When the depressed person is already taking his medication, does that allow him to go into the S4 stage first?

RFG: Of course. That's why they say... There are people with depression. Books tell you that you must wait three to six weeks for an antidepressant to take effect. But 90% of patients I see get better in the first week. First week. And after three, four days, they're already saying "wonderful, this is wonderful."

The first patient we ever had here. After twenty years without sleeping —listen to this: twenty years without sleeping, then she starts to sleep in three or four days.

I found out because she commented it with my mother-in-law, in a ladies' breakfast. "Yes, after twenty years without sleep, I'm sleeping after only four days, thanks to this great doctor."

So I find out from my mother-in-law before I hear it from the patient, that she was doing well, and that was the first patient of the CPH.

But what I wanted to say is: that's the norm, they generally get better during the first week, even though the book tells you "wait from three to six weeks."

Let's stop here and take a fifteen-minute break. What do you think?

[Fifteen-minute break].

We continue, then, with the second part of Class 3.

The break was a bit long because we got carried away talking about brain research.

But we can now say that we've agreed on a reading for the next homework: "Dialogue on consciousness", which is a dialogue with a coma specialist, and the article about sanctity that I sent last night, which is not the one I sent previously, because it has many addendums.

Those two articles would be good for our homework for the next Class (4).

Well, one day I asked Mrs. Zimbalist: —Tell me something about JK.

And she says: —What do you want to know?

And I tell her: —Something from everyday life, let's pretend we are just gossiping about JK

And she tells me: —Well, what amazes me—Mrs. Zimbalist tells me—is that when JK wakes up, he leaves the room and I

go to make the bed and... there's no need to make the bed, because there's not a single crease in the sheets.

So, it seems he slept in what Yoga is called the *shavasana* posture. The corpse posture, in yoga.

Audience: Which is said to be the most difficult one.

RFG: Right, “stillness is the most difficult movement.” David Bohm. “Stillness is the most difficult movement.” David Bohm.

Well, and that's what JK did when he went to bed. Stillness. But Stillness with a capital S. Stillness with a capital S, because there wasn't a single crease in the sheets, Mrs. Zimbalist told me. And so, it seems that JK2's sleep was complete rest. There wasn't any muscular movement, and it's likely that he was doing what is known in yoga as *shavasana*, the corpse posture. It wouldn't surprise me. I never asked him.

Phylogenetic imbalance between memory, homeostasis and fragmentary perception in the newborn. What does this mean? It means... *phylogenetic* means, the human species, from its beginning. All we can say about the human species from its beginning up to now is the *phylogeny* of the human species. So, if we say *phylogenetic*, it means we're speaking about the human species, but from its beginning.

Then, there is a phylogenetic imbalance (i.e., an imbalance that seems to be as old as humanity) between memory, which starts as homeostasis—i.e., maintaining the balance of temperature, etc.—in the newborn baby and fragmentary perception in the newborn.

So, it seems that everything in the newborn is D sleep, desynchronized sleep, and that S sleep is a more refined kind of sleep that starts to happen as the nerve cords get their myelin sheath. The neuron's axons. The neurons' little tails have a myelin sheath which we aren't born with, but they form over time, and after eighteen to twenty-four months, the whole

nervous system is myelinated, and that's where the S sleep appears more and more each time.

But, at the beginning, everything seems to be oriented towards memory and fragmentary perception. D sleep and homeostasis: maintaining body temperature, balance of sodium, potassium and iron in blood, etc., etc.

It's all there, phylogenetically, that is, from the beginning of mankind, it seems to be that way, undoubtedly, that memory overcomes what will be the basis of Unitary Perception. And that might be the reason we find it so difficult to live in Unitary Perception. Because since we are born, there is a preponderance of memory, a preponderance of C. And if some circumstance, for example, as may or may not be the case, the inversion of poles wiped Unitary Perception from us, it's not so easy to recover it. Luckily, it can be recovered because it is in the brain as a potential function. But it's not so easy to recover it as a permanent function, because phylogenetically, everything is in favor of memory in the neurological development of the human being, from birth.

I always give the example of Doctor Fernandez, some of you might have heard it already. Doctor Fernandez worked with me in El Centro. And this man tells me he went out from the IVC College after taking a course, and he goes out at sunset, driving at the legal speed of sixty-five miles per hour, and crashes against a Coca-Cola truck that was parked across the street. The truck was like this in the street [gestures indicating the truck was perpendicular to the street]. He comes at sixty-five miles per hour and crashes against the truck.

In the hospital, I ask him:

—What happened?

He tells me:

—I don't know what happened. I didn't see the truck.

—But it was right there; red, Coca-Cola. It wasn't overturned. Red. Coca-Cola. You didn't see it?

—No.

And I tell him:

—Let's see, I'm really interested in what happened.

In everything related to perception here. I mean, what made perception fail to the point of not seeing the truck?

He tells me the phrase I wrote down, because I think it is historical. Because I think it proves what we're saying a lot, a lot:

—Rubén, I saw the road as I've always seen it.

Hypnosis.

Hypnosis takes over perception. That means hypnosis is so big, it influences our visual and auditory perception. He saw the road “always empty” and “now it's empty.”

What he didn't see was the Coca-Cola truck. Well, how far can hypnosis go? Hypnosis can reach perception.

Audience: We see with memory.

RFG: It almost cost him his life. What?

Audience: We see with memory.

RFG: So, we see with an 80% of memory and 20% of light. We don't see 100% thanks to light. We see 80% with memory and 20% with light.

Beautiful, beautiful.

Beautiful. What I'm saying is tragic, but I mean, how beautiful it is to understand this and how it is related to hypnosis, of which we were talking a moment ago!

Then, the “I” is a product of memory to give memory continuity. And both, memory and “I”, are the great enemies of

Unitary Perception, because they are hypnosis. What enemies other than hypnosis does Unitary Perception have? None.

Audience: Hey, Rubén, if I may interrupt you. This means a hypnotist is hypnotized and hypnotizing, right?

RFG: Very good, exactly. I'd never thought of putting it that way, but it's accurate. He's using a technique...

Audience: Not that he knows how to hypnotize; he's hypnotized and he does that.

RFG: No, but let's suppose he's based on Erickson. Great hypnotist: Erickson. And that he's using Erickson's technique. He had to hypnotize himself by studying Erickson in order to hypnotize others with Erickson's technique. In that sense, what you're saying is very good under the light of Holokinetic Psychology. It would be hard to accept in any other kind of Psychology.

But, based on the things we're seeing, I think more and more evidence is piling up, right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: That hypnosis stands in the way of seeing these glasses here, on the table. And on top of that, Sigmund Freud, who was a friend of Bernheim's—they were friends, right? And Freud adds this to what Bernheim said (that thought is hypnosis), he adds: "In the first five years of life, we learn 90% of what we know as adults."

What is he saying?

That in the first five years, we have all the hypnosis we're going to carry until we die. That's what he's saying.

And the "I" appears in the two first years. It takes us twenty-four months to incorporate the idea of "I". The concept, the hypnosis of "I".

And undoubtedly, it has many functional things. Language, which is a very good example of hypnosis. If it wasn't for hypnosis, we couldn't have language. Although we have Chomsky, who says that language is predetermined in our neurological structure. That's undoubtedly true, but we're also saying that the baby is born with a predisposition for memory and for hypnosis, more than for Unitary Perception. That is proven too.

Then, the “I”, language and relationship with progenitors: mom and dad. And you have a figure that shows you how that 90% of what we know as adults starts. It starts with dad, with mom, with language and “I.” At twenty-four months, we already say “I.” Then language. At age five, language is complete. The native one, the language you learn at home, in your own country. And progenitors or those who replace progenitors give us the rest. But, in those few words, a very large percentage of what we know as adults is there. Then JK—Jiddu Krishnamurti—comes along and says: “The stream is that which the newborn goes into psychologically.” We're born, and we immediately go into the stream. That is why JK was not to keen on talking about reincarnation.

I mean, when he talked about reincarnation, first he asked: “What is it that continues?”

And if what continues is the stream, which is the collective consciousness of C (the collective consciousness that is in C, that is, in hypnosis), then the newborn goes into that hypnosis, into that stream, into that collective consciousness.

Audience: The dragon.

RFG: The dragon, says apocalyptic John, the dragon opens his mouth in front of the vagina, to eat its product, which is the baby.

Something like that, in a metaphorical fashion, is said by John in the book of Revelation.

Let's see, who wants to answer to this question? Do you, Javier?

Audience: If I know the answer, sure.

(Laughter).

RFG: Question. What is the contact with Holokinesis which is conscious during wakefulness and unconscious during sleep?

Audience: Well, it's Unitary Perception during wakefulness and the S4 stage during sleep.

RFG: Is that clear? It's clear. That's the tremendous importance of sleep research. Sleep research demonstrates that we're talking about something neurological. Built-in. If you buy a radio, the box says "microphone built-in." It's inside the radio, so don't bother looking for a microphone, because it's built-in.

Well, and Unitary Perception is built into us, it's already built-in. That's why the only thing we have to do is rescue it.

And where is it? It's in S4 sleep. It was proven that it's there, and then, in wakefulness, we have to rescue it.

Audience: Rubén, neurologically, what would be the difference between Unitary Perception and the S4 stage of sleep?

RFG: I think there's no difference, you see? It's proven...

Audience: But, I remember you describe how the anterior brain is aware of what the posterior brain is doing.

RFG: Right. The only difference is that the anterior brain intervenes for you to be aware.

Audience: But here, it's at rest, right? It's...

RFG: Sure, and here, there isn't necessarily a connection with the anterior brain. But it is built into us. Because there's absence of words: if you wake up an individual in that S4 moment —which we've done. The S4 sleep starts, you wake

him up. And he's kind of lost, there is no thought, no "I". I tell him:

—Your name?

—Uhhh.

That's right, it's beautiful, because you verify that there's a situation, an aspect of brain functioning in which there is no "I", no memory.

It's easy to prove, all you have to do is wake up a person during S4.

Audience: Is it possible that in a certain moment the person can become aware of the S4 stage, of that energy, even if it is for seconds only?

RFG: Well, not while they're sleeping. But if you insist during wakefulness, yes. If you insist during wakefulness, yes. I couldn't believe what happened with my energy. I couldn't believe it.

I married Cecilia when I was forty-six, and I felt more energy at the age of forty-six than at twenty.

I'm saying this in the name of the most sacred, it's completely true. Then I was amazed, really amazed, that my body was better at forty-six than at twenty. Thanks to what? To Unitary Perception, undoubtedly.

Then, why is depression so serious?

We've said it already, I think you made the question, right? (talking to a participant in the audience) What happens in depression with the electroencephalogram? Straight to D.

S sleep is skipped, no S sleep. Only D sleep. That's how the sleep of a depressed person starts: D sleep. There's no S4, none of the S's. That's why depression is so serious. It's a metabolic problem. Depression is a metabolic problem, just like diabetes.

Diabetes can kill you, it can leave you blind, without legs, but depression won't do you any of those harms. But stress is so high (due to lack of S sleep) that it will bring you all the complications of stress, rapidly. Very rapidly.

Audience: Of course. There's no rest.

Audience: There is no regeneration.

RFG: No rest, there's no rest. Then, there's no S4 and stress grows, with its six complications: gastritis, fall of immunity, hypertension, arthritis, metabolic syndrome, and lastly, suicidal and homicidal ideas.

I don't know if you've been in the United States and seen those bumper stickers that say: "Be all you can be. Join the army."

Now, what is the meaning of a hypnosis like that? What does that mean for a person who believes that? That you'll stay as a caterpillar. That the butterfly is not possible for you. "Come as a caterpillar and be all you can be as a caterpillar." They are denying you any possibility of the butterfly. Because they're telling you what's "all you can be". Whoa! Does that mean they're already telling us that all a human being can be is a soldier? Watch out; is that all a human being can be? God forbid. I know we can be much more than that.

I don't think we can even imagine what the human being can be, the human butterfly. We cannot even imagine. We have examples like Krishnamurti, Jesus, to give us an idea.

But, Jesus said "You can do things greater than those I have done." So he's saying: you can't even imagine how far human development can go. That's what Jesus Christ is saying, two thousand years ago. He said it and it's written.

Now, "be all you can be" destroys all that. All that potential, all those possibilities are destroyed when you tell a person: "Look, you can get up to here, you can be a doctor. That will be your highest glory, that will be your heaven: being a doctor." Watch out! Watch out, because that's not heaven. I mean, the human

being can be a doctor and can also be more, much more than that.

They say the summit of world literature is Hamlet. And there are several characters. Hamlet is a disgruntled prince of Denmark who... —written by Shakespeare, of course, and everything is written in verse, the whole book is poetry. And Hamlet is a disgruntled prince of Denmark who, one day, sees his dead father, the ghost of his father, who tells him he has to kill his mother's new husband (the husband of the ghost's ex-wife). There are lots of implications there, right? That we kill by order of the dead. Because if it wasn't for nationalism, racism and belief, perhaps we wouldn't kill anybody.

There wouldn't be armies or divisions. And all of that is implied in that play. That's why they say it is the Everest, the summit of world literature.

So the dead father (ghost) tells Hamlet he has to kill his mother's new husband.

Well, Hamlet was already disturbed by his father's death, and now he's even more disturbed by the order given by the dead and the killing. And was his mother an unfaithful person? No, mom was now safe with the new king. Because he —Hamlet —was the prince of Denmark and his father had been the king. Now there's a new king who married Hamlet's mother.

And everything is tragic, it's a great tragedy, but there's a very tragic character. Ophelia is Hamlet's girlfriend and she dies almost at the beginning of the play; hypnotized by the families, she commits suicide. She throws herself into the lake, due to the hypnosis of the conflicting families. And what does Ophelia say in Hamlet? She says something like this: “I see all that man could be, but is not.” Look at what Ophelia says. That's why it is a truly magnificent play. That Ophelia, despite her young age, despite the hypnosis that is carrying her to suicide, is capable of saying “Ah, how it pains me to see all that man could be, but is not.” That's beautiful. It's related to everything we've been saying.

A couple gets married. Then along come the fathers and in-laws:

—When? When? When?

—When what?

—When are you having children? When?

Now, are those children a product of that hypnosis, or are they meant to look after us when we're old, or is it to give them our love? Those are three alternatives. Why are we parents? Due to hypnosis from our parents? To have someone to look after us? Out of selfishness? Or is it out of love? Which of the three is true? In each case. That's for each one of us to discover for him or herself.

Is it possible for a soldier to kill in war without lots of hypnosis? No. No. A training is needed. I don't know if you've seen any movie. You tell me if that's not pure hypnosis. The songs you sing. All of them are homicidal songs. “We will kick their...” They're all comic-tragic things to hypnotize you into killing.

Now, can you kill a soldier in war without hypnosis? No. You can't, you can't.

And now, to start delving into Precinct A, I recommend reading that article called “Sanctity,” which is a compilation of things written across a long time. To have a dialogue. It's just to talk about it, and for the study of that Precinct to begin. That's what it was written for. It has no other intention than that.

And we should also talk about the word *fotizo*, which is in the Gospel, and which wasn't translated as enlightenment. Because that's what *fotizo* means. Fotos: light. Fotizo: enlightenment, in koine Greek.

Now, Theognostos, who was one of the monks of Esikia, the path of stillness and silence, defined enlightenment saying: “Enlightenment in an immense peace; it's a gift from God

which doesn't give merit to those who receive it, and which is immense peace and immense energy.” Theognostos' definition of Enlightenment. “A gift from God, gives no merit to those who receive it, and is immense peace and immense energy.” And that's how Theognostos defines Enlightenment. So it's out of grace, it's a gift, not a personal achievement; it's peace, energy and happiness without cause, he also says.

He was one of the Esikia monks. Stillness and silence as a way of life. Stillness and silence was their way of living. Stillness and silence. What we now would call *vagrants*. Hobos..

And can something like that exist, as defined by Theognostos, without a neuro-physiological component? I mean, something must be going on in the brain for something like that to happen. And that's our duty, right? Maybe not ours, since we're doing a pioneering job to start a teaching. But it is a job which will have to be approached imminently. What is the neuro-physiological component of Precinct A?

And “Sanctity,” which I beg you to read for next class, is another thing we should see from the psycho-neurological viewpoint. What happens there? What happens, for example, to a saint? Not a saint like “you're a Saint” because the Pope said so, but people like the one you mentioned. Or the one I saw in Cologne, who was incorrupt. Physically incorrupt after four hundred years.

I saw that in Cologne, Germany, with a German psychiatric residency colleague. Karl Jungmann, from Cologne, Germany. He took me to Cologne's Cathedral, which is famous for many reasons. It is beautiful to walk up that spiral staircase, surrounded by big, empty, triangular windows. And you walk up that spiral staircase and feel the immensity, the sensation of immensity. An architectural wonder.

And this incorrupt person is also there. What neuro-physiological component is there? How can we not study that? If it is possible that incorruptible matter is something that happens inside the brain, will we not study that? Almost three hundred years of science have gone by without us studying

that. Isn't that a crime? It's something that has to be studied. I keep attending Psychiatry congresses and they already know me there, and they know I'm going to say this: it is necessary to study the neuro-physiological component of what is called Sanctification and Enlightenment. And, of course, I'm a "loony."

But we're talking about something very serious. If a man was four hundred years without corrupting, it's necessary to know why. Because that might help us a great deal in our life. It's not because we want to know about that dead person. It's going to help us, in our life, to know what happens in a transformed brain. It's going to help us in our life, before dying.

We already did the exam that was planned for next class today, so we're going to have more time next class.

But well, then, what we've seen in this second part (I apologize for getting carried away and speaking too much downstairs) is:

JK's sleep. What kind of sleep is that? Is he dead there in his bed? *Shavasana*—corpse pose—which doesn't even leave a crease in the sheets.

What happens in the newborn, with such a big imbalance of memory-homeostasis and no Unitary Perception, not even in sleep? It's all D sleep, desynchronized. That goes against the human being's attempt to get closer to Unitary Perception. It means we're more predisposed from birth to memory than to Unitary Perception, watch out.

"I saw the road as I'd always seen it." A proof of the former. We're born with more memory than perception, and the doctor who crashes against the Coca-Cola truck and tells you "I saw the road as I'd always seen it." Is that related to the predominance of memory in the newborn, and with D sleep, as the only sleep the newborn has? Of course it is. And luckily, he didn't die. The car was totaled, but he barely survived.

And then we talked a bit about the "I" and memory. The "I" as a product of memory. That Freud says we learn all our

hypnosis during our first five years. First five years! We're already hypnotized for the rest of our life.

And Krishnamurti says: We're born into that soup of hypnosis—which he calls *the stream*. We can call it the collective consciousness of humanity, also collective unconscious of humanity, as Jung called it. Both the collective conscious and unconscious make up the stream, and into that are children born. All of us.

And we've seen why depression is so serious: because there's no S sleep. And no S means more stress, more complications, the six complications of stress.

“Be all you can be.” All the hypnotic inductions that tell us up to where we can develop. “Oh, I can develop up to *here*.” Big mistake. I mean, all those ideas about “I can develop up to here” are false, because we have no idea of how far human development can go. The human capacity for development is infinite.

And it's in the Gospel, with JesuKristos saying “You will do things greater than those I have done.”

Ophelia, Hamlet's character, my favorite character in Hamlet—which is said to be the greatest literary work—what does she say before committing suicide due to hypnosis? “Ah, all that man could be, yet he isn't.”

And why do we have children?

And killing in war, is that hypnosis?

And after that, a bit about Precinct A, that's why I recommend you to read “Dialogue on consciousness” and the article about Sanctity to make a balance with all this, so we can start discussing Precinct A with the language we have, besides everything we may discover when we start talking about all that has been written about this in a summarized way.

And that was the summary of this second part of today's class.

Yes, I believe there's a lot, a lot to talk about here, that's why I leave more time for dialogue, if you want.

Audience: To “why do I want to have children?” I would add: “Because am I not completely happy and, since I love children, I will entertain myself with a child who can give me happiness temporarily in spite of all this horror”

RFG: In the United States, young girls get pregnant to get the eight hundred dollars a month from social welfare. They have three or four children and get around three thousand dollars per month for those three or four children. So that's a *modus vivendi*, i.e. a way of living, besides what you're saying.

And of course, teenage pregnancy in the US has gigantic proportions, more than any other country. Because the state subsidizes the teenager's pregnancy.

Audience: The biological aspect of memory... is that of common use in science? I mean, because generally, memory is associated to eidetic capacity. So using the word *memory* for biological memory... I don't know if that is common in science.

RFG: Yes. Yes.

Audience: Is it common in science?

RFG: Yes, for example, in a Congress on Genetics, I was (gladly) surprised that the top geneticist who was speaking said... I stood up and said: “Can you define the gene?” That's the kind of questions I make. I asked Skinner: “What is the purpose of your teaching?” He said: “To put an end to sin and error.” And to this geneticist, whose name I can't recall now, I ask: “Can you define the gene?” And he tells me: “Very simple. Gene is the memory of protein synthesis.” Look at that, one of the greatest geneticists in the world, as any great person, makes it easy for you. He who knows—like Bohm—makes Physics easy for you. And this man who knows about genetics, look at how he defines the gene: it's the memory of protein synthesis. Then it clicked. Genetics became clear with that

phrase. Click! All genetics became clearer. And I sat down “Thank you.” I'm still grateful for such an exact, accurate, short and beautiful answer. And I think it answers your question too, because a geneticist himself is defining gene as the memory of protein synthesis. And that's what genes are. A gene is an agent of biological memory, to synthesize protein. Our muscles, our bones, are memory of muscle and bone synthesis. That's what genes are. Besides eye and hair color, etc.

Audience: And where are genes stored?

RFG: In the chromosomes. They're in the cell's nucleus, in the chromosomes, which would be the bus. Genes would be the bus passengers. And chromosomes are the buses inside the cell's nucleus. So, there is a number of chromosomes. Suppose, forty-six and a sexual chromosome X or Y. Then, those forty-six chromosomes are pairs. If you put them under the microscope, you will find pair number one. They are grouped according to their shape. Pair one has a size and a shape. Number 2... Each pair is described as how its shape and size must be. And sometimes you find three chromosomes 21. Among the forty-six, you find three 21's (chromosomes) instead of two. Mongolism. How is mongolism called scientifically? Trisomy of chromosome 21. It's three 21's.

And *Cri du chat*, the children who are born with a cat's cry... Trisomy...

Audience: With what? A cat's what?

RFG: *Cri du chat* in French. It was discovered by a French. I think that's how you pronounce it: *Cri du chat*. The cat's cry.

Audience: Cry?

RFG: The baby who's born and cries like a cat [*imitates sound*]. That is an ominous sign of a child who will have severe retardation. Trisomy of chromosome 18. See, with the chromosome map you can already have an idea.

But more than that, today we have the genome, which is the map of genes, i.e., of the passengers. We have the passengers

map now. Ah, does that mean that by 2020, 2025, we will have the cure for Diabetes, Parkinson's, Schizophrenia? Yes, quite possibly.

Audience: They have already divided the map gene into races.

RFG: Yes, and they are doing gene tracking studies too.

Audience: Yes. Of the black race and...

RFG: Yes, so I know where you come from. Where are your genes from? Turkey? They are even doing that. So, genetics will be of great benefit for humanity in the future world. Diabetes will disappear soon, Parkinson's will disappear, Schizophrenia too. Humanity will be freed from all those genetic diseases.

Audience: But I hope it's not the same as how when they told you that by the time you get married, nobody would work because of the advancements.

RFG: Right. Who will own the genome?

Audience: In whose hands...

RFG: In whose hands will the genome be? Because it's not in the hands of the people, that is, if it remains in the hands of a corporation, it can cause a lot of harm.

So my mother, yes... Cecilia reminds me that my mother would tell me, when I was a little child, when she was washing in those huge bowls, I don't know what you call them...

Audience: Washbowls.

RFG: Washbowls. With a washboard and a bar of soap this big. And she did the washing, there were no washing machines, of course. You call them that way, right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: No washing machines. And I watched her wash the clothes in winter, with that cold, and there was no hot water

either. And she said: “The day you get married”—she was Argentinean. “The day you get married, your wife will not need to do all this, because there will be washing machines and people will have machines for everything. It means people will work only two hours a day.”

So, that was a logical thought, but she didn't count on imperialism's cunning!

Audience: Of power.

RFG: That all of that can be true, but is not, because there are lords who want misery to exist for them to have slaves.

Audience: Two hours, that would be sweet.

RFG: We could be working two hours a day *today*. But, where does all that free time saved by technology go? Where does all that time go? Into the banker's pocket it goes.

Audience: Yes. Genetic and epigenetic memory, besides that repetitive aspect that makes them similar... do they have a biological component in their functioning that makes them belong to the same genus?

RFG: The same...?

Audience: The same genus, being covered by the same name of “memory.” I mean, if the name “memory” is given because repetitive events can happen in genetic memory, and therefore they call it memory... And in epigenetic memory, repetitive events also take place and are thus called memory, or rather, they are called memory because, besides being repetitive, there is a mechanism or some biological aspect that makes genetic and epigenetic memory biologically similar.

RFG: No, of course, it's the same substrate. For instance, I say this in the book *The New Paradigm in Psychology [republished as Holokinetic Psychology]*, perhaps not in due detail, but I say it.

The child is born. Now, why is the child born from a womb at 37°C to an environment like this one, at 23°C or 25 °C? Twelve degrees of difference. And you see the newborn shiver, because he left paradise, and he enters the world and he's shivering, right? Okay, what's the first thing that starts to work there? Maintenance of temperature—twelve degrees of difference—and the baby's body temperature stays at 37°C. What is that? Homeostasis. What is that? Memory. Genetic memory.

Now, that is the substrate of all memory, all memory. On top of that substrate—this is what I say in *The New Paradigm in Psychology*. On top of that homeostatic substrate... you follow?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: On top of that homeostatic substrate, the “I” is born. But it takes twenty-four months. And on top of that substrate of the “I”, add... you name it. “Be all you can be.”

(A participant laughs).

RFG: Right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: And you can add what you want. The prayers we learn, everything. You can add anything you want there.

There was even a very serious dialogue with JK about prayer, and whether prayer is or isn't hypnosis. And Krishnamurti says: “Sir, we don't need to discuss much to realize that it is.” Says JK. Prayer is hypnosis.

But there was a priest there who defended prayer, and he said that a life without prayer was like a person who's missing an arm. And Krishnamurti says: “Sir, if you want to live, prayer has to disappear.” Krishnamurti said that to the priest. The priest's face was red.

Why? Because it's hard for a person to let prayer go. Who finds it hard to let prayer go? RFG. Every now and then, when I'm not feeling so well, there I go with the Lord's Prayer on my back. (Laughter).

Seriously. And then, when you're in a very big tension, will the Lord's Prayer help me? I think it will.

Now, Krishnamurti tells you: "That's just ordinary hypnosis."

And when I'm up to my neck, there are times — we all find ourselves in extreme situations some times, luckily not always. And in that moment: "Our Father who art in Heaven..." right?

So, Krishnamurti tells you: "It's hypnosis" and the priest tells you: "Without that, you're missing an arm," and which of the two is right? And what is it that one discovers in the way?

We have a friend who's going through a very bad situation, and he has returned to prayer. If you ask him if that's good for him, he will say yes.

Then, how do you solve this controversy between the necessity of prayer or prayer as hypnosis? What is the truth in this issue?

Why did Krishnamurti say this with such emphasis? It's even on tape. I was watching this in person, and I also saw the video. And Krishnamurti does this "Prayer? No sir!" [*gestures with hands*]. "Prayer? No sir!" Like this [*gestures with hands*].

Why the emphasis? If Krishnamurti says something with such an emphasis, I pay a lot of attention because you know enlightenment is talking there, an enlightened person is talking. Why such a big emphasis in abandoning prayer?

Audience: It's still an egocentric action.

RFG: First, you got divided: horizontal conflict. "God is there and I am here." So God is not inside. Kristus says "The body is the temple." Ah, it means God *is* inside here. Jesus himself tells you that. Then why should I ask for something over there, over there — "Thy will be done" —, if that's here?

So there's a bunch of contradictions in hypnosis that we have to see. And if you leave those contradictions, you get closer and closer to JK. The less contradictions, the closer you get to JK. Then you realize there's such a thing as the peace of silence. *Esikia*, the path of stillness and silence: the first Christians, who went to the Egyptian desert. In *Esikia*, the path of stillness and silence, there was no prayer. There was only silence and stillness. And they said that that silence was the greatest prayer. Ah... they are Catholic monks talking. Well, I don't know if you can really talk about Catholics in A.D. 300. Rather, Christian. Catholicism appears in A.D. 400, I think. So they were Christian, when Christianity was still only one thing.

Later, the Orthodox, the Catholic and the Protestant appeared.

But, this is a serious subject. It's serious, because you speak with people who take religion seriously, and they give prayer an enormous value.

You've heard about Rasputin, right? Rasputin? Yes. If you don't mind, I will dedicate some minutes to this, because there are no taboo subjects, and I think it's related to what we're saying.

When I was in Russia, I went to a little town called Tikhvin, which was my translator's home town. We arrived, she wanted me to meet her parents, so I went, met her parents, and her father cooked a potato fritter. Everything was really nice, really beautiful.

And she says: "Do you want to know the town?" Okay, so she took me to the hospital, which had an artificial kidney room, to meet the hospital manager. Anyway, a series of things in that town, Tikhvin, which is between Moscow and that big Venice called... Saint Petersburg. It used to be called Leningrad.

And I speak to the hospital's manager and tell him: "Do you know anyone who is very very old?" "Yes!" he says. And we went to speak with an old lady. A married couple, actually, both of them over ninety.

This was in '91, Ceci, right? No, wait, 2001.

Audience: 2001.

RFG: That means, people who were being born in the 20's. And I made them several questions, I asked this old couple many questions; one of the questions is relevant to what we're speaking about now, it's about Rasputin.

—Do you know anything about Rasputin?

—Ah, Rasputin, Our Friend.

I didn't understand a word of what they were saying. This girl was translating me, right? And translating for me.

—Ah, Our Friend.

—What?

—Yes, Rasputin was called Grisha.

—Is that so? What does Grisha mean?

—*Our Friend.*

All of this through the interpreter. “Our Friend? But wasn't he a pervert? How can they call it Our Friend?”

Well, it turns out that the people in that area, where he — Rasputin— lived, the people love him, because he was a man who healed people, healed cows, healed horses. And he went out from the Queen's palace to heal cows, horses and people, by touching them with his hands. And I tell her:

—Wait a moment. What was his name?

—Grisha.

—And what does that mean?

—Our Friend.

I couldn't believe that.

—And where did the name Rasputin come from?

—Oh, yes, that's because one of the counts was homosexual and fell in love with him, then did a conspiracy to kill him, and they killed him. They poisoned his chocolates and then shot him to death.

—Who?

—Our Friend.

—Grisha?

—Yes.

And, since that count owned the newspaper —the only newspaper at that time— and owned the only Rolls Royce in Russia at the time (he was from the economic elite), they nicknamed him Rasputin.

They changed his name. From “Our Friend” to “Rasputin, the licentious.” “Ah ”—I tell her— “so that's how history is written, right? By those who have the money?”

The man was a saint.

Audience: Also because many women were close to him, precisely because they were attracted to him for what he did.

RFG: Right, and the queen. He would heal the queen's son from hemophilia. He touched him and the kid would stop bleeding.

And well, then, we're in the presence of a serious character. Historical, that's why we know about him. And I tell her:

—What else do you know about Rasputin?

—He would never stop praying.

—What?

—Yes. He would never stop praying.

—And do you know which prayer he used?

—Yes, of course, he said it openly.

—What prayer?

—He said that the prayer has two words: *Kyrie Eleison*.

Audience: *Kyrie Eleison?*

RFG: *Kyrie Eleison*. Lord, have mercy on us. *Kyrie Eleison*. I tell her:

—How do you know that?

—Because everyone in Russia knew that he, as a young man, walked from the place he lived in Siberia, reciting *Kyrie Eleison*, all the way to that famous Greek monastery at the top of a mountain...

Audience: Parthenon?

RFG: The Parthenon is a monument to the virgins in Athens. Parthenon means monument to the virgins.

Audience: Mount Athos.

RFG: Mount Athos, exactly, Natzio.

He went all the way to Mount Athos, to the monastery on top of it. On foot!

Audience: From where?

RFG: From Siberia. He walked all the way. He was nineteen or twenty, perhaps. And he went saying “*Kyrie Eleison, Kyrie Eleison,*” “*Lord, have mercy on us, Lord, have mercy on us,*” “*Kyrie Eleison, Kyrie Eleison.*” And he got to Mount Athos. And in Mount Athos, they wouldn't let him go up, because they are very strict. You have to go up in a basket.

Well, in the end they have mercy on him because he wouldn't go. He was there, stayed for several days. "I won't leave this place until you take me up." They took him up, and after I don't know how much time, one or two years that he lived with them, he wanted to go, and the monks wouldn't let him go. (Laughter).

Well, they kill that man and call him "the licentious." Human history.

Now, what bothers me is that a man who healed animals and people, who healed the queen's son, who lived a saintly life — married with children, but a life of a sanctity— gets called "the licentious one."

But a thing that also bothers me if I compare all of this with what JK said, is that he was praying all the time. So, what value did prayer have for Rasputin? A lot, it seems. And why would Krishnamurti say: "Prayer? No sir!" "Prayer? No sir!" Something like that. Or "Prayer? Throw it!". Something like that.

Tremendous dilemma, right? Having all this information... A dilemma regarding prayer is created in me, which still persists, I haven't sorted it out yet, and I still turn to prayer.

If Krishnamurti knew this, he would disinherit me. (Laughter) But well, you know that Krishnamurti didn't leave me any inheritance, but, yes, he did leave the inheritance of the Teaching, blessed be the Teaching.

But, what a dilemma, right? That a Rasputin, who was really a good person, discredited for the reasons I just mentioned, prayed. And JK: "No, sir." It's a dilemma.

Is it that prayer is a good hypnosis like the Ten Commandments? I don't know what answers you have.

Audience: But isn't praying running away? Because, when there is a problem and you start praying, you're kind of running away from that problem.

Audience: Not wanting to see.

RFG: It's true.

Audience: Yes, but, on the other hand, Rasputin prayed, but he did it while walking. So now that's not running away from a problem.

RFG: Yes, yes. You're right. You're right. Thanks.

Yes, this is a very, very serious subject.

Audience: Perhaps *praying* is like the misnomer *meditation*.

RFG: Right.

Audience: And on the other hand, saying “have mercy on us” is not necessarily praying.

RFG: Well, he said that prayer consisted of two words: “Have mercy on us.” “*Kyrie Eleison*,” which is still used in the Catholic church. “*Kyrie Eleison*” is often said in the mass. “*Kyrie Eleison*,” yes.

But he used only that part of the mass, nothing else. “*Kyrie Eleison*,” not even the Lord's Prayer

Audience: But I also wonder how many people pray, say, the “I Believe” or Creed, but only as a repetition...

RFG: But the Creed is not Jesus' prayer.

Audience: Yes, that's where I'm going. When the “Our Father” comes and you attempt it within Unitary Perception, well, the difference also lies in Unitary Perception or merely repeating what they taught me.

RFG: Well, and the funny thing is that, if you read Chapter 6 of Matthew, which is where the “Our Father” or Lord's Prayer is, when Jesus gives it to his friends. He gives the Lord's Prayer and says: “Pray like this.” And once he's given the Lord's Prayer, he says: “But don't forget that before you open your mouth, God already knows what you need.” What? Was this

dilemma present in Jesus Christ himself? Because he gives the prayer and then immediately sets you free from that prayer. We're talking about something serious. It's a dilemma, even for Jesus Christ, it seems, because after the prayer he says: "Don't forget that God know what you need, you don't need to ask for anything."

Audience: Prayer is very tied to the repetitive aspect. Then, today's topic is repetitiveness, memory. But it's also true that sacred literature, that is, literature that deals appropriately or coherently with Precinct A, when you read it, it opens your understanding. Then prayer, besides its repetitive aspect, is sacred literature. So if you say the "Our Father" just like you read Krishnamurti's notes, like the one he called Journal, it's like reading the written work, it's an essential part of life, no longer a repetition.

Audience: And you still need to mention that the Lord's Prayer you're talking about is the properly interpreted one, I believe, which you have written many times, in some parts where you say "Our Father who is in the unknown NOW." That is, it leads to the act of..

RFG: Being here.

Audience: And that's not the Lord's Prayer they transmit, but the Lord's Prayer that...

RFG: When you analyze it, it's telling you: "Stay here and accept God's will." Well analyzed.

Audience: It's the Lord's Prayer, not the one who takes us away, but the one who takes us closer to the act.

RFG: Yes, yes.

Audience: An abandonment to God's will from a functional thought, functional Precinct C.

RFG: And by saying "I abandon myself to God's will," you said a lot of things, implying that the "I" does not intervene. Yes. "It's your will, not mine."

And well, all of these are subjects that I find important for this Course, because, if we're going to delve, as we have to, into Precinct A, we have to start doing it this way, with what we know about Precinct A, based on what has been said about it, and then we will see if we can discover something from Precinct A, right?

And, what is the neuro-physiological component of Precinct A or B? Bohm said a molecular change happens in the neurons for one to be in Unitary Perception, or rather, as a contingency of Unitary Perception, there is a molecular change in the neurons. Perhaps it is better to say it the latter way. Of course. Otherwise, nothing related to human behavior can happen without a molecular change in the neurons.

Audience: In the same way that hypnosis affects the neurons genetically.

RFG: Exactly. There cannot be hypnosis without a molecular change in neurons.

Audience: Exactly.

Audience: All research on neurons has been done with the brain of Precinct C, I mean, if there is a molecular change, that change has never been seen because that kind of brain hasn't been examined, if that is something you'd find there.

RFG: Yes, yes. I would love it if there was a serious research on that brain, once this man dies, but of course, there are so many legal problems to make that kind of investigation, that I'm not sure it is possible.

Audience: It seems the weight of the Inquisition, which was something so terrible, can be perceived today.

RFG: Every time I bring up the subject of Enlightenment, I am either ridiculed or scorned. And you cannot speak about Enlightenment. In India you can, but in Latin America, the times I've tried to talk about Enlightenment, the subject is ridiculed. Not necessarily Rubén is ridiculed, but the subject is. You cannot talk seriously about that subject. I think that is a

grave mistake, to ridicule a subject that I think has a tremendous importance.

I don't know if you have comments in Buenos Aires.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Rubén, the collective is stronger than the individual, right? The unconscious and the conscious too. The collective weighs more than the individual, right? I don't know if it's the right question...

RFG: Yes, yes.

Audience: ...that's what "change is made by all of us" means, right?

RFG: And also, I have an article which I can send you today, if you want, where I analyze that question.

Jung's collective unconscious. Jung said that yes, what he called the collective unconscious was of enormous importance in the individual and collective life of humanity. But there's also a collective consciousness, which is, for instance, state terrorism versus non-state terrorism. That is in the collective consciousness of humanity today: state terrorism versus non-state terrorism. That is the basis of people's fear today, the basis of the invasion of countries, of a thousand things, and that's part of the collective consciousness.

But in the collective unconscious, according to Jung, there are even more things.

I don't know if we're in dialogue.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Yes. In the collective unconscious, there are many more things. For instance, Jung's idea of archetypes, which you use to analyze dreams, and you meet with tremendous surprises and benefits for the person. We have done it, right Cecilia?

Audience: But the collective unconscious is contained in the individual.

RFG: But if you can, say, interpret a dream that translates something from the collective unconscious or the archetypes, you can benefit a great deal from that.

Audience: Ah, yes.

RFG: And that is what this disciple, some people say girlfriend/disciple of Jung, Marie von Franz, said. She knew a lot about the analysis of dreams. It was tremendous, a whole-day seminar. It ended around eight P.M. and I learned... I learned a lot. And we have applied it to the interpretation of our dreams, during our breakfasts as a couple, and it helps a great deal, it helps a lot.

I don't know if there's another question or comment.

Audience: Rubén, could you give one or two examples of what you just said, just to have an idea?

RFG: Okay, well, I don't know if I told you the dream I interpreted... the dream I had in Leadbeater's bed in India.

Audience: Yes, any other example?

RFG: Well, that was a good example. And there are much simpler examples, right? Like a dream, for instance, in which I walk into a shoe shop, and the guy who served me brings me a pair of shoes and I tell him: "Yes, I'll keep this pair of shoes, please bring me more." And there was like ten pairs of shoes, and I say: "Make me a pack with the ten pairs of shoes, so I can go." And that was the dream. So I tell it to Ceci during breakfast, and when we interpret it, the meaning was clear, really clear: we have to leave this place. And we went from Islamabad to Islamabad. (Laughter). But we left, we left, that's when we went to Bakersfield. We ended up moving to Bakersfield.

But the dream was saying "Leave, leave."

Audience: I thought you were going to say "Buy some new shoes."

(Laughter).

Audience: “No, not just a pair.”

Audience: He was so traumatized that, well, just look at his shoes.

RFG: I was so traumatized that I haven't bought shoes in eight years. (Laughter).

Yes, yes, for real. It's funny.

And well, this is, of course, infinite in its implications.

Why did they give such importance to stillness and silence? Gregory Palamas, Paconius. Great personages.

Paconius started the first free monasticism, with no authorities whatsoever. No pope, no patriarch, nothing. Then, I think that's the origin of the nickname *Paco* for the good Franciscan. And things like that. I mean, why did he give such importance to stillness?

I am doing that experiment of being in complete stillness now, most of the time, to see what happens. And things happen, things happen.

Stillness has something very special that you can't discover unless you attempt it: being in complete stillness. And that's difficult if the person has a tendency to action, especially when we were hypnotized, as we were, with “Stop that and do something.” There is hypnosis and a bunch of dilemmas, but, if you take stillness seriously, what happens? Many good things happen. Many good things.

Audience: *Wu wei*. The *wu wei*, as Taoists call it.

RFG: What's that? Ah, *wu wei*.

Audience: Inaction.

RFG: Yes, it's funny that sometimes I like to look for a good movie on the TV, and now I can't find a good movie. *Zap, zap,*

zap, click, I turn it off. And it's happening quite frequently. *Zap, zap, zap, click*, and I turn it off. And I end up remaining still. The same that happens when I start to sing, which I've told you already, and I prefer to stop singing, and so on. Things that happen because I turned to stillness whole-heartedly, because you feel really good with stillness. If you take it seriously, it's something beautiful.

Audience: Isn't it, rather, that life in Unitary Perception is offering a way of living in which stillness is? And not that "I will put myself in stillness to see what..."

RFG: Ah, no, no. Of course not.

Audience: Because that's how it sounded, as if it were the other way round. I think it's the opposite.

RFG: Ah, no, no. What happens is that Unitary Perception, with its peace, makes you fall in love with that stillness of peace.

Audience: Otherwise, it's not possible...

RFG: No, of course.

Audience: ... to really enjoy stillness and have that stillness be a part of life. Because stillness... does not necessarily imply immobility.

RFG: It's not something imposed.

Audience: And it doesn't have to be precisely immobility.

RFG: No, and neither it is "stay still and you will find..." No, no.

Audience: Precisely.

RFG: Attempt Unitary Perception and you will see the peace, and after that, you will want that peace. You will want that stillness.

Audience: We can say that contingencies... are that which is being released, released.

RFG: What's being released?

Audience: Contingencies...

RFG: They are being released, right.

Audience: ...[contingencies of] a life in Unitary Perception causes some activities to be released, which really takes you, in a given time, to that stillness you didn't know before, right?

RFG: Yes, yes.

Audience: And it's becoming more prominent.

Audience: Because there is no effort.

Audience : Uh-huh, yes.

RFG: Yes, stillness, very important. That's another thing that society rejects. Stillness, silence.

Audience: "You're wasting your time."

RFG: "You're wasting your time." A synonym of wasting your time. A synonym of being stupid. A synonym of "you won't say anything when an infamy occurs." No, it has nothing to do with that. Love of silence doesn't mean you will shut your mouth when faced with injustice, no. But love of silence is something else.

Audience: Yes, it's something else.

RFG: Yes. It's not being silent in the presence of injustice; it's learning to be in silence in everyday life, but in Unitary Perception, of course.

Well, it's time to end, and we actually took fifteen additional minutes during the break. I don't know if you want to go on for another fifteen minutes or not.

If there are questions or comments.

Audience: A comment. Regarding the [Lord's] prayer, it calls my attention that it has in something in common with the attempt of Unitary Perception: letting “That” work in us. Opening the door to the sacred.

RFG: Exactly. Not that you're “going there.”

Audience: Exactly.

RFG: But you just open the door and stay in stillness.

Audience: And let That work in us.

RFG: Right.

Audience: That's why, if what sees is all there is, we can try to let God work in us, and let his will be done.

RFG: Even sanctification, in the original Christian literature, was something the Holy Spirit did in you, as long as you remained still and doing nothing. I mean, that's how the process of Sanctification was described. You stay still and let the Holy Spirit do its work.

Audience: The Lord's Prayer, for example, the spoken prayer as they said it, “thy will be done.” That is, “your will be done” and then “give us our bread.”

Audience: Super-substantial.

RFG: All.

Audience: Right.

RFG: Gives us all: *pan* [Spanish: bread].

Audience: Above substance.

RFG: But St. Jerome translates it as: super-substantial. St. Jerome's “Our Father” is: “*Panem nostrum supersubstantialis danos a nobis.*” Literally: “Give us the super-substantial

bread.” It doesn't say “give us our daily bread.” No. It says: “*Panem nostrum supersubstantialis danos a nobis.*” Literally: “our super-substantial bread.” Not flour bread. “Give it to us.” Now, if you analyze this properly, the only concordance that phrase has is when Jesus says: “My food is to do my Father's will.” That is: “Thy will be done.” It means that the whole phrase “*Panem nostrum supersubstantialis danos a nobis*”, only means: “Thy will be done.” Look at that: it repeats itself.

Audience: And that's why silence is hated.

RFG: Right.

Audience: Because silence is what Javier was saying, the end of your own will. And, since psychosocially, we don't expect anything that comes from anywhere other than our own will, we're at the forefront of time-wasting.

RFG: Right, right. Especially in this society based on profit, money, growth and a series of atrocities like that, which make human life nearly impossible.

Suicide rose by 318% in Argentina, I heard this two days ago. A rise of 318% of teenage suicide in Argentina. Good heavens!

Did you hear this in Argentina? What I am saying.

Audience: Yes Rubén, we heard it, and I wanted to comment that there's a game in the Internet that teenagers are experimenting with, called “the hangman” (choking game) in which they tie six knots and put them in around their heads, and supposedly, when they hang themselves playing that game, the knots will untie. That's what the Internet tells them. It's like a series of orders that they have to accomplish. And that happened in Salta, which is the place specified in the article you sent, where there was a rise of 318% in teenage suicide.

RFG: It means we're talking about hypnosis again, right?

Audience: Exactly, and now it spread to the whole country.

RFG: Incredible. Was it the news or the act that spread to the whole country?

Audience: No, the self-choking game.

RFG: The game. The game.

Audience: There are like waves, in which a self-choking game gets trendy among teenagers. It's something that you hear about lately and in several parts of the world: children who play, experimenting with self-asphyxia games to get that dizzy sensation, and many times it ends in death.

RFG: Well, not long ago, Carradine, a famous actor, just died with that game.

Audience: And as I remember it, the figure of the rise was 328%.

RFG: Amazing. Well, well.

Yes, and the article, in the end, said: "Are we building a world where human life is becoming impossible?" That's what the article said. And I found that way of presenting interesting, that's why I shared it: that we're possible making human life... impossible? Well, I think we're close.

Audience: Anti-life.

RFG: An anti-life life. Yes. If there is slavery, if there is misery and if there is permanent war, we're going to create an impossible human life, very, very difficult to live.

Audience: Yes, and also, what I think is: what is the family environment of kids who do such things, following orders from a computer? Where are their parents or family? Who cares for them, and why do they hang themselves as a game? That is, the society in which they are living also leads them into that.

RFG: Undoubtedly, yes, what I'm saying is what the article says, about the relationship between the kind of life man creates with the rise in suicide. It is hyperbolic, a tremendous

rise. And we have to think about the kind of life we make for something like that to happen. Right?

Okay, then, I don't know if you want to end it now, and we'll meet next Sunday at ten, which is two for you, (in Buenos Aires) unless there is another question or comment.

Audience: Yes. No more questions. So, whenever you want, Rubén.

RFG: Then, a hug for everyone in Buenos Aires, see you next Sunday, God willing.

Audience: Very good, thank you very much. A hug

RFG: A big hug.

TOPICS - CLASS 4

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 4 (227)
- THE CONCEPTS OF *KOSMON* AND *OURANON* (227)
- THE WORD CONSCIOUSNESS (228)
- THE PEACEFUL SILENCE OF THE PRECINCT B (232)
- THE *ESIKIA* MOVEMENT (234)
- THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPACE AND CONSCIOUSNESS (231) (235)
- THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SANCTITY AND ENLIGHTENMENT (240)
- THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRECINCT A AND ENLIGHTENMENT (236)
- «OPEN THE WINDOW TO LET THE WIND IN» (240)
- THE NEW DEFINITION OF MIND (242)
- THE INFLUENCE OF PLATO IN CHRISTIANITY (244)
- THE HYPNOSIS OF THOUGHT (246)
- THE FOUR TYPES OF MEMORY (250)
- LAWS OF PRECINCT C (230) (252)
- FEUDALISM IN MANKIND (255)
- THE DISSEMINATION OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (259)
- REDEEMING ONESELF FROM HYPNOSIS (260)
- THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING OUR HYPNOSIS (260)
- READING FROM THE BOOK «QUESTIONS OF STUDENTS TO RFG» (263)

- CREATION IS HAPPENING IN ALL THE UNIVERSE (265)
- THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE BRAIN WHEN PASSING INTO PRECINCT B (267)
- DO WE SEE WHAT IS PRESENT, OR DO WE REPRESENT IT? (268)
- STRESS AND ITS COMPLICATIONS IN EVERYDAY LIFE (268)
- THE IMPORTANCE OF NOT MIXING (271)
- THE NATURE OF FRAGMENTARY PERCEPTION (272)
- THE DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS OF UNITARY PERCEPTION (275)
- EXPLANATIONS OF THE M.E.T.A. PROCESS (276)
- WHY DOES UNITARY PERCEPTION NOT SPREAD MORE? (279)
- DYADS AND TRIADS (281)
- THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEAR AND DESIRE (284)
- DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRAGMENTARY PERCEPTION AND UNITARY PERCEPTION (286)
- THE BUZZING (287)
- THE AURA (292)

CLASS 4

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, August 15th, 2010.

RFG: Hello. We begin the fourth class of the Sunday Presential Course, as always, remembering the division between man and man, between human beings and human beings, and the fact that we're contributing with *the* solution to the growing human suffering, which is Unitary Perception.

Today we'll go over our homework, which was to read "Sanctity and Consciousness." We will begin with the concepts of "Kosmon" and "Ouranon." In Greek, "Kosmon" means, of course, "cosmos," the order in which all the stars and the whole universe are, in Greek. There is another Greek word, "kaos," which also means the universe, but in disorder.

The word "Ouranon" in Greek means "the Kingdom of Heaven..." Well, actually it means "Heaven" and "Basileia tou Ouranon" means "the Kingdom of Heaven." Now, Kosmon is ruled by Satan and his angels, his fellow angels, because he is an angel too. Ouranon is ruled by God and JesuKristos.

It's important that we know that in these two words we already have the code, the key to the New Testament. We have the first mistranslation: "Kosmon" gets translated as "world" and we get into a problem, because "world" is a very narrow translation of the word "Kosmon." Not that there's no Greek word for "world." There is the word "oikoumenes" which means "world," so it's not that they lacked a word, it was simply mistranslated. Accidentally mistranslated.

Nowadays, we have wild theories, like saying that JesuKristos came from Andromeda and that's why he had powers and all that, which is against the original word "Kosmon," because the whole material cosmos is ruled by Satan, therefore Jesus

couldn't have come from Andromeda, unless we translate “Kosmon” as “world,” and have the world be only planet Earth, and all that man has done on planet Earth is the world, right? I insist, there is a wrong, reductionist translation there, which can lead to very bad interpretations and banal, fantastical theories, like JesuKristos coming from the star Andromeda. “Ouranon,” the “Kingdom of Heaven.”

Let's start with Javier... Any comment or question about Kosmon and Ouranon?

Audience: So far, no questions.

RFG: Eduardo?

Does anyone have a comment or question about Kosmon, Ouranon or this article about sanctity?

If there are no questions, we will continue with “consciousness.” The word “consciousness” still lacks an appropriate definition in science. The dialogue about consciousness was with a colleague in Arcadia, near Los Angeles. She is a specialist in coma. What we can say from the start is that we're suggesting the brain works completely in ABC, and we only know C. That there's also a consciousness in Unitary Perception and another consciousness in fragmentary perception. “B” consciousness is Unitary Perception, and the consciousness of thought is fragmentary perception.

Now, from the etymological viewpoint, the word “consciousness” means “to be aware of everything together,” which would make it a synonym of Unitary Perception, and then it wouldn't be compatible with fragmentary perception, but since there's not a definition of consciousness, we say that there is a consciousness in the fragmentary perception of thought, and another consciousness in B, or Unitary Perception.

We've also said that there are two forms of intelligence: one that is measured with the intellectual quotient (IQ), e.g., with the WISC-III test, the intellectual quotient that is measured belongs to Precinct C, to the META process. That is—let's put

it this way— the intelligence of the META process or Precinct C, which can be measured, for example, with a WISC-III test. Wechsler III.

The intelligence of B, Unitary Perception, is actually the capacity we all have of recognizing when we need thought and when we don't, so we can be in the blessing of Unitary Perception. That is before you can live in ABC, living naturally in the three precincts.

In coma there is no ABC; in coma there's a minimal brain functioning, and there is only homeostatic C, which is the minimal form of Precinct C. The most primitive form of Precinct C functioning is homeostasis: maintenance of temperature, chloride, sodium, red blood cells. Life is reduced to that very basic, minimal level of Precinct C when a person is in a coma, the minimal functioning of the brain in Precinct C. There is no B or A. Neither is there consciousness even of Precinct C.

We've spoken about sleep. We said that in S4 sleep there is the counterpart in sleep of Unitary Perception in wakefulness. It means that in wakefulness we have Unitary Perception, and in sleep we have Unitary Perception in what is called S4 sleep. Then there is D sleep, de-synchronized sleep, which is the sleep of dreams, which is where infarctions may occur, or duodenal perforations, etc.

In that article, “Dialogue about Consciousness,” it's also implied that “meditation” is not a good word, and there are thousands of meditation techniques. In India there is a guru in every corner—I saw this—each of them with his own meditation technique. In that article there is something interesting, or rather, less easy to comprehend perhaps: that the mind is not only in the brain and that *what sees is all there is*. I.e., the mind is *what sees*. *What sees* is not Rubén with his eyes; the mind is what sees. The mind is not only in the brain; the mind, like matter and energy, is what constitutes the universe, therefore matter, energy and mind are universal. Then, the mind cannot be only in the brain. So the mind does not need the brain, just like sodium doesn't need the brain.

Oxygen doesn't need the brain; it is the brain that needs oxygen to work, it is the brain that needs sodium to work, and the mind functions *in* the brain, as it functions in the whole universe.

Does the brain produce sodium? No. Sodium participates in many chemical transactions or reactions in the brain, just like oxygen, like glucose. But the brain doesn't produce oxygen, sodium or glucose. It makes use of them to work. The same thing happens with the mind. The brain does not produce mind; the mind works in the brain.

I don't know if we made, in that article, an allusion to Romans 13:11, where Paul says that “waking up is more important than believing.” That is in the New Testament. Despite the fact that today the emphasis is put on believing, the New Testament itself emphasizes waking up and not believing. We say that there is a second awakening which is Unitary Perception, a second awakening during wakefulness, which is Unitary Perception. We also said that there are five thousand Christianities with a “c,” and many of them are very far from the original Kristianity (with a “k”) of JesuKristos; we said that there are at least five hundred Buddhisms, that there are thirty-two psychologies, all of which shows the fragmentary perception of thought.

The ear doesn't see and the eye doesn't hear. I mean, in that way, we can understand that Precinct C doesn't do what Precinct B does. Just like the eye doesn't do what the ear does, Precinct C cannot do what Precinct B does. They have different laws. We already know what the laws of Precinct C are: cyclicity, repetition, duality, unconsciousness, incoherence, etc. I don't know if I'm forgetting any of them.

In C, which is the cradle of fear, anger and sadness, in C there is a fear of B, which is fear of the unknown. That's why we say that C is the worst enemy of B, because B, as I see it, is what JesuKristos called “metanoia,” which can be properly translated as “to go beyond all the known,” and that might cause fear. Even when they say—as they have been saying for the last twenty-five hundred years—that you shouldn't be afraid of that mental transformation that takes us beyond the known,

which is the greatest blessing. The fact of moving to a different form of brain functioning and to a new way of living without fear, anger or sadness, is still feared.

Another thing implied in that article on consciousness is that... let's say we have water. This water here [*holds a glass of water*] is not imaginary. We can drink it [*drinks from the glass*] and quench our thirst, but if someone tells me “water” and there's no water, I have to imagine water. With that imaginary water, I cannot quench my thirst. So we have non-imaginary water that quenches thirst, and imaginary water that doesn't quench thirst.

Krishnamurti insisted on that until the end of his public talk in Madras. He said: “The word microphone is not the microphone,” alluding to what we're saying: that there are imaginary realities and non-imaginary realities. God may be something imaginary, and if it's something real, if it's something non-imaginary, then we have to discover what it is. But “the word 'God' is not God,” JK said, because the word “God” is only an image of God, and the first Kristian commandment tells you not to make images before God.

Another thing we talked about in that dialogue on consciousness was that consciousness without time is the consciousness of B. The consciousness of Unitary Perception is timeless consciousness. Consciousness does not need space. In the head of an ant there is consciousness, and those ants, which are very numerous, seem to live in a collective consciousness that allows them to eat a whole cow in minutes, less than half an hour; i.e., there is a consciousness of the ant that exists in that tiny ant head, which shows us that consciousness and space are not related concepts, and also that a collective consciousness can exist in the human being—there is a collective consciousness that JK calls “the stream”— and that, besides collective consciousness, when the ego, let's say, surrenders its defenses, there can be a group mind. Group mind is not B, it's also C, but a very fine form of Precinct C functioning, group mind, which is, of course, overlapping of memories. John with his memories overlaps with Peter with his memories, and there is a relationship in group mind. That

happens as the first contingency of the person who takes Unitary Perception seriously. Even if this is not B, it is a contingency of B.

In Precinct B there is a great peaceful silence; that's the fundamental feature of Unitary Perception: a great peaceful silence, which is what you perceive if you're looking at the sky at night. The night sky is not Prigogine's chaos, but rather, it seems to be the cosmos, the universal order, or at least, human beings can only perceive universal order there. If there is disorder in the universe, a human being won't perceive it in his garden at night, looking at the sky in darkness, but in Unitary Perception there can be a great peaceful silence in contact with the cosmos, in order. Peace.

Those are the fundamental implications of this assignment. I don't know if you have seen more in the dialogue, or if you have questions or comments.

Audience: About intelligence... intelligence as in—not the intelligence of Precinct C... But, to distinguish when to use C and when not to use C.

RFG: Essentially, how does the intelligence that is not from Precinct C act?

Everything we can say about Precinct B is summarized in that it doesn't follow the laws of Precinct C. But, being a new discovery, it is likely that Precinct B has laws we still don't know. There is a very old dialogue between Stokowski, who was a famous musician during the 20's and 30's of the last century, and JK. He has a dialogue with Stokowski in which they talk about intelligence, inspiration and intuition. But it is obvious that JK uses a language that he later stopped using, and in that dialogue, JK implies—if he doesn't say it, he implies it—that a musician's inspiration is compatible with a high level of intelligence only, and in that high intelligence level is also intuition, which is almost like group mind, only when it's intuition and not other things (that I describe in my work). I mean, “I don't like that person because my intuition tells me bla, bla, bla, bla,” and it turns out it's only racism, for example,

or ethnic prejudice, and God knows how many other forms of human division.

But the words *intuition*, *inspiration* and *intelligence* have given much to talk about. Krishnamurti himself changes his language since 1927/28, when he has this conference, this dialogue with Stokowski, until his final talk in Madras, 1985. In those sixty years, Krishnamurti transforms his language, although it continues to be a simple, everyday language. He keeps using the word *mind* with three meanings, which can lead to a lot of confusion, although generally, when he says *mind*, he is usually talking about thought. All of this can lead us to confusion. But if we define the intelligence of B as something that, fundamentally, allows us to know when to think and when not, we have a very big understanding of the intelligence of B, because that lets us understand thought is not permanently necessary, and that is an act of intelligence in itself: understanding that thought is not permanently necessary. It is only necessary for twenty or thirty minutes a day, when you think a lot.

So, when to use thought? Seldom. When to live in Unitary Perception? All day. It is a form of intelligence. But I think the laws of intelligence in Precinct B are still far from us, we're far from understanding them. Or the very movement of Precinct B with its laws, I think that's still far from us, except for what I already said we know about B: what it is not. Precinct B is not repetitive, not cyclical, not egocentric, not dual, not hypnotic. It's not temporal, because time isn't there; it's irrelevant. Neither is it unconscious, it's purely conscious, and it's not incoherent either. So we're beginning to understand what Precinct B is through the negative way, using Krishnamurti's language. The negative way means "what it is not," rather than what it is. We know more about what it [Unitary Perception] isn't than about what it is. I don't know if I'm answering.

This issue is under-studied in psychology and psychiatry, because it's a difficult subject and there are no clear definitions of the word *consciousness*. The first acceptable definition of the word *intelligence* was that of Binet, but he's talking about the intelligence of Precinct C: the capacity of achieving a goal,

i.e., a simple definition, but it gave rise to Binet's test, and then to Wechsler's test, etc.

Another thing which is related to all this... I think the movement of *esikia* is worth remembering: free monks, monks who were independent from any Pope or patriarch, who lived freely, but alone, who had made silence and stillness a way of life. It's known in the dictionary –if I remember correctly– as *hesychasm*, with an “h,” but I've seen it mentioned as *esikia*, with no “h” and with a “k.” Stillness and silence as a way of life, that's a form of consciousness.

What is the neuro-physiological component of enlightenment? There has to be one. There has to be, in an enlightened person, or a saint—not a saint because the Pope said “this guy is a saint,” no, but a saint, i.e., that person who separates from the world to live a life of complete peace in love. So there is a definition of sanctity, which I just gave you. What is the neuro-physiological component of that person who chooses to live a life apart from the world? I think there's a saying in Spanish, if I remember correctly, that says “*Entre santa y santo, pared de cal y canto*” – “Between a she-saint and a he-saint, a wall of lime and stone.” It means that there's a necessity for separation, loneliness in sanctification.

Something that JK emphasizes a lot when he calls us to live True, non-imaginary Life, is exactly that: that we're alone, that we don't depend on anybody to live that life. That someone can teach us that life; we can have dialogues about that life, but it depends completely on us, individually, to live it. How much further will we continue with national circles, religious circles and all the circles of conditioning that make our life...? That depends on us. Or the circle of family as a center of isolation, that family in which all members take a picture together and “we are the Pérez, and we're different to all the other people in the world,” better and all the rest, so family becomes a form of isolation too, instead of being society's cell, a society of tenderness, of peace.

So, what is the neuro-physiological component of that saintly person who lives in peace and love, who lives far from a life

based on profit, money and all that? We have no idea what the neuro-physiological component is, but without a doubt we must have it. I think Holokinetic Psychology gives us the basis to discover the neuro-physiological components of enlightenment and sanctity, which are different things.

(Short pause).

I don't know if you have questions or comments about this, before moving to the subject of "I" as a product of thought and one of the super-productions of Precinct C.

Audience: A participant here [*Buenos Aires*] says he didn't understand the relationship or lack thereof between space and consciousness, when you talked about the ant.

RFG: Right, let's say, you can park a car in space B4. The car is parked there, in that space.

You can park your car in B4, but you can't park your consciousness anywhere, you can't park consciousness anywhere, because consciousness is universal. That would be like saying we can park the stars in B4. No, no; stars don't have a parking space; they belong to the universe, intelligence belongs to the universe and matter belongs to the universe. So we need to start from this universal comprehension to understand the mind, to understand matter and to understand energy. The brain is matter, mind and energy, all of which is universal, not only cerebral. I don't know if I'm answering why there's no relationship between consciousness and space. Am I?

Audience: Yes, thank you.

A participant here has a question: can you explain the difference between sanctity and enlightenment? And the neuro-physiological component?

RFG: Yes. Sanctity...

Audience: And the neuro-physiological component?

RFG: Well, we still don't know the neuro-physiological component. I say that Holokinetic Psychology is in a privileged position to explain the neuro-physiological component at some time, with things like that, when we understand more about these subjects we're discussing, enlightenment and sanctity, of which we only have vague definitions and allusions. Of course we don't mean the enlightened John Doe, who claims to be enlightened, or Saint so-and-so, who was sanctified by the Pope—no; we're not talking about that. We're talking about true neuro-physiological states that manifest as physical and psychological incorruptibility.

As I see it, incorruptibility begins with your pocket. I mean, what a person does with his or her money: that will tell you if that person is corrupted or not. What they do with their genitals is not what makes people corrupt, but what they do with their money.

Now, the saint and the enlightened one have very few thoughts about money, to begin with.

What is a saint? A saint is an incorruptible person, who has been defined as someone full of love and peace, who may or may not devote his or her life to teach that to other people. Because there's the saints who isolated themselves and the saints who began to prophesy, to speak. In that ecstasy in which they live, they go out to talk about what they are living, to spread it.

An enlightened person is something different. The definition we have—the first of all—comes from Theognostos, around 300 or 400 A.D. Theognostos, who was one of the monks of *esikia*, those monks who went to live alone, in stillness and silence, without any authority. Most of them were in Egypt, in the desert of Egypt, and they wrote a book called *Philokalia*, *the Love of Beauty*, beauty as something universal too, not as something particular. Theognostos says that enlightenment is a gift from God and doesn't give any merit to the enlightened person, because, being a gift from God, it's not something that person has earned with his work and effort, but something that

came to him because he was extremely lucky. What came? That gift which is great physical energy, immense peace and...

Audience: Joy for nothing.

RFG: Joy for nothing! Immense peace, joy for nothing and great energy. That trinity that defines enlightenment comes from Theognostos, around 400 A.D.

Now we have a starting point to know what enlightenment is, or at least to study it. It has differences; we're talking about Precinct A, right? Within Precinct A, enlightenment is one thing and sanctity is another thing. That means, inside Precinct A there are modalities, and sanctity would be one of them, possibly something that you have to earn, possibly having to do with some sort of discipline. Enlightenment, on the other hand, is something that comes contingently, as a gift from God.

Am I answering?

Audience: Yes. So, enlightenment does not necessarily imply sanctity in a person. Not necessarily, then?

RFG: Not necessarily.

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: Yes; Javier says that enlightenment does not imply sanctity in a person. Of course not, because enlightenment is a gift from God, while sanctity is something that can be defined mainly as: that person who lives in love and lives in peace, who may or may not teach, may or may not isolate him or herself from what we call "the world," and has a very special relationship with money, which is very different from the relationship most people have with money, and this is considered by many as the basis to understand sanctity: relationship with money.

In the Catholic Church, you know that you must take votes to enter a monastery: chastity, poverty and obedience. It means that poverty seems to be... poverty (of money) seems to be a *sine qua non* condition, that is, an indispensable condition to be

in sanctity. Having renounced profit, having renounced money, at least the excessive money that goes beyond covering our necessities.

We're in a dialogue. Are we answering?

Audience: A question, then: can we link mental Precinct A with enlightenment? Can they be synonyms?

RFG: Not synonyms, but I say that Precinct A...

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: What Karina is asking is whether we can say that Precinct A equals enlightenment or sanctity. Actually, what happens is that Precinct A seems to be something too large and too far beyond words, but we have at least two things about which we can start to talk. Why? Because those things have been already defined and talked about a great deal: sanctity and enlightenment, which could help us begin to understand, in words, what Precinct A is. Despite Precinct A being something very big, not in size but in its dimension: something universal, something that transcends the human being, but also something which is, as the mind, in the brain, like oxygen is in the brain, *in* the brain, something which has a cerebral component that we have to study. Holokinetic Psychology is in privileged conditions to study not only the intelligence of B, but also Precinct A.

What little we know about Precinct A is what little we know about sanctity and enlightenment. That's why we're talking about this, to see if we can start having an idea of what Precinct A is, at least an idea. Precinct A is related to love, to peace and to an energy and a joy for nothing that are very unusual, very unusual in everyday life.

So, now we have at least four fundamental things to begin to understand what Precinct A is.

The Catholic Pope says that the purpose of human life is to understand what sanctity is. JK says that it is necessary to de-condition ourselves from everything we were conditioned with

from birth, to begin to understand That—he said—, which is Precinct A, i.e., the Sacred, which is also a form of life that each one of us has to discover and it can't be imitative, therefore it can't be taught by anyone; you have to discover it for yourself. So we're in a solitary precinct that is paradoxically related to communion. How is it possible that in Precinct A we're alone, that no one can teach it to us, but still it is, if we can put it this way, the “place” of communion?

But... what? Am I alone or in communion? Precinct A is communion, but we have to understand that it's something solitary in the sense of nobody being able to take us to Precinct A but ourselves; so you're alone in Precinct A and and you can't depend on anyone, because you're the only one who knows what you are, the only one who knows what your relationship with money is, only you. What relationship do we have with our house? JK says that in “The Stream.” There is a paragraph in the article “The Stream” that struck me, where they talk about the collective consciousness as an obstacle to understanding Precinct A or the sacred. JK says something like: “as soon as I place my hand on the door handle, to open my car... am I the car? Because if I'm the car, then I'm lost.” It means I'm quite far away from Precinct A.

“What relationship do we have with things?” says JK. What is our relationship with the house in which we live? What is our relationship with one another? What is our relationship with ideas? Are we completely swept away by a fascinating idea, or are we able to see it with moderation, with care, with sense? Nature; what is our relationship with nature? All of this is related to Precinct A, but that's not the only thing that Precinct A is.

So, the two things that JK emphasizes are: complete self-deconditioning, complete freedom from the past; and not depending on anything we have been told about the sacred, so we can discover it by ourselves. That means, if we want the love of Precinct A and the peace of Precinct A, we should ask ourselves, if we're not in peace, why we are not in peace. If we don't feel love, we should ask ourselves why we don't feel love. That is the teaching of JK in a nutshell, in a few words.

But we're alone; we have to insist on this, that we're alone. Nobody can tell you what your relationship with money is, or what your relationship with peace is; only you can know that. That is what JK is saying.

On the other hand, many organizations, e.g., of the gurus, tell you "Look, the guru will give you the first initiation, and it will cost you two thousand dollars. And he will give you the second initiation for five thousand dollars." All that is, of course, totally corrupt, because nobody can give anything of Precinct A to anyone. I insist, only each one of us knows what his or her relationship with the sacred is.

I don't know if there are questions or comments about this, either here or in Buenos Aires.

(Pause).

No questions or comments?

Audience: [*In Buenos Aires*] No.

Not here either?

Audience: To delve a bit into what we were just saying... enlightenment does not imply being a saint, but it does imply, in terms of Holokinetic Psychology, the constant attempt of Unitary Perception.

RFG: The constant attempt of Unitary Perception seems to be the fundamental contingency for that gift to come. As JK says, "open the window and let the wind in." The wind would be the sacred, enlightenment, for instance. How do we open the window? By listening to all the sound at the same time and feeling the weight at the same time. That is to open the window to the sacred, e.g., enlightenment. JK repeats that frequently. I don't know if I'm answering.

Audience: Yes.

Audience: A question over here [*from Buenos Aires*]: what is the relationship between merit and sanctity?

RFG: Some people, not everyone, say that sanctity won't come without a merit, unlike enlightenment, which is a gift from God, so the enlightened one doesn't have any merit there, because it came as a gift from God. But in sanctity, there seems to be a merit, a necessary discipline. Let's say that, if you need to be thin in order to be a saint, then I'm doomed (laughter), I am sentenced to death. It means that you do need a discipline, for instance, staying thin, a minor thing, but still important: to stay in a weight that is... below metabolic syndrome. If that really is a condition, then it's a merit, because you need a discipline of feeding and exercise. However, many Buddhist writings in which sanctity is discussed, say such a thing is not necessary, no discipline is needed.

Krishnamurti speaks about discipline in a rather peculiar way. At the beginning of his message, before 1940, he gave a great deal of importance to discipline, like being thin and eating properly, for instance. After 1940, I don't know if he takes away importance from all that, but he speaks about discipline as the capacity of learning, not so much as striving to be thin, to be a vegetarian or whatever. He even says it's not necessary to be a vegetarian for That to come to you, for the sacred to come to you.

There are, then, conflicting opinions about the relationship of sanctity with discipline and merit. There's a school or movement that says you need a great deal of discipline to be a saint, while there are others who say discipline is not so important, that the important things are stillness, repose and love. Love and peace. They say love and peace are more important for sanctity than any physical or mental discipline; mental techniques and all that are secondary. We have to know that conflicting opinions exist about sanctity.

What discipline did Saint Francis follow, for example? Apparently, none, except that he wouldn't touch money. That was his discipline, not touching money, which brought him countless problems, of course.

Is any kind of discipline necessary for sanctity? If discipline is the capacity to learn, then it seems there's something you have

to learn for sanctity, and if it's related to the merit of living an incorruptible life, that's important too. What does that have to do with money? Debatable. But it seems that abundance of money is incompatible with sanctity in most religions and most of the writings about the subject. Krishnamurti says you need a certain degree of uncertainty, of being in the unknown, of living in the unknown and going from the unknown to the unknown for the sacred to come. Because if you go from the known to the known, you will miss the sacred. JK repeats that a lot.

Any question or comment?

Audience: Are you trying to say that discipline, if there is need for it to arrive at sanctity, would be the consciousness of B, being in Unitary Perception?

RFG: Right. It seems the only absolute (that's not the word Eduardo used) requirement is Unitary Perception, in this path to sanctity or in the fact of sanctity. Unitary Perception. My question is: is Unitary Perception sanctity? Because if we're in Unitary Perception, peace is with us, and if you see without words, what happens to me whenever I look without words, be it at my wife or my dogs, when I watch without words, there is nothing but love; when you see without words, only love pours out. So, is Unitary Perception sanctity? That's my question, that's my question.

Any other question or comment?

What is sanctity's greatest enemy? For Rubén, it is Rubén. For Karina, it is Karina (laughter). I mean, the greatest enemy is the "I": that which carries our name. It's a product of thought. The "I" is not what thinks, but a product of thought. The "I" can't do anything, because a product of thought can't do anything. A unicorn can't do anything; it doesn't even exist.

In the definition of mind, the "I" applies only to the first two parts of that new definition of mind, the one that describes Precinct A. Let's go over the definition of mind in Holokinetic Psychology: mind is the result of the interaction between the

organism and the environment from the uterus until death. That is Precinct C, which ranges from homeostasis to the formulation of Holokinesis by Bohm. It ranges from the minimum to the maximum, as a product of thought. So the mind is that, Precinct C, but it's also Precinct B, it's also Unitary Perception, which is the conscious contact with Holokinesis. The "I" or "self" belongs to that result of the interaction of the organism with the environment.

Are there different selves? Of course there are. The self follows the laws of Precinct C, and it is not far from egocentricity, not far from temporality and not far from hypnosis, because it is a product of hypnosis. Even if the "I" can't do anything, it's a product of hypnosis.

In Holokinetic Psychology, we say there is only one space. If we say there are two spaces, e.g., Mexico and the USA, that's a product of thought. Mexico and the USA are two products of thought, whether we like it or not. There is only one space in which Mexico and the USA are.

There are two orders, two orders: the *implicit* and the *explicit*. (We will delve more carefully into this later). There are three times: Newton's *absolute* time, Einstein's *relative* time and David Bohm's *irrelevant* time. There are three Precincts of the human mind: *Precinct C*, the one we know, in which we live and die. With a bit of luck, study and dialogue, we can understand that other precinct of the mind that is *Precinct B*. The mere existence of Precinct B seems to be enough for the advent of...*Precinct A*.

The brain can begin to work in ABC, in a complete way, which is, without a doubt, the only way in which mankind can get rid of the countless problems it has gotten into by inventing conflicts, inventing divisions.

Now, Plato had a strong influence in Christianity, with things that are completely incompatible with Kristianity. The influence of Plato in Christianity, which reached Europe with the invasion of Spain by the Moors, the Arabs, who were

experts in Plato... —because Plato was Greek, but the only ones who read Plato's books were the Greek and the Arabs.

So the Arabs reach Europe—the Muslim invasion of Spain was back in the 600's—and they settled there for eight hundred years.

Audience: Until 1492.

RFG: Until 1492! (laughs) When Torquemada convinces Queen Isabel of expelling all the Arabs from Spain to keep the Catholic faith pure. But in those eight hundred years, there was a great influence, people like Averroes, they were all Platonic. They influenced Christianity strongly, especially the Hispanic Catholicism. Sometimes in Christianity you see more from Plato than from Kristus himself (with a k). The idea of “platonic love” and all that has nothing to do with JesuKristos. The idea of “soul” doesn't seem to have much to do with JesuKristos; it rather comes from Plato, brought by the Arabs.

Now, what's wrong with Plato? Nothing, except that Plato founds the Academy—he was a very wealthy man—he founds the Academy and that Academy lasted for nine hundred years, I think it went from the year 300 before Christ to around 600 or 700 A.D. Plato's Academy. So it lasted as long as the Roman Empire. Plato had a huge influence as a thinker. What did Plato say, among other things? And his disciple Aristotle, who was one of Alexander's teachers?—which is important because Alexander invaded the whole known world of that time. From Europe he reached the doors of China and the north of India. Everything belonged to Alexander.

Alexander was highly influenced by Aristotle, but luckily he had another teacher who was called Aristandro, about whom I wrote, who teaches Alexander something that neither Plato nor Aristotle taught: that there are no hierarchies. Plato and Aristotle were full of the idea of hierarchy. They would, for example, take hierarchy to a universal level: “The Sun is a level of being, therefore the Moon is lower than the Sun.” Then, it's not a coincidence that Francesco Bernardone de Asissi, St. Francis of Assisi, said “brother Sun” and “sister

Moon.” He didn't say it just because; he said it to break the Platonic idea of hierarchy. That the Sun is not more important than the Moon, and the Moon is not more important than the Sun, and Rubén is not more important than Cecilia and Cecilia is not more important than Rubén. In other words: brotherhood.

Brotherhood means what? According to Krishnamurti, “brother” means there is no “I.” For us to be brothers, the “I” must cease, said JK. The “I” is the one who invents hierarchies to give itself importance.

So, careful with saying the Sun is a level of being superior to that of the Moon. That's Platonic, Aristotelian. Alexander tried to put an end to all that and he forced his generals to marry native women, especially Persian women, who were the great enemies of the Greek. Alexander's generals were deeply influenced by Aristotle (Plato's disciple) and by the idea of hierarchy, and that “we're much more than these women, why would we marry them?” That seems to have been the reason why the generals killed Alexander at the early age of thirty-four, because they didn't want to drop the idea of hierarchy, which is what Alexander wanted: the end of hierarchy and the union of mankind in love.

Luckily, this gives Kristianity a great help to spread around, thanks to the dissemination of the Koine Greek language by Alexander the Great, and thanks to his idea of non-hierarchy.

So Kristianity—the original Kristianity, a Kristianity without hierarchies, the Kristianity of communion, not the Christianity of popes and cardinals. That is Platonic. The original Kristianity spread throughout that territory that Alexander had conquered, thanks to Koine Greek. That is the origin of the words “Kosmon” and “Ouranon” and all that we have seen.

There are no hierarchies... to what extent? With David Bohm we talked a lot about the body being the Sun. The human body is the Sun, that's to say, the Sun is not separate from the human body. To the extent that a sunbeam hitting the skin produces transformations in the skin—in the skin fat, to put it some way—: certain lipoproteins in the skin transform into Vitamin

D. Simple as water. That's thanks to the Sun operating on the human skin. Without vitamin D, which flows through your blood, you can't absorb phosphorus or calcium in your bones. It means the human skeleton depends on the Sun. It means the human being is the universe, said Bohm.

Let's start by realizing the human being is the Sun. That means the idea of hierarchy, that the Sun is more than us, is (to me) quite ridiculous, no matter how Platonic it may be. It's not a Kristian idea. JesuKristos called his twelve close students "friends." He never said "my apostles" or "my subordinates." Much less "my slaves," as the book of Exodus alludes to the slavery in Judaism and previous times. What does Jesus say about that? He says "There will be neither Greek nor Roman or Jew, neither slave nor master." So he puts an end to the custom of slavery, which the Jews had also adopted, despite their having been slaves to the Babylonians. They had been slaves for many centuries, after the Egyptians. However, they had, as the Old Testament shows, slavery laws, and JesuKristos puts an end to all that by saying "there will be neither slave nor master." That means JesuKristos ends the idea of hierarchy. That's why it is a great revolution that still hasn't been digested—that of JesuKristos.

We have the mind-house metaphor, and the one with the caterpillar and the butterfly. You know them. They are useful metaphors to begin understanding what we have been talking about. The caterpillar, which gets in the cocoon (quite a feat) transforms into something completely different from the caterpillar, and comes out flying as a butterfly. What can we learn from the butterfly? That caterpillars don't follow butterflies. If a caterpillar follows a butterfly, it won't enter the cocoon and it will never be a butterfly. Again JK, who tells us "Don't follow anyone." In the spiritual terrain, we are alone, and only each one of us knows where he or she is standing from the spiritual viewpoint: how much love is there in us? How much peace is there in us? Only we ourselves know that.

Eduardo: Is thought hypnosis?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Why do you think we say thought is hypnosis?

Audience: I think it [thought] creates images and illusions in those who live in it and ends up taking them out of reality.

RFG: Yes, absolutely. And something that has been already proven by Bernheim, Bernheim's experience, is what you're saying: that it ends up producing images that take us out of reality. They end up taking us out of reality.

Okay, here goes an example of hypnosis, see how easy hypnosis is: “Relax.” How many times have you heard that? If not from mom, it was from dad, or a priest, a guru, a psychotherapist or a teacher. How many times have we heard that word from a friend who sees us get nervous? “Relax, what you need is to relax.” That's a very, very subtle act of hypnosis. “Think positive”: another act of hypnosis. In other words: “don't see the evil,” don't see the evil. “Evil does not exist.” That's what in Greek they call a sophism, i.e., in philosophy, they study sophism as something that's not true, but is elegantly disguised as something that appears to be true. There was a sophist school that earned lots of money helping politicians in Greece. That was their job, to write political speeches in order to deceive people.

“Everything is well as it is,” that's another act of hypnosis. “Use Colgate for bad breath.” Another act of hypnosis. What are they using? Fear. “Oh, I have bad breath, I have to use Colgate.”

Let's suppose there's a nation called Greenland—since no one here is from Greenland, we can say that (laughter). That someone comes and says: “I am very proud to be from Greenland.” What is your merit in being from Greenland? You were simply born in Greenland, just like you could have been born in the Patagonia. I mean, the fact that you were born in Greenland is an accident. What makes you so proud of being from Greenland? Or being Argentinian or Mexican?

Audience: Hey, hey, hey

RFG: . (Long laughter)

But well, so we're seeing how the ego and its divisive activity work. The ego can't do anything, but it can divide.

Many times, in school, they have told me: "We are all equal." Well, we are all equal, but some are *more equal* than others, because there's a difference in class, difference of race, difference... of justice? Is there a justice for the rich that is different from the justice for the poor? In a divorce, is justice equal for the man and the woman?

"Your vote decides." We're seeing hypnosis in social action.

"The good guys win" (laughter). "Banks are trustworthy" (laughter). "Birth doesn't give you privileges" (laughter). But these are things that people say and pass as truth. They are not true, they are pieces of hypnosis.

"Intelligence is more important than the silver spoon" (laughter). Napoleon said that—I think it's Napoleon's birthday today. Napoleon said it, textually, "Intelligence is more important than the silver spoon," and he created laws to make the silver spoon less important, and that sealed his fate, because just with the money of the English monarchy, Napoleon disappeared. It didn't take much more money than that of the English monarch to buy the monarchies of the rest of Europe to terminate Napoleon, because he had said things like that.

Metaphysics and ideology, are they hypnosis?

Carl Jung said that there are psychological archetypes. For instance, the *anima-animus*, which is the one most people know: that we all have a feminine and a masculine side. Women have a masculine side and men have a feminine side, that's unconscious and collective, i.e., it applies to everyone. Those archetypes condition our dreams, behaviors and attitudes. It means there are nuclei of hypnosis inside us that don't come from outside. That's what Jung is saying, that there are nuclei of hypnosis, apparently built-in. As Chomsky says, language is already structured in our nervous system. In the

same way, archetypes are already structured in the nervous system, so conditioning comes from there, from within us, affecting our attitudes, behaviors and dreams. Even the archetype-based analysis of dreams brings lots of insight to the person, many comprehensions about him or herself.

In 1979, Kallman does research and says homosexuality is genetic, which is a fact. Huntington's Chorea is genetic, depression is genetic, schizophrenia too, diabetes, high blood pressure, asthma, hemophilia, arthritis, all those are genetic diseases. Then, can we talk about genetic hypnosis? About something inside us, related to health, that determines problems in our behavior? Sure we can, sure we can.

Is there a chemical conditioning? We can perfectly say so. A chemical hypnosis. If you've ever drunk a bottle of wine, you know it's true, there is a chemical conditioning. If you drink three cups of coffee, you know you will feel different, more stimulated, more talkative. Therefore, there's a chemical conditioning.

Otto Rank talked about the trauma of birth, birth trauma. The sole fact of going from thirty-seven degrees Celsius to twenty-three (here) is a trauma. Other things that happen during birth condition us for life, for all our life. Otto Rank says that many of our fears come from the moment of birth, the conditioning of birth, disrupted for many reasons: the head won't pass through the birth canal, there is previous placenta, or some problem with labor.

On top of the trauma of a normal birth. A big change of temperature, to name one thing. The beginning of heart activity, the heart starts to work when the person is born, you know. The interauricular hole is closed and the heart starts to act.

Audience: Not before?

RFG: Not before. The heart starts to act at the moment of birth. So it's a big change for the human organism, which Rank denounces as a source of conflict, fear, etc.

Then comes the after-birth conditioning, especially if there is no oxygen. If the baby takes too long to be born, anoxia, he may have serious attention problems, not genetically from attention deficit, but because the baby lacked oxygen at birth. The baby can have serious attention deficit problems and even mental retardation if he didn't have enough oxygen at birth. The mother with heroin; if the mother is addicted to heroin and she has a baby, that baby is born with heroin withdrawal. I had to witness that in Argentina, during my pediatrics residency. I saw that in the Centennial Hospital of Rosario, at the Faculty of Medicine: the child of an heroin-addicted woman who's born with heroin withdrawal, shaking, all his body shaking as in seizures. I thought it was seizures, but my teachers said it wasn't; it was heroin withdrawal, which is a generalized trembling that may look like seizures. There are RH problems, problems with forceps at some point. A C-section, delivery is delicate, because if in the C-section the baby's meconium enters the lungs, it has to be aspirated, etc. Meconium is the baby's feces still in the uterus, which may go to the baby's lungs during a C-section. So a C-section is not a heavenly surgery.

Then, Freud has already told us about traumas in the epigenetic development of the “I”—we're talking about the self/ego and hypnosis. The oral, anal, phallic and genital stages, which may in turn contain traumas in the epigenetic development of the ego. For instance, an oral trauma may give rise to alcoholism, Freud said. What is an oral trauma? That the mother is distant, there's lack of breastfeeding, etc.

And we talk about four kinds of memory: *Phylogenetic memory*, which is the memory of the human species in us. *Homeostatic memory*, remember? The baby is born with homeostatic memory to regulate body temperature, sodium, red cells, potassium, etc., Otto Rank's *newborn's memory*. Birth trauma and *Perinatal memory*: that of the child who has anoxia, heroin-addicted mother, c-section, etc.

So there are four types of memory in an individual.

Audience: And epigenetic.

RFG: Phylogenetic memory, which is the memory of the human species. For instance, Jung's archetypes belong to phylogenetic memory. That's how Freud called it, Jung called it "archetypes" to differentiate himself from Freud, but it's actually phylogenetic memory.

There's homeostatic memory, natal memory and perinatal memory, in each of us, conditioning us, hypnotizing us. It means we have lots of work to do if we're interested in Precinct A.

Audience: But, isn't epigenetic memory one of them? Or the natal one is epigenetic?

RFG: Phylogenetic memory is the memory of the human species. Now, in the individual, all other memory is epigenetic, because it comes after the genes. For instance, homeostatic memory is genetic. Natal and perinatal memories are already epigenetic. What happened between you and your dad ten years ago, that's already epigenetic.

Any question or comment? In Buenos Aires, do we have questions or comments? Is all this clear? Is it clear, Eduardo?

Audience: Can you give an example of phylogenetic memory?

RFG: Well, Jung's archetypes, which exist in the very structure of the nervous system, Jung said. Archetypal memories, like the feminine side in a man and the masculine side in a woman. Those are memories of the human species. The sole fact that so many human beings have existed before us has left in our personal, individual nervous system the psychological masculine and feminine in each one of us.

Audiencia: *[They ask him to repeat what he said from Buenos Aires].*

Of course, I'm talking about phylogenetic memory according to Jung, who says there are psychological structures like the anima/animus: the feminine and the masculine, in each one of us, psychologically. But there are other archetypes too. The archetype of the old man, which is when you dream, for

instance, with an old person, who usually represents your superego. If we've done something that makes us feel bad about ourselves, then we dream with the old man rebuking or punishing us, which would be, according to Freud, the superego, but according to Jung it could also be the archetype of the old man, who's been reproaching us since way before the formation of the superego. Phylogenetic memory, memory of the human species, things that may have affected the survival of humanity and the old man rebukes us about.

So... the relationships of the "I" with hypnosis are very clear, and even clearer with conditioning, because the word "conditioning" can be clearly related to the word "hypnosis." Conditioning, as we said, can be chemical with alcohol, genetic with asthma or schizophrenia, metaphysical, literary, ideological, of advertisements (which are all hypnotic), etc. Even in therapy, when they tell us "relax," an act of hypnosis is being committed.

Now, we know the laws of C are: repetition, cyclicity, hypnosis—like in hunger, thirst, fear, desire: they are all repetitive, like sleep. The clearest example we have of repetition and cyclicity as a law of Precinct C in pathological psychology is obsession. The new idea that obsessions are a cluster that includes autism, obsessive-compulsive disorder, anorexia nervosa, compulsive gambling, all the addictions and even homosexuality. The obsessive cluster. All these psychological disorders take you to the repetition of thoughts and behaviors.

Then there is duality. Duality is in ambivalence. As in a person who is passive-aggressive, i.e., who doesn't attack you, but is still aggressive with his or her quietness.

Audience: How?

RFG: It is possible to be aggressive with quietness, you don't need to attack. I mean, duality has many examples, among which is ambivalence, which is very frequent: "I want to be with this person or I don't want to."

Audience: “*And* I don't. I want to and I don't want to.”

RFG: “I want to and I don't want to,” and that's how it is in human psychology, duality, as a part of Precinct C, which may lead to duplicity (lies), ambivalence, contradictions: I tell you one thing today and another tomorrow. Incoherence: United Nations Security Council, formed by the countries that sell most weapons. That's a social incoherence. Then, within duality we have to discuss something very important, about duality, which is horizontal conflict: that we think we're separated. Rubén believes he is separated from everything, I mean... Rubén thinks he is separated from everything, i.e., “I look at my glasses”: a separation between subject and object. That's why we try to be careful with the words *subject* and *object*, because they imply horizontal conflict, they imply that the subject is separated from the object. Now we started to talk about epistemology within Holokinetic Psychology, but that's an important aspect, one that deserves our attention.

Within duality lies the very important fact that we have only one face for crying and for orgasm. The facial expression in orgasm is the same as when crying, and that's part of the duality of thought, that the maximum pleasure sometimes comes near the maximum pain, at least in facial expression.

If we cry and we're in Unitary Perception, we will see that crying is expressing fear, anger and sadness at the same time, which indicates us that the word “fear-anger-sadness,” that the words fear, anger and sadness refer to one fact, only one fact.

Then crying, in which we can see fear, anger and sadness if we're in Unitary Perception, will reveal to us that there's not just one crying, that we're crying for many things. In the same crying, we cry for many things.

However, that “pathos,” which in Greek means “disease”—but also “emotion”—, that emotion of crying lasts less if there is Unitary Perception. Unitary Perception is incompatible with conflict, incompatible with fear, anger and sadness.

There's also the problem of cause and effect, which is also part of the duality of Precinct C. If we analyze causes and effects, as I do in the book *The New Paradigm in Psychology [Holokinetic Psychology]*, we will see the intimacies and subtleties of the cause-effect problem. For instance, "Tuberculosis is produced by Koch's bacillus." If that was the case, we would all have tuberculosis, because Koch's bacillus is in 98% of people. It's not the case, because there are defenses in our bodies that, when failing, lead to tuberculosis. Why do the defenses fail? Ah, well, this means there are other variables: feeding, housing conditions, etc. How does stress influence tuberculosis? And so on.

In the study of cause and effect, what happens with astrology is very interesting. There are times in which there seems to be a relationship between the position of a planet and an event.

The word *syndrome* does not mean *disease*, but a syndrome is a group of symptoms that seems to be related, with an evolution, an origin and a treatment that is the same for that syndrome, for that group of symptoms. For instance, stress is a syndrome, not a disease. Why? Because it has many causes. It's like schizophrenia, which, although it's genetic, it's rather a syndrome, because it seems there are many varieties.

Audience: It's a syndrome, but a non-recessive one then. I mean, you can treat it, but it won't disappear.

RFG: No, stress does disappear. Of course, life is stress, but if a person who is working too much takes some rest and sleeps, stress will go away. Now, as soon as the person starts working too much out of need or habit or whatever reason, stress will return.

Audience: But it's a syndrome.

RFG: But it's a syndrome that has its treatment: rest and nine hours of sleep per day.

Audience: And schizophrenia?

RFG: Schizophrenia, even though there are several types, has one life-long treatment.

Feudalism is a system of life that has been with us for five thousand years or so, and it hasn't changed even with people opposing feudalism, like JesuKristos, who said there were neither slaves nor lords, and no hierarchies. But in those five thousand years, not even a person like JesuKristos could do something for feudalism to disappear as a system, and for mankind to start a social relationship of love, fraternity and equality without hierarchies. For example, there is more tuberculosis today than in the 18th century, and it's worse, more serious and intense. AIDS appeared, new forms of the flu, new viruses. Around 1350, nearly a hundred million people died of the plague in Europe. That was a baby compared to AIDS, which has already killed, as far as I know, over forty million people [in a much shorter time].

Audience: Another syndrome.

RFG: It's something apparently produced by a virus with a very obscure origin.

Going back to duality, here's an example: What is the name of God according to the Old Testament? His name is "I am what I am." Now, what is the difference with Rubén, who is what he is, or with Yolanda, who is what she is? What is the difference between God and us, if we are what we are? That's the origin of saying we're made in his image and likeness. "Image and likeness," another duality of thought, where the highest, most sacred thing is compared with the observer.

Then there is paradox. For instance: "time is irrelevant, because there is a movement from here to here," Bohm's paradox of movement. Or "the electron is a particle and a wave," de Broglie's paradox—1929. That is duality, but it's a form of duality where intelligence is shown at its maximum—we're talking about intelligence again. There are dualities that show lesser forms of intelligence, but the quantum duality or the holokinetic paradox of movement, quantum and holokinetic paradoxes, display a very high level of intelligence.

To me, it is obvious that the word *metanoia* is what we call Unitary Perception. Of course, if we compare, we fall into a paradox, because comparison is neither Unitary Perception nor *metanoia*, since it implies comparing two known things, whereas Unitary Perception, which would be *metanoia*, is to go beyond all the known, including comparison.

In the Gospel [of John] there is a great duality with the word “poverty.” It is used as “lack of money” but also as “human condition,” i.e., poverty can be the human condition or the lack of money, both things. A rich man, being in the human condition, is also in poverty from the Johannine point of view, from the viewpoint of John's Gospel.

There are very interesting dualities in the act of watching TV, if you want to read about that, it's in an article in page [261] of *Lo Profundo de la Mente*: the article about television, where you can see other aspects of the duality of Precinct C.

Question or comments?

Audience: I have two.

RFG: You have two? Who goes first?

Audience: What do you see as the most important thing to spread this teaching?

RFG: To live it.

What is the most important thing for Unitary Perception to spread? Living it.

Audience: In mankind, but...

RFG: Living it.

Audience: Yes, but I mean, what do you see after having experimented with many people... what kind of person...?

RFG: Ah! I don't know. It is unbelievable: after 32 years of teaching this, I am still in the dilemma of who's going to listen

and who's not. I mean, a bricklayer listens, but a psychologist doesn't, or a psychologist listens and a bricklayer doesn't. You can't answer, I cannot answer that question. I've been looking for the common factor, but it doesn't exist, as far as I know. How many people understand and live Unitary Perception? Very difficult to know, but I reckon it's very few people, those who take Unitary Perception seriously after hearing from it. I reckon it must be less than one in one thousand (1/1000): of a thousand people who listen, less than one take it seriously. I think it's close to that.

JK speaks about that and says that “the few will awaken the many,” 1929. The few will awaken the many. The man who was interviewing him on the radio asked him: “And what are the few like?” JK says: “Ah, that's the difficult thing, to know whether one is among the few.” And what does it mean to be among the few? Two things are difficult: first, to know if you're among the few who understood, and second, what is it to be one of the few? What is it to be in Unitary Perception? Only one can know. Again, we're alone there, but it's necessary that those who understand the value of Unitary Perception come together to spread it, I mean, the fact that only one knows if he or she is in Unitary Perception or not, in the Sacred or not, in love or not –only one knows. The fact that we're alone means we have to be very serious, because, since nobody can help us; we have to take this fact of living in love much more seriously. If we don't live in love, ask ourselves why, with great seriousness, because no one can help us. It's not that you have to be serious because Rubén says so, but because, since no one can help us, that's why we have to be very serious in asking ourselves if we live in love or not, if we're in peace or not. If I'm not in love, why? If I'm not in peace, why? Who can answer that but oneself? Nobody but oneself.

That's related to your question, all of that is related to your question. It is a tremendous question, for which I haven't found an answer after nearly thirty-two years of spreading this throughout the world, and I still don't have a clear answer to know who will take this seriously and who won't. There are psychologists who have taken this seriously. There are also

workers, like this young man from Spain, a truck driver. There's all kinds of people in the whole spectrum of human activities who have taken this seriously. It means there's not a particular type of person who takes it seriously; it is obvious that anyone can take it seriously.

[To the same student who asked the question] Did you have another one?

Audience: Yes, about... You've talked about how newborns, for instance, suffer a change of temperature, it's...

RFG: Birth trauma.

Audience: Trauma, but isn't that trauma good for the baby? I mean, isn't it like a reaction to reality?

RFG: Of course, of course it is. That's why we say...whether birth trauma is an adjustment to reality, of course it is. That's why we say life is stress, to live is stress. The reality we have is that we need to make a series of efforts every day, just to survive.

A young man in Dublin complained that "I spend my whole life getting money so I can live," he said that. "My life is such a paradox," said this man from Dublin, Ireland. You can read this in the book "Complete Incarnation," which is a workshop in Dublin. He said "I spend my life getting money so I can live, what a paradox." So his whole life is stress for survival. He complained about that a bit. That's life, that's reality.

But, can it be different? Of course it can, of course. I mean, most of the stress we suffer to earn a living has been invented to maintain the slavery-based feudalism, which hasn't stopped in the last five thousand years. Not even JesuKristos could stop it when he says: "There shall neither be slave nor lord," despite there being so many Christians.

[To the same student] What do you say?

Audience: And they killed him.

RFG: On top of never listening to him, they killed him.

It seems that feudalism is here to stay. Feudalism is what makes... “Feud” means “war.” Feudalism needs war to maintain itself, and that war has to be permanent besides being a good business. Misery; who invented misery? The feudal lord needs misery to exist for the people to be trapped in it, thus easily enslaved. It's very clear.

Can we have a society with less stress? Okay, but it cannot be this one, it has to be a different society, based on love and not on profit. Can we have a society of love and peace then? Of course we can, it's easy to visualize. David Bohm said that, with good will, we can build a society of peace and love—a Kristian society, some would say— *in a few weeks*. In a few weeks we can build a society like that, it won't take much time; it only takes good will and understanding.

But we (mankind) seem to lack that good will and understanding. The belief that we're fine the way we are, that “everything is okay as it is” and that you should “think positive” lead us to a comfort and a security that don't exist, that are illusory, and make us stop paying attention, for example, to Unitary Perception. Like a lady in Caracas who told me “I'm very satisfied with my coffin-hole.” I had been talking about the coffin-holes of society. She tells me “I'm very satisfied with my coffin-hole, don't bother me. I'm fine the way I am. I don't need any Unitary Perception.”

That's another illusion: believing that you don't need Unitary Perception to live the non-imaginary, true life. Because we don't realize we're living an imaginary life that's full of stress. For the sole fact of being imaginary, it is a life of stress, of suffering, division, war, misery. “Don't bother me.”

The dissemination of this teaching is not easy, we can all see that, but it must be done, it must be done. And who will do it? Those who understand that we must disseminate the teaching, which might be very few people. JK in 1927 said “The few will awaken the many.” 1927. “The few will awaken the many.”

And he added: “The difficult part is knowing if one is among the few or not.”

[To a man in the audience] What were you saying?

Audience: Talking about the hypnosis of thought: the mere comprehension that thought is hypnosis shows us that, in some way, there is something beyond hypnosis in the capacity to think. The proof lies in that, once given the definition of Unitary Perception, a person can attempt it. So, it means that hypnosis may have a glimpse of what hypnosis is, and therefore end. So it's hypnosis, but not an absolute damnation; you can redeem yourself from that hypnosis.

RFG: Sure. We can redeem ourselves and step out of that hypnosis that is thought, for which we need a factor of higher energy than thought, which is Unitary Perception. Because with thought only, since it is hypnosis, we remain in hypnosis. You need a factor of higher energy, that luckily exists, and that we know thanks to JK, who called it “meditation” at the beginning, unfortunately. JK renounces that word in September 1985, in which is now a book called “Facing a World in Crisis.” It's also a DVD, I recommend you to watch DVD 4 of “Facing a World in Crisis,” when JK talks about meditation as “a stupid word.” He realizes that it's not with meditation... rather, that you can't use the word meditation, which brings about such confusion, because he's not talking about a technique, but a brain function. We give it the appropriate name: Unitary Perception.

Thanks to that, we know there's a factor of great energy that can take us out of the hypnosis of thought, even if only for an instant. But we also know, thanks to that, that there's an end to hypnosis. Now, hypnosis goes on, because I can't be all the time in Unitary Perception... Ah, but I know I'm hypnotized by beliefs, by nation, by teachers, by my parents, I've been hypnotized by a thousand things. Very well, but to know that, the mere fact of knowing that, is already a factor of liberation.

Audience: Rubén, what does that word “redeem” mean?

RFG: To redeem: to get out, to liberate yourself, to get rid of hypnosis. Is it possible? Of course it is, with a factor of higher energy than thought, which is Unitary Perception.

What comes when you leave that hypnosis? Peace, energy. We enter the definition of enlightenment. Peace, energy, communion. The problem is that communion... I realize communion is something that people fear. Generally, most people prefer isolation. "Leave me alone, don't bother me. I'm okay in my church." You see what I mean? Or "in my party," or God knows where they've gotten into. "I'm fine with the life I live, leave me alone." That's choosing isolation as a way of life. "I have my family, don't bother me. I have to take care of my children and my wife." That way of living is an isolated way, do you see it? It's an isolated way of living. "Don't bother me, I have to look after my little child and my wife. Leave me alone."

"On Sunday I have to go visit my family, it's my family and nothing else, don't bother me." Is that a form of isolation? Of course it is. We take shelter in family, in the cinema, sometimes we take shelter in art—producing a sculpture, a painting—, all forms of isolation to evade what? To evade the communion that comes with Unitary Perception.

Audience: So energy is a fundamental feature of intelligence, of the intelligence we're talking about, because for intelligence to see hypnosis and refrain from obeying it, which is really what happens... the body needs to have energy—can we say it that way?

RFG: Intelligence takes energy, right? The body needs to have energy for intelligence, of course. Unitary Perception gives you that energy. JK said "In order to live with intelligence, it is necessary that you're in revolt." Look at that wonderful word. Revolt. You have to be in revolt. "But then—the interlocutor in the radio tells him—are you saying that we must be disturbed in order to be in intelligence?" JK says: "Yes, sir." Of course, disturbed because there must be some revolt to redeem ourselves—as Natzio said—from hypnosis. Because, if there's not an intelligent, energetic revolt, we will continue with

family Sundays, know what I mean? (laughter). Watching television and doing the isolated things we do to live a life of complete isolation, complete isolation. “Leave me alone, don't bother me.” Yes, yes.

The human couple, the way in which the human couple lives, is a deep form of isolation, because, even if they are in love with each other—something which is less frequent each day—, they lock themselves up in isolation, and they forget their problems and the problems of mankind because of that mutual fascination, which doesn't last forever and, when it ends, it leaves them once again in a state of despair that is worse than when they got together. So the human couple, being an act of isolation and not of love... Careful, don't let that be another form of isolation. Whatever we do, let's not make it a form of isolation. May it be contact with true, non-imaginary life and not another form of imagination. In the couple, let's say John imagines Mary and Mary imagines John. A relationship in which John and Mary are united in a non-imaginary way is very infrequent. A non-imaginary way.

We have to see all this, because the imaginary relationship is hypnotic. Non-imaginary relationship is non-hypnotic. You understand this, right?

Our situation as human beings at this moment is very, very difficult. Why? Precisely because most people choose to live in a “comfortable” isolation—between inverted commas—when they see the origin of war and misery, that isolation. The lack of loving solidarity in mankind. The lack of love and peace is the reason we have all the problems we have. That love and that peace come from the non-imaginary life, a true, non-imaginary life that only Unitary Perception gives you.

Everything we've been told as imaginary life... “Believe in God.” My two-year old neighbor asked me if I believed in God. So I went and told my mom: “Mom, do I believe in God?” (laughter). My mother says “Of course, why do you ask that?” “Because the neighbor—I was four years old—asked me if I believe in God.” “Tell her you do, tell her you do” (loud laughter). So I go back and tell her “Yes, I believe in God.”

Now, is that the level at which we're related to God? The level of a four-year-old? When they ask you "Do you believe in God?" "Wait, wait... yes, oh, yes, I believe, yes" (laughter). Okay sweetheart, if that is our level of religiosity... then what a deplorable level of religiosity, buddy! How deplorable, how childish, how puerile. If we don't move from that level of religiosity to a more mature, more serious, energetic, intelligent level, then we're all lost! We're all lost, do you see that? All lost.

Do you want to stop and take a fifteen-minute break? Those of you in Buenos Aires, do you agree?

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* Yes.

RFG: See you in fifteen minutes then.

Audience: See you.

[Fifteen-minute break].

[When the recording starts again, RFG is explaining the origin of the book "QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS TO RFG," from which an excerpt will be read].

RFG: The book is practically writing itself through the questions from students and their answers.

[Reading begins]

Interlocutor: I hope you can clarify more about what is mind in Holokinetic Psychology. I can't deny I'm confused.

RFG: I will do everything I can to clarify, and you will let me know if you end up cleared or more confused (laughter). I will give you the basics so you can understand better when you read the written work of Rubén Feldman-González.

1. David Bohm completes the conception of time.
2. We can no longer speak in the same way in Psychology.

3. I started Holokinetic Psychology in 1986, after more than a decade of dialogues with Jiddu Krishnamurti and David Bohm. You can't mix the language of Holokinetic Psychology with the language of previous psychologies, just like you cannot mix Ptolemy with Copernicus.
4. I confirmed my findings with Margaret Mahler, the Winnicott, Albert Ellis, Karl Pribram, William Dement and hundreds of other serious investigators in psychology.
5. The new definition of mind is made with a foundation in new concepts, especially the concept of Holokinesis by David Bohm, and with the help of Jiddu Krishnamurti, who taught me how to discover Unitary Perception, something that happens in 1978 once I defeated my own resistance to the new.
6. Jiddu Krishnamurti used the word “meditation” for what I call “Unitary Perception” in Holokinetic Psychology.
7. Jiddu Krishnamurti says in Brockwood Park, England, in September 1985, that the word “meditation” is a stupid word. You can see this in DVD 4 of “Facing a World in Crisis.”
8. I define “mind” as the contingency of the interaction between the organism and the environment, from the uterus until death, which is functional Precinct C, that ranges from homeostasis to Bohm's mathematical formulation of Holokinesis. But the mind is not only C, that is, memory, thought, imagination and self. Mind is also Unitary Perception. All of this is well clarified in my written work. Perhaps it will help you to know that oxygen does not need the brain, nor does potassium need the brain, but the brain needs oxygen and potassium to work. Since David Bohm, it has been clarified that 1% of the universe is matter and 99% is energy—I am simplifying for clarity—and there's an interface between matter and energy in the whole universe that is mind. That's why it is said that the universe is matter, mind and energy. The brain doesn't produce potassium, but it needs it to work, or rather, potassium

works in the brain in multiple chemical reactions. The same with oxygen, which is matter too. The brain does not produce mind, but mind exists or functions in the whole universe, including the human brain. For you to start reading my written work, we could say this: the brain does not produce mind, but mind, which is as universal as potassium, light, matter and energy, contributes to producing the brain. Mind, matter and energy are three forms of only one thing, which is the universe, just like water can be vapor, liquid or ice.

[End of reading]

RFG: Did you hear that in Buenos Aires?

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* Yes.

RFG: I'm glad. It's clear, right? Any questions about that answer? Yolanda?

Audience: How can the mind produce the brain?

RFG: Right, I mean, if we talk about creation... Right? If we drop the word "creator" for a moment and use the word "creation," there is creation in the universe; all kinds of things are being created in the universe at this precise moment. Bohm said that we're being created at each moment, that everything is being created at each moment, as is demonstrated by some things he says about atoms, about electrons, in his work.

So creation is not something that happened millions of years ago, the Big Bang and all that only, but also something that is happening now. That creation is happening with what the universe is, which is matter, mind and energy. That's why in the moment of conception, when the development of the fetus starts, all of that is being created with the elements of the universe, which are matter, mind and energy. It means that mind... if we say mind is one of the three forms that matter and energy take, and that matter is one of the forms that mind and energy take, then mind has produced the brain, it's not the other

way around, not that the brain produces mind, I don't know if I'm clear.

Audience: Yes. But the three forms are one.

RFG: If the universe is matter, mind and energy, just like water is vapor, liquid and ice, it means matter, mind and energy are three forms of a same thing called universe, and matter transforms into energy and energy into matter. That's a well-known fact in physics. If mind is, as it is, part of the universe, like universal matter and energy are, we can say that mind can be matter or it can be energy, and energy can be mind and matter, etc. They are three states or aspects of the same thing. Just like water may present itself as ice, vapor or liquid, also mind can present itself as matter and as energy, and energy becomes matter, as it does, and matter can become energy, as we can see in the radioactive elements, from Uranium onward: the transuranic elements of Mendeleev's table. The elements transform into energy through the radiations they emit.

The Sun itself... in this moment, there is a solar flare, you know that. At this moment, the Sun is shooting a storm of plasma at the Earth, which they say might affect communications, but luckily our communication with Buenos Aires is unaffected now (laughter). But there was much discussion about the communication problems it was supposed to cause, which don't seem to be as many as they predicted.

From the Sun itself, there is a constant emission of energy. That means the Sun, with all the matter it is (boiling molten metals, that is, boiling matter) is transforming into energy, there is energy going out of the Sun. The Sun is matter and energy, and by definition, it is also mind, but not a state of being superior to the Moon, as the Platonic and Aristotelians said.

Audience: So the mind existed before the brain existed? And if the brain stops existing, will the mind continue to exist?

RFG: Of course. Creation goes on even if Rubén dies, you see? I mean, creation continues.

Audience: Even if all the brains died, mind continues.

RFG: Of course, mind does not need a brain. The brain doesn't produce mind, but the mind functions in the brain like potassium and oxygen, like matter and energy. For instance, we know the brain produces electricity; how do we know that? Because of the electroencephalogram (EEG), which gives us an epi-phenomenic, relatively important information (great information in the case of epilepsy) about the brain... or rather, about the way the brain is working, not about what the brain is. Then, if the brain produces electricity, it does so because oxygen-glucose-mind is functioning in the brain. So, in that great movement, which is energy, matter and mind, the brain produces electricity, that gets recorded in the EEG. It's clear, right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: The electroencephalogram will be, of course, not only improved, but possibly transcended by other forms of diagnosing brain functioning which will be more sophisticated, more refined and deeper.

Any question or comment?

Audience: Right now, what you said about electricity in the brain: when changing from Precinct C to B, there must be a transformation there, in that brain...

RFG: Oh, we talked about that with Bohm for hours, even with JK, about what goes on in the brain and in the neurons when you go from C to B, when Unitary Perception begins. Bohm said: "Inexorably, there has to be a molecular change in the neuron." We can't measure that, we still can't tell what the change is, but inevitably, there must be a molecular change, otherwise, you can't explain how a person who is agitated, with fear, etc., starts listening and enters into peace immediately. That's because, among other things, besides listening to everything at the same time and feeling the weight at the same time, there's a molecular change in the neuron which is tremendously regenerative.

It was something extraordinary to listen to Krishnamurti few months before his death, with an extraordinary lucidity. He kept his lucidity to the last moment. That's the brain that is constantly regenerating thanks to Unitary Perception. And how does it regenerate? Molecularly? Of course. Energetically? Of course. At the quantum aspect? Of course. Ultimately, holokinetically, because that transformation in Krishnamurti has helped other individuals take it seriously and enter a certain, say, process of transformation too. It means the sole existence of Krishnamurti has made many people take a deep change of themselves seriously.

I don't know if I'm answering.

Bohm again. Bohm said: “Do we see the present, or do we represent it?” Do you understand that question? Remember that colleague who crashed against a Coca-Cola truck? “I saw the road as I had always seen it: empty,” but the truck was there.

Way before the truck incident, Bohm had told me: “Do we see the present, or do we represent it?”—in memory. That is, do we see with memory or with light? We see an 80% with memory and 20% with light.

All this is related to stress. If we see with memory, conflict is involved, fear-anger-sadness is involved in the act of seeing, just in the act of seeing. Now, stress, as you already know, is something in which the hypophysis causes a release of cortisone, adrenaline, for many causes: cold, fatigue, radiations, infections, intoxication, trauma, excess of work, lack of sleep, mental disease, all that produces stress. What are the complications of stress? Do you remember, Eduardo? In order, first comes gastritis...

Audience: I don't remember.

RFG: Do you remember, Javier? Complications of stress. It's very important, because all the mental disorders bring stress, so we need to know what the complications of stress are. Why? Because if you ask a patient “Do you have heartburn?” and he says “Yes,” you already know he has a complication of stress,

even if they are depressed. You know that every depressed person has ten times more stress than anyone. You ask them: “Do you have heartburn?” They say “Yes,” so this person has at least three years of depression without treatment. Between the second and third year, gastritis appears, the first complication. “Do you have high blood pressure?” “Yes.” Ah, five years without treatment. According to the complication, you know for how long the patient has been without treatment, how much time the patient has been with stress. It's very important to know the complications of stress. First of all, gastritis. Then, arterial hypertension, fall of immunity. What do you ask? “Do you suffer from many colds or many flus?” If he says yes, ah, that man has a lot of stress, and has that complication too.

Audience: Cold sores too, right? Out of stress.

RFG: Of course, anything that is infectious shows a fall of immunity. You're talking about herpes.

Audience: Yes, herpes, commonly called “cold sores.”

RFG: That's a viral infection like so many other infections, most commonly sinusitis, common cold, the flu, pneumonia, etc.

According to the complication, you can tell how long this man has been without treatment.

- Gastritis, two or three years without treatment... one year without treatment!
- Then comes high blood pressure: five years without treatment.
- Fall of immunity: at any moment.
- Arthritis: ten years without treatment.

If the depressed person has arthritis, it's because they have suffered from a complicated stress for at least ten years. If they have homicidal and suicidal ideas, that's generally a very old depression that has never been treated. Because depression rarely brings suicidal and homicidal ideas, unless there is stress

and complications of stress. What I mean is that you don't diagnose depression by asking if the person has suicidal and homicidal ideas. When you ask "Do you have suicidal and homicidal ideas?" what you're seeing is how much stress that person has. You see the difference, right? Depression is not "Do you have homicidal and suicidal ideas?" "Yes" "Oh, then you're depressed." No! That person is under stress, and has been under stress for a very long time. In depression, the symptom of depression is not suicidal and homicidal ideas. The symptoms are... Do you remember the symptoms of depression, Eduardo?

Audience: I was about to ask you.

RFG: Okay.

Audience: Lack of energy...

RFG: Lack of energy.

Audience: Lack of energy, because they can't sleep properly and rest.

RFG: And sleep problems.

Those are the two symptoms you have to ask to know if there is depression. Not if the person is suicidal. How is their sleep and how is their energy. That's what you ask in the diagnosis of depression.

Audience: If that person has depression, stress is maximized, right?

RFG: "I don't want to go to the cinema." "Why?" "Because going to the cinema causes me stress."

Audience: But if that maximizes it, then...

RFG: Depression maximizes stress, takes it over the top.

Audience: So, if they have, say, gastritis, it wouldn't be one or two years, but three months.

RFG: Yes, it could be... I meant in the first three years. Sometimes gastritis appears within the first year, in months.

We have to know what the complications of stress are and in what moment they appear. Gastritis, the first of all, which may be due to fall of immunity, because gastritis is linked to the *Helicobacter*, a bacteria. *Helicobacter Pylori* is a bacteria. Gastritis could be linked to a fall of immunity.

[A new subject starts]

Do you understand why I say: don't mix the previous thirty-two psychotherapies with Holokinetic Psychology? Do you understand, Eduardo? Why would you tell a person: "Don't mix Holokinetic Psychology with the thirty-two previous ones"? Why?

Audience: Because any other psychology is based exclusively on Precinct C. Nothing outside of that.

RFG: Sure, but there is a sound, very scientific reason, do you remember? What you have said so far is correct. Do you remember, Javier? Do you remember why we can't mix Holokinetic Psychology with the other thirty-two previous ones?

Audience: Because the thirty-two previous ones are based on absolute and relative time, and not on irrelevant time.

RFG: Of course, because Holokinetic Psychology is based on a complete understanding of time that David Bohm gave us, which the previous thirty-two psychologies lack, therefore the language that we're using has to be different from that of the previous thirty-two psychologies. It is a deceptively simple, but highly polished language that not anyone can replicate without study. The language we are using is deceptively simple, but not anyone can replicate it without study.

Do you remember fragmentary perception and that wire on the eyelid that sends a galvanic current, and that the brain is made to perceive fragmentarily? The electric current passes through the eyelid, and is perceived as heat in the eyelid, as light in the

eye and as sound (a buzz) in the ear. So a single energy, which is electricity, determines three perceptions in the brain: heat, light, sound. It means the brain is made to perceive fragmentarily, for the survival of the species, to perceive in a fragmentary way, that is, perceiving the same energy in many ways. That fragmentary perception is the perception of Precinct C, of the META Process, of thought.

Audience: You could add “functional.” Functional Precinct C.

RFG: Both the functional and non-functional Precinct C have fragmentary perception. Look at this beautiful example of fragmentary perception and nationalism. We're lucky to have Spanish people here, because they ought to know this. But many people ignore it. In [1350], I mentioned today, there was a great plague that killed around [one hundred million] Europeans. It was the first great epidemic catastrophe in Europe, one hundred million deaths, which was tremendous back then, because there were no more than four hundred million Europeans. It means a quarter of Europe's population disappeared due to the plague. Now, what do you think they called the plague in England? It was called “the Spanish disease.” What do you think they called it in Spain? “The English disease” (laughter). Simple as water, it was the same disease, but fragmentarily perceived. Each one perceived it in a certain way and they seized the opportunity to express the hatred they had for each other.

So nation is a fragment, obviously, and, at the same time, a nation is not a homogenous thing. Many people say: “My nation this and that...,” as if it was a homogeneous thing, an undivided thing, but that's not true, because in a nation you have races.

Audience: Parties.

RFG: For instance, in the USA: white race, black race, yellow race, without mentioning the native, which they call “the red people,” “the red race.” Prisons are crowded with people, not all of them white. A nation is separated in classes: the rich and the poor. A nation has one justice for the poor and another

justice for the rich. Obviously. In a nation, not everyone is the same age, and according to their age, people have different problems. We were talking about night clubs, “open bars” (free alcohol) for teenagers in Italy—which also happens in Buenos Aires, in Mexico, anywhere: the promotion of alcoholism in youth. So alcohol and drugs in youth and premature pregnancy are the great problems of a nation. In the USA, they spend millions on that, on girls who get pregnant to receive the eight hundred dollars of social welfare for each child. After three or four children, they are getting 3200 dollars a month. So having children is a business.

The helpless elderly in the USA is not the same as a young person. Nations are separated by sex, each with its problems. The apparition of ideologies, feminism, chauvinism, which are so related to sexuality and class.

In a nation, there's not homogeneity of religions; there are many religions in a nation. We have already said that queen Isabel drove out the Arabs to have an homogeneous religion, Catholicism. But today, all the religions are in Spain, so that one backfired on queen Isabel, because today, there are all kinds of people and all kinds of religions. It's like that in every country. Catholic and Protestant, believers and atheists. In the Middle West, Iraq for instance: the Kurd, the Shiite and the Sunni can't even look at each other, within Iraq. All three of them call themselves Iraqis, but the Sunni will be happier if he can kill a Shiite. Iran's Shiite is not the same as Iraq's Shiite, it's a different Shiite. Then there is Northern and Southern Ireland: six hundred years of war against England, who wants to dominate Ireland. The Serb and the Bosnian, that is, one country (Yugoslavia) that is now fragmented in Serbs, Bosnians, the Montenegrins, etc. People say “Israel” and believe that's an homogeneous nation. It's very far from being a homogeneous nation. I've been told, by people who've been to Israel, that there's a rivalry between the natives, born in Israel, and those who come from another country to live in Israel, even if they are Jewish. So there's the native Jew from Israel and the diaspora Jew. Then there are aspects of Judaism: Hasidic, Sephardi, Ashkenazi, the Arabs in Israel, the

Christians in Israel and the Muslims in Israel. Is Israel a homogeneous nation? Of course not. Then there's Begin, who speaks about the union with Palestine, and Netanyahu, who says they shouldn't unite with Palestine. There's the left and the right in politics, as in every other country.

Then there is the dichotomy between the individual and society. Society, to maintain the security, for example, at this moment, against terrorism, forgets about the individual, the individual's stress, his poverty. Then society is oriented, mainly in the US, to deprecate even privacy, because security against terrorism is deemed more important.

Then, we have other problems, like ecological equilibrium and economic growth, inside a nation. The problem of global warming in any nation. Dengue appears now in Buenos Aires, as in Italy. Why? Because the Brazilian mosquito is already in Buenos Aires. Why? Global warming. The mosquito, who lived happily with Brazil's hot climate, is now happy to live in the warmed Buenos Aires. There's a cold spell now in Buenos Aires, so this sounds absurd, but we're talking about a generalized warming in Buenos Aires, which we can't perceive now because there's a cold spell. But dengue exists in Buenos Aires now, and that's because the mosquito came down from Brazil. Where does the mosquito come from in Italy? From Africa; the mosquito was happy and warm in Africa (laughter), and now that Italy is warmer, there goes the mosquito and, with it, dengue. The rise in dengue is tremendous in Europe, mainly in Italy.

Then, there's all the things we have said about the ego: that there can be an ego in sleep as there is in wakefulness, just like there is a Unitary Perception in wakefulness and a Unitary Perception in S4 sleep. But the ego of sleep, which is seen in dreams, is as dangerous as the ego of wakefulness or more, because during a nightmare, an individual can have a duodenal perforation or a heart infarction that kills him, because of the nightmare. In that nightmare, who's the protagonist? Of course, the ego, the observer is always present in dreams.

Now, Unitary Perception is not the ultimate or final. There is clearly something beyond Unitary Perception, which we call Precinct A, in a “provisional” way, so to speak. We also know there are definitions of Unitary Perception according to human activity. For instance, psychologically we say Unitary Perception is to perceive everything perceptible at the same time. But if we speak to a physicist, what is Unitary Perception? Who remembers?

Audience: [Conscious] contact with Holokinesis.

RFG: [Conscious] contact with Holokinesis, very well Javier. Unitary Perception in Physics is [conscious] contact with Holokinesis. Who remembers how we define Unitary Perception in Neurology? [*To a woman in the audience*] Do you remember? In neurology?

Audience: Yes. The three mental Precincts: ABC.

RFG: ABC. Yes. But strictly speaking it is the anterior brain being aware of what the posterior brain is doing.

In Epistemology... who remembers?

Audience: It's the observation in which the observer merges with the observed.

RFG: Right, it gives place to that phrase, which sounds esoteric, but it's as concrete as this piece of paper: “What sees is all there is.” That's the epistemological definition of Unitary Perception: *what sees is all there is*; so *what is seeing* is universal matter, mind and energy, it's not merely Rubén or Rubén's eye.

[*A new subject is introduced*].

Laughter itself, for example, is not something homogeneous. There are different kinds of laughter. For instance, if I tell you a joke, that's very different from the laughter that comes from the grace of being happy for nothing. Sometimes, we sit down to eat with friends here at the CPH, and suddenly, we start laughing for no reason. There is a communion that comes with

grace. But there's another laughter, that of a joke. We can say there is a laughter of B and a laughter of C. That of a joke. For example, the divorce joke that I like so much, in which the judge says "I'm giving the Thomas couple their divorce, and I'm assigning three hundred dollars per week for Mrs. Thomas. Is that clear, Mr. Thomas?" "Yes, Your Honor, I'm deeply grateful, because you're very generous. Believe me, every now and then I will also help with a couple more dollars" (laughter). The man didn't have a clear notion of what a divorce was. When he heard "I'm assigning three hundred dollars to Mrs. Thomas," he thought the judge was going to pay his wife (laughter).

[A new subject is introduced].

Then, Freud used to say: "Sexual desire grows with fear." When I read that for the first time I said "What? Freud was crazy." Then, when I started to look into it more carefully, I saw he had nailed it.

I think it's time we talk about what Krishnamurti proposes regarding sexual desire: do not repress and do not express. What happens? If you live sexual desire without expression and without repression, watching it while you listen to all the sound, in little time, let's say, ten hours, you find yourself feeling an immense energy, great energy. That comes from "do not express and do not repress." It's something that's worth taking into account and experimenting with.

Now, there is no duality in B. So, in Unitary Perception, the perception of that desire is not perceived as repressing or expressing; it is perceived as desire, not being expressed or repressed, but at the same time that you listen and feel the weight, desire starts to disappear. The desire for anything. I mention sexual desire because it is one of the most powerful desires, if not the most powerful one.

[A new subject is introduced].

How can you quickly explain the META process? It is thought, imagination, memory and "I." The META process is all that.

Memory, imagination, ego, visceral reactions... and imagination too. Memory, imagination, visceral reaction, ego.

Now, is there a functional “I”? Sure, the “I” that shows its passport when crossing the border. They tell you “Let’s see” [*takes out his passport*]. “Here’s the passport.” That’s the functional ego, “this man in the picture is me.”

Is there a non-functional “I”? For example, in medicine, the functional “I” is that person that learned how to diagnose and prescribe, “this person has diabetes, I have to prescribe this much NPH [*neutral protamine Hagedorn*] insulin, etc.” That’s functional “I” or ego. The problem starts when that physician says: “I want to be the best physician,” or “I want to be the wealthiest physician,” and so status and egocentricity begin and get mixed with the functional “I,” and conflict begins. The functional “I” does its function, say, the architect that builds a house and does it well, puts a good roof on it, everything (laughter). And there’s the architect that does it wrong, with a bad roof. But there’s also the architect that makes the house and stays in peace, or the architect that builds the house to get status. That “I” that is looking for status is the “I” that brings conflict, and by bringing conflict, lives in conflict.

Remember when we spoke about the nucleus of the “I”? The nucleus of the “I,” which is the homicidal ego and the suicidal ego, remember? When does it appear? When the “I” is afraid not to continue. I always give the example of the couple of lovers, when she tells him: “I need space.” He tells her “But you have lots of space.” She says: “No, I want to leave.” What is it that appears in him? The nucleus of the “I,” the homicide and the suicide. “What? This will not continue as “I” had always expected to continue?” “No.” Okay, the homicidal ego and the suicidal ego appear. Obviously, there is a nucleus of the “I” that is the homicide and the suicide. You don’t only see that in the Muslim guerrilla, the Muslim terrorist, you can also see it in each one of us when the ego is afraid not to continue. Example: “Mr. Rubén, we don’t need you anymore in this organization. We’re doing some...”

Audience: Re-engineering.

RFG: ...re-engineering of the company and you will no longer be needed.” Homicidal and suicidal ideation appears there too.

Audience: So that nucleus appears ...only in what's dysfunctional. Or would you say there is a functional nucleus of the “I”?

RFG: It's a nucleus of the “I,” functional or not.

Audience: Functional or not.

RFG: Right, because it's telling you... Say, that woman that you love is telling you “Bye bye, baby,” and there is a response of fear, anger and sadness, that may be homicidal and suicidal.

Audience: Or trying to defend yourself from a bear chasing you.

RFG: Well, that would be functional.

Audience: Yes, it's functional in that case.

RFG: But when your boss tells you, you're his employee and he tells you: “I no longer need you,” many times the homicidal and the suicidal ego appear as a very natural reaction of the “I,” because the “I” consists of a nucleus that is suicidal and homicidal. In an invasion, for instance, of a country against another, insurgents appear. For instance, insurgents in Iraq still haven't been suppressed by the USA, there are still insurgents in Iraq. Where do they come from? From the population that feels invaded. What comes out of that “I” that feels invaded? The homicide. Although there are some suicides, usually the homicide comes out.

We're looking at the aspects of the duality of “I.” Machiavelli wrote a book titled “The Prince,” a condensation of dualities and contradictions, pieces of advice for a prince to retain his power, which is the book the people in power use. It's still in vogue. They are good bits of advice for those who want to retain power. Machiavelli's best-known and most used piece of advice is: “Divide and rule.” That's what any good empire does: divide and rule.

A country like Yugoslavia is now Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro, etc., etc. It was divided, it was divided for it not to be too powerful. Korea is divided in South and North. That is convenient for Korea to have less power. Is there an intention of dividing Mexico in North and South? You can read that in some places, that they want to divide Mexico in North and South. "Divide and rule" is a wise piece of advice for those who want to retain power. A person who has power will not find it convenient if somebody says "It is necessary that mankind is united. Mankind needs to be united in peace and in love." So that's the end of power, power has to end in a humanity where love and peace rule.

Why doesn't Unitary Perception spread more? It is obvious that many people believe Unitary Perception is not convenient for them. They feel protected, they feel isolated in some illusory form of power that they consider more valuable than the union of mankind, when that union would bring about unimaginable abundance, peace and happiness. Just with the money spent on producing weapons, what could be done is... how much? We cannot imagine the happiness of mankind. The things we could do for health, education, proper roads, whatever we can think of, is now being used to make weapons, to sell them, use them to destroy people of invaded countries, etc. All of which implies a very adverse psychological situation, where fear and division rule. Any question or comment?

Audience: Rubén, a moment ago you mentioned this and we talked about it... the way in which we live, Precinct C, fragmentation. You say the brain is made to perceive fragmentarily. Wouldn't it be more correct to say it is made to function in ABC, but it functions only in one way?

RFG: Well, both are true.

Audience: Can you repeat that for Argentina?

RFG: She's saying... Blanca asks whether the brain is made to perceive fragmentarily or to function completely in ABC.

Audience: No. Whether “it’s made to perceive fragmentarily” or “it’s made to perceive in ABC,” but it functions only in one way. To change the expression “it’s made [to perceive] fragmentarily” because “it is made to perceive in ABC, but it only perceives in C.”

RFG: No, no, undoubtedly. The brain is made to work in ABC and it’s obviously functioning only in C. But the fact that it functions in C and that perception is fragmentary is explained, for instance, with that experiment with the little wire [on the eyelid]. What I’m trying to say with the experiment of the wire is why the brain works in C and why it has fragmentary perception. Because the brain is made to function fragmentarily in C, although we know well that the brain can function in another way, which is unknown, unused.

Do you understand that the experiment with the wire is to explain fragmentary perception? Do you, Eduardo? Do you understand that the wire on the eyelid is to explain fragmentary perception? That the brain perceives that electrical current on the eyelid in three different ways. Is that clear? Yes.

Audience: Doctor, can you say... would it be okay to say “phylogenetically”? The brain... would it be correct to say “phylogenetically, the brain is made from the start to perceive fragmentarily”?

RFG: Yes sir, yes. Phylogenetically, the brain is made to function in ABC. Of course. Bohm said: “Man has to have functioned with his brain in ABC like any animal functions, in a complete way.” That’s why JK says that animals live in an unconscious perfection, but man lives in a conscious imperfection (laughter). That unconscious perfection... obviously, the animal brain is functioning completely, otherwise a tiger could not catch an animal to eat, which is his way of feeding.

But in the human being, what happens? Why isn’t the human being functioning in ABC? Well, Bohm said: “Humanity is born functioning in ABC, and one day—says Bohm—a man goes up a hill and says “This hill is for me.” That day, the brain

starts going into functioning only in C, because conflict begins." A man decides he is the owner of the best part, and so much for peace; enemies appear, tribes appear, dyads appear. I don't know if you know the meaning of the word *dyad*.

It's a very important concept, a concept in family therapy, from someone called Minuchin. It's an interesting concept. When two people work together to destroy a group to which they belong, that's called a dyad, and it's something unconscious. For instance, in a ship, two sailors say "I'm sick of this captain, what do you say if we kill him?" That's a dyad. Because mutinies start like that. Two against the captain, or those two kill the captain and the ship falls into chaos, which has happened. I don't know if you've seen the movie "Mutiny on the Bounty," based on a true story, a very good film starring Marlon Brando. It starts with a dyad, "this captain is no good." It's the union of two against the union of all. That's a dyad.

Audience: Could it be mom and daughter...

RFG: Of course.

Audience: ...against everyone else?

RFG: Mom and daughter against dad. That's a very, very common dyad. That destroys homes? Of course. From that to divorce there is but a step and a half, right? It happens quite frequently, and it's unconscious. That's why it is very good to denounce a dyad as soon as you detect it. I mean, careful with affecting unity, not only in a family, in any movement that needs unity. It's very easy to fall in a dyad because it is unconscious, we don't realize we are in a dyad. We do it inadvertently.

Here in the CPH, a very interesting dyad happened at the beginning. As you know, we were all gathered here to work. Suddenly, a person who had come here to work says: "Okay, I won't stay here unless you pay me eight hundred dollars a month." I tell that person: "Well, let us think, let's see where those eight hundred dollars will come from." That person made a dyad with the psychologist, and the psychologist joined her in

asking for a salary. I tell them: “Look, you're in a fantasy, in something impossible. And also in a dyad. A dyad against what? Against the CPH, against the baby—I call the CPH “the baby,” something you have to protect. You two are in a dyad, asking for something that might be very fair, but also impossible at this moment. Let's take care of the baby.” The person who started that dyad left, but we stayed talking with the psychologist and told him: “What happened?” and he tells me: “I fell into the dyad inadvertently. I know what a dyad is—says the psychologist—but I still fell into the dyad without noticing.” Because a dyad is something you fall into inadvertently. It's like when mom starts telling her daughter “Let's see if we can leave that piece of... father of yours on the street.” Do you understand? It starts with a word. “Let's see if we can leave your dad on the street.” Do you understand? It starts with a little thing and then snowballs into full-blown family chaos.

Dyad is an important concept. Also triad: three against a unity. There's a city in which three people are against the building of CPH's. That's a triad, of course. Are they aware that they're in a triad? I don't think so, because a triad is, by definition, unconscious. Some people say CPH's are not necessary.

Without the CPH's, what happens? We cannot have a place for the master's degree. We have been recently told the master's degree could happen sooner, much sooner than expected. The big surprise is that the master's could start very soon, and, where can it be? In the CPH, naturally. That's why we say: the CPH is a three-year-old baby, with all the vulnerability of a baby, and we must look after it. We have to be careful not to fall into dyads or triads that destroy the CPH. We have to watch out for that, because the future of the master's degree depends on the CPH, and the master's will be a wonderful way of spreading the teaching, as long as we take care of some very important aspects, such as assessment, not letting this become a mediocre teaching, with mediocre teachers graduating, which is what is happening in university education today. Am I wrong? I'm not. We have to keep it from becoming mediocre, but that's all.

Audience: Teachers are told to pass students.

RFG: What?

Audience: Teachers are told to pass students, otherwise the teacher is incompetent.

RFG: God forbid.

Audience: No, it's already happening.

RFG: Yes, I mean 'God forbid' that the same happens in the CPH...

Audience: Ah, yes, yes.

RFG: ...with the master's in Unitary Perception or Holokinetic Psychology. That of the teacher passing students to keep everyone happy. No, sweetheart. The teacher has to pass a student when that student knows. In the meanwhile, he has to work for the student to learn. That is what we do in the ICHP [Internet Course in Holokinetic Psychology]. I asked a person who no longer comes here to do the ICHP for free. Since she was a psychologist, I was interested in her working with us.

There was no performance, no understanding, so she had to retake a module. She takes the module again: no performance, no understanding, because I think there was no *reading* either. So she tells me: "I give up." What can I do? Nothing. The only thing I can do is to insist that she retakes the module for free until she learns, which requires much more work from my part. But I can't say: "I'm gonna pass her to keep her happy and to look good, with so many students passing my module." No! God forbid.

Audience: In the ICHP you really learn.

RFG: What?

Audience: In the ICHP you really learn.

RFG: In the ICHP you learn, because if you made it to Module 4, it means the professors have given their best to help you learn, and those who didn't learn are asked to retake the module. "I beg you to retake it, because it's the way in which you'll learn, you haven't learned yet." There are reactions: "No, I want to move on." "You can't move on to the next module, because you will find many problems in Module 2 if you haven't passed Module 1. There are many scientific elements in M2, etc." That is what happens; if you finish the ICHP, it's because you have a rather clear idea of what we're talking about, and if you want to take the Professor exam, studying for it will be much easier. That's what we want in the ICHP.

What do we want for the master's degree? The same. Not to pass students to keep everyone happy and look good as a teacher, as one of our friends here has denounced. God forbid! God forbid. Or having students grade the teacher. What do you mean? I think it was the other way around (laughter). Teachers are the ones who have to grade students.

We have to be careful with all those corruptions of education. Don't let them come in when the master's starts, don't let that corruption happen in this teaching, which is so important, and as I understand it, even sacred. I believe the teaching of Holokinetic Psychology is even sacred, because it has connotations that imply a serious study of the sacred. From the psychological viewpoint, that seems to me a necessary function of Psychology and Neurology: to study what happens, as we have already said, in enlightenment, in sanctity, things that are indisputable facts but have been never studied seriously, in depth.

We have fifteen minutes left, I don't know if you have questions or comments in Buenos Aires.

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* There is a question here about fear and desire. We don't understand why Freud compares them.

RFG: We had a case in the University of Pennsylvania.. sorry, in the University of Pittsburgh, of a man who was inviting her

wife to participate in something that was somewhat popular in the seventies, which was couple-exchange clubs.

In the seventies, there was a sort of trend called... called... I don't remember the name, but it was like clubs in which three or four couples would get together to exchange partners. That is, John and Mary met Peter and Patty to make a swap (laughter). That brought all kinds of murders and suicides (laughter), so it didn't last for long as a trend. I had to see a case, a young man who wanted her wife to sleep with his friend. I tell him: "Let's see, explain to me, what makes you want your wife to sleep with your friend? Tell me." He tells me: "Because there's nothing I fear more than my wife leaving me for my friend. When I think about seeing my wife with my friend, the sexual arousal kills me, I get terribly horny." "Why?" "Because it's what I fear the most, and being my worst fear, it's also my biggest turn-on." I think that's a good example that confirms what Freud described, that fear and sexual desire are strongly linked. I don't know if I've answered.

Audience: [*Still from Buenos Aires*] Yes, thanks.

Audience: [*In CPH Mexicali*] How does the story end? Suicide and murder (laughter).

RFG: Imagine, for a couple to work well you need lots of adjustments, now imagine what it takes for six couples to work well, in an couple-exchange club. Ah, all kinds of dynamics you can imagine are formed there. Of course there were even murders and suicides. Because in the end, Patty liked the other guy more than Peter (laughter)... "But, what? I thought this thing was just for the weekend." "But I liked your friend more than you." That's when you saw the homicide and the suicide.

It's all related. The fear with sexual desire, that's something that, wisely, Freud links for the first time. This is just an example, but it's something that was very much seen in the US during the seventies, with those couple exchange clubs. Ah! Wife swapping! That's what they called it. Wife swapping. Exchanging wives. It was a very common practice among the hippies, who started with the idea of the flower instead of the

machine-gun. That came together with drugs and wife swapping, a new sexual philosophy where possessiveness ended. Everyone with everyone, and that also brought all kinds of deep problems, logically. If it is difficult for a couple to work, a club of couples will be much more difficult.

Audience: There are two egos in a marriage... now they had six egos.

RFG: Exactly, that's what I always said: if it's not easy with two egos, it will be more difficult with six egos or eight egos.

I don't know if there is another question or comment.

Audience: I had a comment about fragmentary perception. The experiment with the wire shows how man can perceive a single energy in three different ways. But it seems that the foundation of fragmentary perception is genetic memory, which is what makes the intervention of memory in perception come through one sense or from many, because the fact that it comes from many senses, I think you can't differentiate that from Unitary Perception. So the miracle of Unitary Perception is produced when perceiving at the same time. Man's predisposition to fragmentary perception could be more related to the preponderance of memory, which we saw in the other class in an extraordinary way.

RFG: You mean it's rather due to genetic memory and not so much to fragmentary perception, right?

Audience: That is, man's predisposition to fragmentary perception seems to be caused more by the preponderance of genetic...

RFG: Genetic [memory].

Audience: ...genetic [memory] in the first stage of human life, than by the fact of having the capacity to perceive a single energy in three different ways.

RFG: Right. What happens in Unitary Perception is a kind of... undoubtedly, a liberation from that way of perceiving,

whichever its nature may be, despite there being a neurological structure or not—there seems to be one, a neurological structure for perceiving a single thing in several ways. But in Unitary Perception, what happens is a leap into another dimension of perception in which there is greater energy, and in which the ear listens. In this case with the little wire, it doesn't mean that the ear sees, but there is a phosphene, of neurological nature, while the sound is heard, and that's unconscious. But in Unitary Perception, the fact of perceiving what has to be perceived, i.e., whatever is happening, at the same time, is conscious. The ear listens consciously and the eye sees consciously, not unconsciously as in the case of the phosphene, which is produced by the impact of electricity, but consciously; the eye is seeing consciously and the ear is listening consciously at the same time. It is an energetic leap in perception. It's not a rather passive perception like the one described with the wire. The passive perception that happens with an almost-reflex action of the central nervous system. What happens here is a conscious act of great energy, much more energy than the reflex in the case of the wire. A great energy in which the ear listens and the eye sees; it's not that the eye listens. But at the same time, in a conscious way; there's the difference and that's the difference of energy between the two perceptions, a different nature and energy in both perceptions, precisely because it is conscious, a conscious act, not a reflex act. This is clear, right?

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Rubén, there's a question here about the buzzing one feels when attempting Unitary Perception. Why does this happen?

RFG: We have talked about this many times in many congresses. Those who take Unitary Perception seriously can hear a very subtle buzzing. Several theories have appeared about what that buzzing is. I tend to believe there is a very large electric network in any country, social electrification is a worldwide fact by now: there are transmission towers, electrical networks practically above the whole territory of this planet, and that generates, as I understand, that buzzing which isn't normally heard. I don't know if that is due to exhaustion of

the ear, but you don't normally hear it unless you've been in Unitary Perception for a long time, attempting Unitary Perception for a long time. And then one day, this happened to Ceci and me: "Do you hear that?" "What?" "That." "Let's see." "That, like a buzzing." "Ah, yes." Nothing esoteric, I think it's...

Audience: "The sound of silence" was the question. Is there a sound in silence? This issue of the buzzing came from there.

RFG: A sound in silence which is a very subtle buzzing, that, I think, comes from the electrical network, which is widespread and has its own subtle little buzzing. But other theories emerged. I don't know if you [*to the man who asked the question*] remember any of the other theories.

Audience: Yes, the sound was attributed to brain activity, because if you cover your ears, you can still hear the buzz. Krishnamurti said in the biography that he didn't hear any buzzing. Personally, I've heard the buzzing in one of my ears, not in both. I personally don't think it's the electric network. I don't know if there was any other theory.

RFG: Of course we should separate Ménière's Syndrome, which is a buzzing caused by arteriosclerosis of the ear, which happens in cases of hypertension with arteriosclerosis: a buzzing appears, and it may be in one or both ears. Of course, when we speak about this buzzing, we're talking about perceiving it with both ears. If it's one ear only, I tend to think it's something like Ménière's Syndrome, because if it's a buzzing, even if it's something mental, produced by the brain, you will hear it in both ears. Otherwise, you have to think it may be Ménière or pre- Ménière, a pre-syndrome before Ménière's Syndrome.

There might be a brain activity that produces a buzzing... everything is possible, everything is possible. However, I tend to believe it is rather an exogenous activity, coming from outside the organism, and caused by the electrical network. If the buzzing was produced by the electrical network, covering your ears would not be enough, because don't forget that there's

transmission of sound through bones, like the mastoids, the sounds of the skull, they all transmit sound too. Those sounds reach your ears even if you cover them. There is transmission of sound through the mastoid, the mastoid apophysis of the temporal bone. Covering your ears is not enough to conclude it's not electrical activity. Could it be a buzzing from brain activity? Yes, that's an attractive theory, but I think it has less scientific weight than the explanation with the electrical network.

Audience: In any case, I would say it could be produced by the waves emitted by radio or TV antennas, because you can hear that sound in the countryside too, not only in the city.

RFG: Sure, because the electrical network covers the whole territory. As you say, Hertzian waves are everywhere. I watch the RAI channel, it's broadcast from Rome—RAI, the Italian TV station. I listen to it at home and say “Heavens, I'm listening to something that's coming from Rome.” It means all those Hertzian waves coming from Rome are all over the Atlantic ocean, all over Europe, those Hertzian waves coming from Rome are all over the world. Perhaps there's not an Argentinian station with the same transmission power, but if there was one, it would be the same as with RAI, with those Hertzian waves covering the planet. I'm under the impression that would be the most logical explanation to the buzzing of silence.

Audience: I heard it since I was a child.

Audience: I think it's something external too, not internal, because it happened to me in a house in which we had a room for silence, and in that room, the buzz was more intense and constant than ever before. So, that buzz...

RFG: With more peace, more intensity.

Audience: And I never heard it as I heard it in that room, but I don't know if that has to do with more peace, more intensity or if that place had a buzzing... I tend to believe there was a buzzing in that place that was absent in other places.

RFG: More electrical activity.

Audience: Right. That would support the theory of an external cause, not an internal cause. That maybe it's not a buzzing produced by the brain, but out there in the environment.

RFG: I think it's in the environment, but we don't hear it because we're too busy, and if there is no Unitary Perception, there is no peace for listening. But as soon as we enter peace, the buzzing appears, and that is obviously consensual, because we've talked about it in the Congresses, and everyone hears the buzzing when they have taken Unitary Perception seriously, obviously. The thing is... theories emerge about an external or an internal source.

Audience: Couldn't it be an interaction of both? Since energy... the electricity in the brain and that electrical network outside...

RFG: I always say, when teaching Unitary Perception, for instance in a workshop or a seminar, which we will do here too—I say: “Listen to the sound in the brain.” We're overextending for some minutes here, but it's okay, right? “Listen to the sound in the brain,” because every sound is heard in the brain. I mean, we're listening to the car tires over there, there's much humidity, you can tell the pavement is kind of wet. You can hear tires rolling on that humidity, almost as if it was rain. That car tire is over there, but the sound is in here [in the brain]. It means you have to listen to sound in the brain, so you can listen to every sound that will reach the brain, like those tires.

If you listen that way, you listen to every sound, you will hear it in the brain, peace will come sooner and you will hear more sounds in your brain, coming from many places.

Saying it is internal is, ultimately, philosophically correct. But scientifically, leaving philosophy aside, we should say that the buzzing sound might come from the electric network, which seems to me a sensible explanation, and that you will hear it

only when you listen to all the sound in your brain, in Unitary Perception.

Audience: So, Rubén, then there is no outside-inside frontier; inner-outer.

RFG: Of course, of course.

Audience: Very high frequency.

RFG: It has a very fine, very high frequency.

Audience: I haven't heard a sound with higher frequency than that. It is above or below all the other sounds.

RFG: It's almost ultrasound. Almost ultrasound.

Audience: I wanted to comment something. Dogs can hear sounds that we cannot hear. I think the key is that he said "ultrasound"; what happens is that, when listening in Unitary Perception, you hear what you don't hear when you listen in fragmentary perception.

RFG: Yes, there's the example of dogs, Natzio says, who can hear ultrasound. Not long ago, there was an earthquake and people say all the dogs ran away, because they heard the ultrasound coming from below the earth. Those sounds are coming from outside, but dogs can hear them because they have the adequate nervous system for that. We will have a system that is adequate to hear something nearing ultrasound when we are in the peace of Unitary Perception. That is my way of seeing it. Yes.

Not that it has an internal origin, although of course, the heart makes its noise, and the intestines make borborygmus. But when we talk about a sound that is produced inside the brain, it gets complicated, because, yes, there is molecular activity in the neurons, but that kind of molecular, inter-neuronal energy is very far from actually producing audible sound.

Audience: It's too soft.

RFG: Sound is Hertzian waves, in the brain we have X and gamma rays, energetic rays of electromagnetic type, whereas sound is not electromagnetic in nature, but of another energetic nature. That's why I resist to believe that sound is generated by the brain; it is *heard* by the brain more easily in Unitary Perception, because it is near ultrasound, which you can't normally hear without Unitary Perception.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Here they ask if you can still hear that sound.

RFG: Yes! You're in Unitary Perception, and the buzzing is part of the sound. The more peace there is, the easier it is to enter the second silence, it gets easier and more frequent each time. There is that sound over there. But of course, you don't concentrate in any sound, otherwise it stops being Unitary Perception. But this is part of, let's call it "deep" Unitary Perception.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] There's another question here: How do you explain auric vision?

RFG: I would like to answer this like JK answered. Don't worry about auras, don't worry about healing with your hands. What you have to emphasize, said JK, is: am I in peace? And if I'm not, why not? Do I feel love? And if I don't, why not? That's what we have to emphasize. I believe the peace and love that Krishnamurti is proposing, just as JesuKristos proposed, comes in Unitary Perception. That is what we have to emphasize. If epi-phenomena appear later (which are material phenomena that have nothing to do with spirit), those are secondary. Careful with emphasizing group mind, auras or pristine healing with hands, because that would be taking the wrong road and playing the game of the "New Age," which is something pestilent, because it has become just another market.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] The question here is what is the scientific explanation for auras to be visible. What is it that you see?

RFG: Well, it is like what Natzio here was saying. I mean, dogs hear ultrasound and, just like there are colors beyond violet—ultraviolet and colors beyond red—infrared—, it is possible for a sensitive person to see things that are commonly unseen.

Now, quoting JK again, JK used to say: “Look, you have to cross the forest of life, you have to go through the forest. You will meet rabbits, you will meet deer, maybe a lion or a cougar. What will you do? Will you stop to have a conversation with the rabbit? (laughter) Or with a deer, or with a cougar? No, you keep walking to cross the forest, because you’re crossing it for some reason.” I think that’s a very good answer to the so-called extrasensory phenomena, which will happen in anyone who takes Unitary Perception seriously. And in what order? A mathematical order. First comes group mind, then auras, then healing. These will appear mathematically in anyone who takes it seriously. “But be very careful—JK said to me, and it’s written too—careful with getting caught in that,” which is what they have done in the New Age movements, which have become disgustingly commercial. I mean, don’t fall in that, don’t emphasize the epi-phenomena. It is very important to emphasize Unitary Perception, which is the open window to the sacred, the open window to true, non-imaginary life, the open window to true communion among human beings.

(Long pause).

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Here they ask if the aura is part of a person's body.

RFG: Of course, yes. In an elevator in Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, I saw something gray in an aura, and I told the person: “Excuse me, I will ask you a question that has to do with an experiment I'm carrying out. Are you ill?” He says “Yes, I come to this hospital—this was in an hospital—to get cobalt radiation therapy, because I have cancer,” and I could see a grayish thing in his aura. So yes, it is part of the body, undoubtedly. The important thing is not to make a fuss about this, because otherwise, you go into the realm of sorcerers, you

stop being taken seriously, as a person who puts science above charlatantry, witchcraft and all the New Age things.

(Long pause).

When I realized I could heal a bit, in the pristine way, the first person to know it was JK, and he tells me: “So what?” I tell him: “I think it's wonderful.” He tells me: “Careful. Do you want to be a quack? If you want to be a quack, tell a lot of people you've done that, and soon you will have a long queue of people looking for you as a quack. If you want to do that, be careful.” They come, but watch out what you do with that, because if you become a quack because you can heal, you stray from the path completely... there is no path, but what I mean is: you move completely away from true, non-imaginary life, because you'll become a quack, which has very little importance.

What is important is that people learn Unitary Perception as soon as possible, before mankind ends because of its divisions, its growing divisions, its growing stupidity. The dissemination of Unitary Perception has to be emphasized, not all the phenomena that will happen to anyone who takes Unitary Perception seriously. I insist, the most important thing is the teaching of Unitary Perception, all the other things will be added. But not emphasizing the contingencies of Unitary Perception. I insist, they are, in their order: group mind, auras, healing, clairvoyance.

But all that has to be masked, all that has to be... not commented, except for the closest friends, because otherwise, people take you as something you don't want to be: a quack, a charlatan. I don't know how people take all this, but it's not in the adequate manner, not in the scientific, fraternal, exploratory manner. Sadly, exploratory fraternity is the last thing you can see, instead of being the first. Sadly.

(Pause).

Audience: I think those who overvalue auras and healing are those who don't know peace, because if you know peace, you know that, if you saw your neighbor's aura, so what?

RFG: Of course. If you see a very gray aura and know there is little life left in that person, you can't tell them: "You have little life left in you," you can't. It is a knowledge you cannot use. Therefore, as Lao Tzu said: "Mask your brilliancy."

(Pause).

I don't know if we overextended the class too much. If there is another question or comment... It's a bit late already, but I think it's been beautiful.

I thank you all for your patience, and we're meeting next Sunday at 10 am in Mexicali, 2 pm Buenos Aires. Good luck, thanks to everyone.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Thank you Rubén, goodbye from here.

RFG: Goodbye.

TOPICS - CLASS 5

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 5 (297)
- CLARIFICATIONS ABOUT LANGUAGE (297)
- OUR INNER VIOLENCE (300)
- DEFINITIONS OF MIND AND UNITARY PERCEPTION (300)
- LOVE FOR THE CREATION AND FOR THE CREATED (303)
- SEEING SADNESS IN UNITARY PERCEPTION (304)
- UNITARY PERCEPTION IS FREEDOM OF THE PAST(306)
- THE INDIVIDUAL RESPONSABILITY TOWARDS THE SACRED (307)
- REVIEW QUESTIONS (309)
- METADEPRESSION AND DEPRESSION (318)
- THE IMPORTANCE OF PEACE (320)
- THE NATURE OF THE SELF (322)
- THE DEFENSE OF DENIAL (324)
- THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY AND METAPHYSICS (325)
- TO BE BORN FROM ABOVE (326)
- THE NECESSITY OF HAVING DIALOGUE, READING AND ATTEMPTING UNITARY PERCEPTION (327)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS- CLASS 5 (329)

CLASS 5

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, August 22th, 2010.

RFG: Good day! This is the fifth lesson of the Sunday Presential Course, in Mexicali, Mexico, August 22, 2010.

Now that we're fresh at the beginning of the class, we will go over some things about language, while we summarize what we have seen until today: We know that Holokinesis, the mathematical formulation that gave the essence of Holokinetic Psychology, is the movement from here to here, and it is in the whole Universe, and in the electron. So, the electron that disappears from Bohm's sight appears again in the same place, because it went to its own implicit order and it returned to the explicit, visible order. And both the implicit and the explicit order are in the same place, which is the electron. We could say this cell phone has an explicit order, which we can see, right? Its color (black), its weight, etc., all that is explicit in the universe. This cell phone is explicit in the way we can see it, but it also has an implicit order, in the same space of the cell phone, into which it is disappearing at each moment, and reappearing so quickly that the eye cannot detect it, in the same way it cannot detect the separate frames in a movie, because the eye has a limited capacity.

And regarding language, when we say the electron disappears in its implicit order and appears again in the explicit order, that happens due to Holokinesis—which is what? The movement that goes from here to here. From here, the electron (explicit order) to here, the electron (in the implicit order). Now we have to see the subtlety of language, to avoid being deceived by egocentric language. In this case, why do we use egocentric language? Because we don't have another way of saying it, and

we can't go around making up languages, so when we say the electron disappears in the implicit order of itself, and that it goes in Holokinesis from here to here, from the explicit order (here) to the implicit order (here), we are using the words *from* and *to*. Watch out, because those words belong to the movement from here to *there*. From here to there, it makes sense! If we get subtle, it loses its meaning when we say the electron goes from here (explicit order) to here (implicit order) of the electron, because there is no *from* or *to*, since it is all here. But we're using the old language, which refers to the movement from here to there, simply because there is no other language.

And it is egocentric language, because *from* is always from the observer *to* the observable. So, we know we're using an old language to refer to something completely new. *From, to*; or, "there is a movement *between* the explicit order of the electron and the implicit order of the electron." *Between* also implies there are two things in space, which is not necessarily here. Now, *from, to* and *between* are words we inherited from egocentric language. A language we will continue to use because that's how Spanish was born, from Sanskrit, and Sanskrit is an ego-based language, and we won't change the language, but we need to be aware of the subtleties of language that may take us away from the understanding of these subtleties. This is clear, right?

And many other things like that happen, like temporal language: "I'm going to achieve Unitary Perception, after this course or within five minutes." And it's not really like that; Unitary Perception is either happening now or it isn't, because the moment when you're listening or not is right now. Therefore, to say "I will achieve Unitary Perception" is temporal language, therefore wrong. Then there is hypnotic language, which we talked about, as in: "Relax," or any form of order. That's hypnotic language. This is for us to start realizing the need to, not change the language, but to be aware that we're using a language from the past, which is egocentric, temporal and hypnotic.

We know the universe is made of matter, mind and energy, and it is in two orders: implicit and explicit. All that matter (which is 1% of the universe, be it luminous matter, dark matter or any kind), mind and energy are in two orders, the implicit and the explicit, in the entire universe. Now, we live in a humanity that's each day more and more divided, more hateful, more sorrowful, and we need to realize that we're in the mind of the universe; we're not in the mind of Rubén. Mind is not in this individual, actually we are in the universal mind and we don't realize that, because we're not in Unitary Perception. But if we want the end of the divisions between human beings, and of the suffering of mankind, produced by thought, then we need to understand, sooner or later, that our mind is the mind of the universe, not the mind of Rubén, John or Peter.

Regarding thought, we already know thought is hypnosis thanks to Bernheim, Bernheim's experience, which we've talked about already. And if we understand that thought is hypnosis, we'll understand that all of us are hypnotized, and therefore, we're barely aware of what we say and what we do, of everything we say and do. We're barely aware of what we say and what we do. When we say "I love you, honey," when we express the violence that comes when mom tells us "No, you can't pee in your pants." We're two years old and violence is born with mom: "No, you can't poop in your pants" and the child, who cannot express himself with words, starts to accumulate violence, and that violence is later directed, as Freud rightly said, to any known person, especially loved ones, those closer to us, and is repeated, for example, in marriage: that same violence (which can be seen in marriage a lot), and that is the transference of hostility we have to our mother and that we redirect to our spouse. Our spouses end up as the victims because they are the least dangerous among the people that interact with us, if we ignore the reports about most murders happening during Christmas and in the house. But oh well.

Audience: Did you say Christmas?

RFG: Most murders happen in the house and during Christmas.

But, ignoring certain statistic reports, we can say that we pick on the person we're safest with to express our violence. It's generally your spouse, son, dad, someone who is harmless and close to you. An employee is unlikely to express violence with his boss. And a boss, if he wants to keep his employee, will not express much of his violence with an employee, but rather at home, with his wife, with his family. So we have to see the violence in ourselves, just like we have to see sadness, and to see the excessive craving we have for money, so we can see the causes of the growing division of humanity. And that division brings not only suffering; it brings the misery created by a few to exploit and enslave the many, and all that sadness, that violence and craving for money brings the sorrow of the whole of mankind, not only our sorrow, not only the sorrow of our loved ones. We have to see all this in Unitary Perception, not in that president, that representative or that relative. No! See it in ourselves, our own sadness, our violence, our excessive craving for money.

And we define mind in a new way because it is necessary. Do any of you remember the definition of mind?

Audience: Mind is the interface between matter and energy.

RFG: Mind as a part of the universe is the interface between matter and energy, and therefore, it is in the whole universe, undoubtedly. And how do we define mind psychologically?

Audience: Mind is the result of the interaction between the organism and its environment from birth...—I mean, from the uterus to death.

RFG: Not from birth; from the uterus! From the uterus to death. Is that all the mind is? Is that the whole definition of mind?

Audience: It is also Unitary Perception.

RFG: Besides that, which was Precinct C, memory, thought, self, imagination, it is also Unitary Perception, meaning, it is also the structure of the universe in the brain. And we cannot

deprecate that the structure of the universe is the structure of the brain, because the brain is part of the universe, just like a bird, rivers, seas, and trees. They are part of the universe. They are part of the universe's mind. We are part of the universe's mind and we don't realize that. That is why there is so much division between human beings, and it's growing.

And there are several definitions of Unitary Perception: psychological, epistemological, physical, neurological. Do any of you remember a definition of Unitary Perception? Jesús?

Audience: To perceive everything perceptible at the same time within the brain.

RFG: That definition is...? Psychological!

Very good, Jesús. Does anyone remember the neurological definition?

Audience: The three functional precincts, C, B and A, in the brain.

RFG: Sure. But Unitary Perception has a neurological definition. You are defining the mind with its neurological functions (A, B and C), which is right, but we are saying that Unitary Perception has four definitions. Well, it has more, but fundamentally, four definitions. Psychological, which Jesús just mentioned: to perceive everything perceptible at the same time. Do you remember what the neurological definition of Unitary Perception is?

Audience: The posterior brain is aware of the anterior brain.

RFG: The posterior brain, says Lénica, is aware of what the anterior brain is doing.

It's the other way around! The anterior brain is the one who is aware of what the posterior brain is doing. And what does the posterior brain do? Receive the energy of the cosmos, light, gravitation, sound. The energy of the cosmos! Not breathing, because breathing is not energy; breathing is part of Precinct C, and if we want to be in Precinct B, then we shouldn't

emphasize that unconscious part of Precinct C that is breathing. By emphasizing breathing, like the gurus do, with their meditation techniques, we're emphasizing Precinct C, and we will never leave Precinct C if we emphasize breathing.

And what other definition of Unitary Perception do we have? Do you remember the epistemological definition?

Audience: Isn't it "the conscious contact with Holokinesis"?

RFG: That is a definition in Physics! Which I was leaving for the end; that is the definition in Physics. What Eduardo has just said is the definition in Physics, which is: Unitary Perception is the [conscious] contact with Holokinesis. Very well. But there is an epistemological definition. Who remembers it? Blanca?

Audience: It is the act of observation in which the observer and the observed are dissolved.

RFG: Well, not the observed...

Audience: The observer and what he observes...

RFG: Right...

Audience: ...are dissolved in the act of observation itself.

RFG: What is it that gets dissolved?

Audience: The observer.

RFG: Right! Then, Unitary Perception is the intense act of observation, the most intense act of observation, the most energetic, which causes—hence the former name, *triangular consciousness*, [in the first writings,] because observation encompasses the observer and everything the observer observes: the observable) the observer to be dissolved in such an intense observation. The observer is dissolved and nothing but the observable remains, including the observer as something observable, with his thoughts, etc.

So we have four definitions of Unitary Perception. Is that clear? Any question? And it is said that Unitary Perception is love for creation, and not only for the created. Look at that beautiful phrase: Unitary Perception is love for creation, not only for the created! It means that, when we see a very attractive girl, love for the created is awakening, right? And we forget about love for creation. But in Unitary Perception, love for creation is above everything. And the created is part of that love, i.e., the created is within that love, because Unitary Perception is love for creation. And if we look at the girl, we can look at her with love and not only with desire, and if we see a dog, we can look at it with love and not only with compassion for its sorrowful nature, and if we see a tree, we can look at it with love and not only with the desire to enjoy its shade.

So, Unitary Perception is also love for creation and not only for the created. It is love for everything you can perceive, everything perceptible, right now. And another thing that is said about Unitary Perception is that the observer is dissolved, which means becoming nothing. You become nothing! In that second awakening in wakefulness—first awakening: we're sleeping and we wake up to wakefulness—, the second awakening is when we begin to listen to all the sound, feel the weight, we enter Unitary Perception: second awakening. So, why does one become nothing in the second awakening? Because the observer disappears!

Audience: And no one.

RFG: You become nothing and no one, because just like the dreaming Rubén disappeared when he wakes up (to his relief, if it was a nightmare, or to his gloom if he was dreaming of rice pudding), that dream-Rubén disappeared in wakefulness, upon waking up. And if the second awakening, which is Unitary Perception, comes, this observer, wakefulness-Rubén, dissolves, so it's like becoming nothing. Unitary Perception is becoming nothing. And that may cause fear. "If I become nothing, it means I will be vulnerable, anyone will take advantage of me, and anyone will fool me." And it's not like that; it's not like that.

So, why does this friend who taught me Unitary Perception tells me “Don’t try to change”? I tell him: “I am very sad.” Today is the 32nd anniversary of the Trelew massacre, in Argentina, which was the beginning of the Argentinean civil war, which went on until the Malvinas war, which was made for people to unite and forget that they were fighting against each other, within Argentina. That civil war went on for ten years or so. They say there were a hundred thousand “disappeared” people, young people of both genders, between ages eighteen and thirty, so, I leave Argentina in those times, after the Trelew massacre, and then I meet Krishnamurti and tell him:

—Okay, my name is *anger*—, and he gets happy when I told him that, and he told me:

—I’m glad you don’t want to pretend you’re a saint, like everyone who comes to see me—and a friendship started between us until his death, and it continues in me, because I still love him. And when I tell him:

—I want to change, I want to be a peaceful person—, he tells me:

—Don’t even think of changing.

I was so surprised by him saying that you don’t need to change. When everyone had told me I had to change. “Rubén, change that shirt, you’ve been wearing it for three days” (laughter) and “Rubén, you have to change that way of speaking you have” or “that way of walking” —my mother used to say, because I walked with my feet pointing inward. And my mother corrected my way of walking, and there was always something to be changed! And Krishnamurti tells me, for the first time in my life, that I don’t need to change anything. When I was suffering as I had never suffered before in my life, and I haven’t suffered that much sorrow again, he tells me:

—Don’t change that sadness.

I tell him:

—What?

—See the sadness, see it while you listen, see it while you feel the weight, see it while you eat, see it at every moment while you are sad, see what sadness is.

I tell him:

—But I already know what sadness is, and I want it to end!

—Ah, no —he tells me—, if you want it to end, you will not see it. And if you don't see it, it will not end.

And this is related to something from Christianity, about us being made in Gods' image, that we're made in God's image and likeness, and when Moses (the only person to speak to God in the Bible) asks God, as it is written, for Gods' name, God answers "I am what I am." You can translate that in several ways, because the original language, Hebrew, is very flexible. "I am what I am," just like us: we are what we are. So, do we need to change this, what we are? Well, no. We don't need to change it, we need to see it. We have to see it! And see it in Unitary Perception. Then we'll see the violence, we'll see the love for money, we'll see the sadness. And I was lucky enough to listen to this friend —at first I would pay no heed to him, but when I did, I was freed from sadness! Have I forgotten the massacre? No, but I was freed from the sadness.

And another thing that is said about Unitary Perception is that it is the freedom from the mutual and collective hypnosis. Freedom from mutual and collective hypnosis! That is, freedom from thought, especially freedom from unnecessary thought, of course, because necessary thought exists too. And we can say this in a simpler way: break free from the past! Break free from the past.

And I was one day with this friend who taught me the most important thing in life, which is Unitary Perception, and he was talking to a Hindu monk, and the monk tells JK:

—I want to complete my spiritual evolution.

And Krishnamurti says:

—What evolution?

—Well, I want to enter a higher spiritual hierarchy.

And JK tells him:

—What hierarchy?

What hierarchy? And you know, the whole thing about hierarchy comes from Plato, as in the Sun being more important than the Moon, stars being more important than the Sun, and spiritual levels for the stars, levels for the sun and levels for the moon. And JK says “No, sir.” “No, sir.” JK sounds like Francesco Bernardone, a.k.a. Francis of Assisi, who called the Sun and the Moon “Brother Sun” and “Sister Moon.” Francesco did not draw differences or hierarchies between the Sun and the Moon. In the universe, we are all inside the mind of the universe, which is only one, and there are no hierarchies there. Hierarchy is a product of thought, generally for a person to take advantage of another poor person (or people). That is, to manipulate and exploit others, we have invented hierarchies, and there’s nothing better for that purpose than spiritual hierarchy. Hence the words “spiritual evolution,” “levels of being,” and all the hierarchies here and there. Bye-Bye, baby! We can get rid of that because it is a fantasy produced by thought. And Unitary Perception puts an end to that false illusion of hierarchies right now. Brother Sun and sister Moon, and we are all brothers but we don’t realize that. Together with all that nonsense about spiritual evolution and levels of being comes the social degeneration: those who have more and those who have less. That’s the origin of the immense fraud and immense plunder humanity has suffered, in the last two years, as it happened five years ago too, and ten years ago; it keeps happening, this time more intensely than ever. From 2008 up to now, more intensely than ever. Fraud and plunder! And it has a lot to do with the idea of hierarchies and levels of being, because the plunderers always claim to belong to this group (we won’t say the name) where they have thirty-three spiritual levels, so there’s people of grade thirty-

three, others of grade thirty-two, etc. You can see all the falsehood behind all that, and all the fraud, plunder, crises, wars, and misery that the idea of hierarchy brings.

Especially spiritual hierarchy, i.e., that someone can tell us how to find God, but well, sadly, there's bad news about that: we are alone in that, and whoever doesn't understand that we're alone in finding the sacred is done for! And if he thinks someone can help him find the sacred, he's deadly wrong. We have to see what our degree of corruption is; we are degenerated—how much? We love money—how much? We are sad—how sad? All of that is the “I,” ego. We're violent, angry—how angry are we? Do we love the image of the hero with a machine-gun in his hand? Do we love that image? We have to confess that yes, we do like that character with a machine-gun in his hand who did so much for the poor. And, until we realize violence is within us, and that we love the people who have been violent, we're simply done for. That is, we're doomed. [*Explains the Argentinean Spanish idiom “estamoslistos”*]Do you say that here?

Audience: Now we do, thanks to Rubén. (Laughter).

RFG: You say it now because of Rubén, but it's not common in Mexico.

But we are wrong, we are really wrong if we think that those characters, with a machine-gun in hand, can do something. The same with believing those sanctified characters can do something for us. No, if we believe that, we're doomed! In the spiritual life, we're alone, and we have to know exactly how sad we are, how violent we are, how much we like money, because as long as we don't see that, we're doomed. And we'll go badly wrong, because that means we will put our sadness, our violence, our love for money above love, above friendship, above the things that matter for mankind, above the economic equality of mankind. And there is a great deal of social degeneration because we don't see any of this and we keep believing in spiritual hierarchies, so we get plundered with money, and there is not even a reaction. Eight out of ten human beings are malnourished. Eight! Malnourished. Which means

they have less immunity, therefore they are more prone to infections. Which infections? Tuberculosis; tuberculosis is on the rise. AIDS; AIDS is on the rise. The flus are on the rise, and new forms of flu appear. Some of them invented, like the last one, the swine flu, to get money, but others are real, like the avian flu, or the Asian flu, because the flu never comes from “here,” it always comes from “there.” Like the plague, which was called the English plague in Spain and the Spanish plague in England. Then there is the Asian flu, which of course, is not the Mexican flu... and flus of every kind are on the rise. Why? Because immunity has fallen, not just because there are more viruses. Some people say that some of the viruses are invented...

Audience: The “Tequila effect” too...

RFG: Ah, no! If there is an economic problem, it’s the “tequila effect or the Buenos Aires effect, not that there’s exploitation or the desire to exploit”—and it’s all over the world, not only in Mexico. And then we have vulgarity. It grows! If we still watch TV, if we’re not sick of it, we will see more vulgarity and more violence in the TV and in the movies. And we will see more stupidity, but we’ll adapt to that, because otherwise, what will we do? Stop watching TV? Stop attending those meetings? Etc., etc.

Precinct C, which is where all of this happens, all of this is a product of human thought and memory, I mean the plunder, spiritual hierarchies, fraud, it’s all one thing. And malnourishment, vulgarity, violence, it’s all one thing; it’s a product of Precinct C, a product of thought, which has its laws. Do you remember the laws of Precinct C? Javier?

Audience: Cyclical, dual...

RFG: Dual, cyclical and repetitive. Cyclical, repetitive, which is the same, dual...

Audience: Hypnotic.

RFG: Hypnotic, very good.

Audience: Unconscious, incoherent.

RFG: Unconscious and incoherent. Those are some of the laws of Precinct C. It means that, out of every hundred things that happen in Precinct C, we are conscious of one of them. Out of every hundred things that go on in our thought and memory, we are conscious of one. Because 1% is conscious and 99% is unconscious. Does this mean we say and do things of which we're barely aware of? Of course!

And we talked about diagnosis. Why do we talk about diagnosis in psychology? For us to know that there are diagnoses that don't benefit from Unitary Perception. Those diagnoses are... Yolanda?

Audience: People with retardation and... alcoholics... ah, no, no...

RFG: Alcoholics are not very well because they've destroyed their neurons.

Audience: And...

RFG: Schizophrenia.

Audience: ...ah, schizophrenia...

RFG: Mental retardation, schizophrenia...

Audience: ...and untreated depression.

RFG: Untreated depression and untreated attention deficit. Very good.

Who remembers what the objective of a seminar or workshop is?

Audience: To introduce you into the reading of the written work on Unitary Perception.

RFG: Right. To introduce you into the reading of the written work about Unitary Perception. That is the objective of a seminar or workshop. What is the objective of psychotherapy?

Audience: To pass from C to B.

RFG: To pass from C to B. Right. The objective of psychotherapy is to pass from C, with all its laws, to B, where there is freedom from all those laws. Eduardo, do you remember the known, visible objective or objectives of Precinct C?

Audience: Well, in a functional way, to interact with each other or the environment.

RFG: Sure, words are communicative. Words are the best way to communicate. And in a non-functional way, what is the objective of Precinct C?

Audience: To support the “I,” the ego.

RFG: Right, and that is manifested in the desire for profit, personal prestige and personal power. Right? Profit, prestige and power.

And, do you remember the objective of this Course, or the Internet Course [IHP]? What is the objective? [*To another student*] Do you know?

Audience: To help students understand the texts, the written work...

RFG: Of course, which in turn, if they wanted to, can help them take the written and oral exams to be professors of the International Academy of Sciences [RSM - Mexico Branch] about the most important thing in life, which is Unitary Perception. And there are two exams to take: written and oral. Do you remember what the objective of the exams is? [*To another student*] Are they to know if the person is in Unitary Perception?

Audience: No, the exam’s objective is to see if that person is ready to teach, using the polished language of Holokinetic Psychology to avoid confusing others.

RFG: And that's it! So, Lénica answers that the exam's objective is not, as some people in the Internet claim, that it is ridiculous to take exams to test Unitary Perception or the sacred. We're not taking exams on the sacred or Unitary Perception, to know whether a person is in Unitary Perception or not. We're taking exams to see what that person's language is like, so he can teach Unitary Perception, for those who want to take it seriously and live it, because you cannot transmit that; you can teach it, but not transmit it as in a blood transfusion. But you can teach it, and to teach it, you need a polished language, to know what hypnotic language is, what egocentric language is, what temporal language is, so that people who listen to you don't get confused, as they get confused so much. In sacred literature, terrible, terrible interpretations exist. And when JK speaks and says "mind," very few people know that—when I say JK, I mean Jiddu Krishnamurti—when he says "mind," he means three different things, and very few people know that. When JK says "mind," sometimes he means *thought*, it depends on the context; it might mean *Unitary Perception* or *meditation* (as he used to call it before withdrawing the word *meditation*); the word "mind" might mean that, and it can also mean *the sacred*. Mind as the sacred, or as an important part of the sacred, is part of JK's language, and many people ignore that the word "mind" in JK's mouth can mean three different things!

There is a student in Module 1 of the Internet Course in Holokinetic Psychology who has to repeat the module, and he says: "Why should I repeat Module 1 if, after all, it's only ordinary psychology diagnosis?"—taken from a manual that was made to de-professionalize psychology. Why insist so much on diagnosis in Module 1 of ICHP? Or why should we talk about diagnosis so much? What do you think? Why do we do it?

Audience: To know if you can teach them Unitary Perception. Basically, for example, to a schizophrenic, to know he won't understand...

RFG: He cannot understand it, because he's incoherent, just like a retarded person will not understand it because they lack a

good intellectual quotient, etc. And together with that, those who take the Course and might become professors should know that there is a way of making diagnosis in psychology, good or bad, respectable or not respectable, that is used throughout the world and has to be known as it is; and I hope they make the necessary modifications to it, we all expect that, but for the moment, we need to know that way of making a diagnosis, because some day we will leave this place as Holokinetic Psychologists, so we must know how diagnosis is made in the world. Not in a deep manner, just an idea. And that is what we do in the Course.

Which one is the correct language? To say “I live with Unitary Perception” or “I attempt to live in Unitary Perception”? What do you think is the most adequate?

Audience: “I attempt.”

RFG: “Attempt.” And if we removed all verbs and left nothing but prepositions... “To live *with* Unitary Perception” or “to live *in* Unitary Perception”? Which is the most appropriate one?

Audience: In!

RFG: In! ...Javier?

Audience: In Unitary Perception.

RFG: Why?

Audience: Because if we say *with*, we’re already separating.

RFG: Of course! That would mean it’s here, “Unitary Perception is here” [*points hands to the side*]. In Unitary Perception we are in the mind of the universe, not outside the mind of the universe. It’s like saying “a child has come into this world.” Actually, was he ever outside this universal world? (laughter) I mean, he was never outside the world; Mateo’s hydrogen, carbon and nitrogen were always in the universe, never outside. And all those elements of universal matter gathered to make Mateo, so he was never outside the universe.

He will never be outside the mind of the universe, and if he doesn't understand that, he will be miserable.

2+2=4 in Mexico. How much is 2+2 in China? Is it 5? 3?

Audience: I think it's four (laughter).

RFG: 2+2=4 everywhere.

So... (laughter) I think he got a bit mad because I asked him that silly question. No, but $2+2 = 4$ everywhere. Now, can Psychology be different once it becomes scientific? Can we have a different Psychology in China, different from Japan and Mexico? For God's Sake! In Psychology, $2+2$ equals 4 too. And also in Psychology, Unitary Perception is what it is, and not what I want it to be. Thought is what it is, not what I want it to be, something divine. Music is what it is, not what I want it to be. "I want music to be divine," well, I'm sorry sweetheart! Music is a product of thought, whether you like it or not. "But, how can you say that about music?" Music, just like $2+2$ equals 4, is a product of thought. "No, but there's music...!" Okay, look, music is a product of thought, like it or not. "And why should I stop listening to music?" No, nobody told you to stop listening to music! God forbid us from telling people what they have to do! We are saying that music is a product of thought, nothing more. You already know what you have to do, but don't ask me. I'm not going to tell you what you have to do.

Who remembers in which moment—for example, a depressed person comes to the CPH, in which moment do you tell that person to start Holokinetic Psychotherapy (Unitary Perception)? Javier, once we have diagnosed a person with depression, what is the first thing to do, and what is the second thing to do with that person with depression, treatment-wise?

Audience: The first thing is that the psychiatrist medicates them adequately.

RFG: With an antidepressant, and, if possible, as Donald Klein says, with two, from different chemical families. And, in what

moment will the psychiatrist tell them to come back with the psychologist for Holokinetic Therapy (Unitary Perception)? When is the psychiatrist obliged to tell the patient to come back to see the psychologist?

Audience: When the patient is sleeping well, has already rested and has energy.

RFG: So you do things with a criterion! $2+2$ equals 4 and you cannot give Holokinetic Psychotherapy to a depressed person who is not sleeping well and taking an antidepressant treatment. $2+2$ equals 4.

The criterion in the CPH, as I think it has to be in any part of the world where things are done properly; a depressed person needs two antidepressant medications, according to guidelines from Donald Klein, University of Columbia, New York, two medications from different families, and once that person starts to sleep well, which usually takes one, two or three weeks, only then should that person begin Holokinetic Psychotherapy, called Unitary Perception. When they are sleeping well! Not before, because they don't have energy before, so they will listen to the psychologist and then they will forget about it.

An experiment was done at the University of Michigan with several groups of students, and they asked several groups to watch the news, and when the news program is over, they tell them: "Let's see, this group watched the news. John, what news did you see?" And they realize nobody can remember more than two or three pieces of news out of the ten pieces the program showed. And some of them can't even repeat a single piece of news. So, is Precinct C 99% unconscious? Yes, even when we're watching the news. We're watching the news and we don't even know what we're watching. And we can't repeat more than one, two, or in the best cases three of the ten pieces of news we saw in the program. Does that mean we're half asleep? Yes, it means we're quite asleep! And that is called Precinct C. And that's why we say 99% of Precinct C is unconscious. We talk and do things and we're barely aware. Barely! Let alone being aware if the news are false or true, which also happens, there are truthful news and false news, but

what we're saying is that you cannot repeat all the pieces of news from the news program.

Eduardo, what is the most important question you should ask a person you suspect is bipolar? Do you remember? He or she seems kind of hyper, very irritable, very excited. What is the question that will help you diagnose this person, perhaps more than any other question? Do you remember the question to ask someone who you think might be bipolar, suffering bipolar depression?

Audience: How's your energy?

RFG: Sure.

Audience: Are you sleeping well...?

RFG: And, exactly what question helps us a lot? Javier?

Audience: Have you ever, in your life, stopped sleeping for forty-eight hours, with no apparent cause, that is...?

RFG: Not due to coffee, cocaine or amphetamines. Have you ever, in your life (if you see a person who is very excited, very talkative, very irritable) stopped sleeping for more than forty-eight hours? That is the fundamental question; it makes the Bipolarity diagnosis.

Who remembers what we can put in Axis 3 of diagnosis in psychology? What do we put in Axis 3 of the psychological diagnosis? There are five axes.

Audience: Medical problems, like diabetes.

RFG: Medical problems: diabetes, arthritis, tuberculosis, AIDS, etc. Medical problems go to Axis 3. Axis 1: schizophrenia, depression, clinical problems; Axis 2: personality disorders, mental retardation; Axis 4: stress; Axis 5: how they are functioning, from 1 to 100. If they have been hospitalized in the last year, they cannot have more than 30 in the assessment. Thirty points in Axis 5. Functional capacity. If

a person comes to your office and they are under treatment for depression, they can't have more than 40 in the assessment.

Audience: In the psychiatric hospital?

RFG: In the medical office.

Audience: No, I mean, 30 if they have been in a psychiatric hospital.

RFG: No; it can be any hospital.

Audience: What if you have been some days in the hospital due to a fracture?

RFG: Yes, that's a disability, you're disabled. So, Axis 5 tells us about your capacity to move, to work, and a fracture is something that affects and bothers you a lot, so it should also be in Axis 5 as a score of 30.

Audience: Doctor, no less than 40 if it is depression with treatment?

RFG: In the external office, if the patient comes here, for example, and I'm giving him a prescription for depression, you shouldn't give him more than 40. Why? Because in governments there is this idea that if you have more than 40, you shouldn't get any assistance from the government. So, not giving them more than 40 is an act of compassion. Even if the person is working or showing he could have more than 40, but it's not convenient if that person needs at least a year of economic support from the government. At least in the United States. But that's not the case here [in Mexico], right?

Audience: Not that I know of.

RFG: No. If they keep using the DSM (Diagnostic Statistic Manual) in psychology, we may reach that point. What I say is: careful with the numbers you put. If he says he got divorced in December, and it's August now, almost a year passed. Axis 4, from one to five... how much stress does that person have, from one to five? Divorced in the last year! Therefore, five.

That divorced person has a maximum stress score in Axis 4. Even if he or she got divorced last September. Within the last year. Five points. And that helps us a lot, because, generally, to see people in numerical terms seems like a callous thing, but it helps us a great deal to see the degrees of stress and functional capacity, and of course, the diagnoses: Axes 1, 2 and 3.

Audience: Is the axis drawn?

RFG: You can draw it, but it's actually enough to write "5." Axis 4 = 5. And between parentheses, divorce. Divorce in November. And if you want to add something: move, because the spouse kept the house. And what else?

Audience: No money.

RFG: Poverty. Axis 4: 5 points of stress—why? Divorce-move-poverty. Of course, generally poverty is not necessarily linked to divorce, but if a person is poor, he or she has 5 points already. That's enough for a 5 point score. Let alone the homeless, etc.

Roosevelt said that people in the United States have the right to four things: 1) Right to freedom of expression; 2) Right to worship God as they please, freedom of belief; 3) Right to have food and shelter, freedom of want; and 4) Right to not having to fear terrorism, racism, poverty, etc., freedom from fear. And we should add: the right to be free from the past! With everything we know now: 5) we should say, the right to be free from the past.

Audience: Roosevelt?

RFG: Yes, Roosevelt, president Roosevelt, not the first one, the second one, from World War II times. Not the one who waged war against Cuba and the Philippines.

We'll stop here and take a fifteen-minute break. Is that okay?

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Yes, thank you.

RFG: Alright, then... do you remember how metadepression is defined? Yolanda? *Metadepression*, a word that I consider necessary to describe what is happening in the human mind throughout the world, not for genetic reasons, but for epigenetic reasons, things that happened after birth. I wonder, if there were a hundred thousand disappeared people in Argentina, after the Trelew massacre in 1972, how many people are sad today. How many Argentinians are sad today! Today is the anniversary of that, the beginning of a very long civil war, the beginning of the hundred thousand disappeared people. How many Argentinian people are sad today? Four hundred thousand or eight hundred thousand? How many among them are metadepressed? Not depressed, but metadepressed. Sleeping well, no problems with energy, but... what do they need to be metadepressed?

Audience: It's when they don't do their job right, they don't feel like working, they do their job poorly.

RFG: Poorly done jobs; love for excellence is lost, love for punctuality is lost—I tell you I'll be at your house at four, and if I get there at five, it's fine; if I get there at seven, it's fine; and if don't even show up, fine too. That's called *metadepression*. And it's growing, not only in Argentina, in the whole world. They first talked to me about that in Peru. Psychologists talked to me about something that was happening in Peru, which they called “the psychological prostration.” And when they describe to me how people were not punctual, how they avoided doing their job and had no responsibility, I tell them: “Do you think that happens only in Peru?” So I start to think about the word *metadepression*, to define something that's not just in Peru, but in the whole world, and it's unwillingness, lack of energy, a non-genetic depression that comes from stress. A stress that exceeds human tolerance to hardships to survive, hardships to coexist, etc.

Audience: We could say the only difference between the depressed and the metadepressed is that the depressed one can't sleep, he has no energy, and the other one doesn't. The rest is, psychosocially...

RFG: The rest is the same, and that's why we know it's not genetic, but a product of an amount of stress that exceeded his or her tolerance.

Audience: Can you repeat what Cecilia said?

RFG: Ceci says that the difference between depression and metadepression is that depression is genetic and brings problems with sleep and energy. Metadepression is not genetic, it's the product of a tremendous stress that exceeds a person's capacity for tolerance, and even if that person sleeps well and is able to work, that person won't do his job properly, efficiently and punctually. It's generally a... [*asks for the word in Spanish: "desganado"*] ...a listless person, a person with no zest, with no stamina.

Audience: Could you call it "an epigenetic syndrome of listlessness," to put it some way?

RFG: Right.

Audience: Because there may be diverse causes for listlessness...

RFG: Sure, there is a syndrome out there called "chronic fatigue." Now, chronic fatigue is an invention, something made up by someone to avoid calling it depression and giving antidepressants. I think it's an anti-psychiatric word to avoid saying depression. Chronic fatigue is depression.

Audience: My brother was told he didn't have depression; he had insomnia (laughter) and medication is for life, but that's depression.

RFG: Of course, the treatment being life-long is a hard pill to swallow. But facts are facts. Diabetics that avoid life-long treatment will lose their legs, eyes, sight, etc. And the depressed people won't lose any of that, but they will lose much of the life quality they could have with a treatment, and life without treatment is very hard for them.

As you can see, we're reviewing everything we've said to solidify the ideas that are necessary to continue. Someone has said that Unitary Perception is peace, but a responsible peace, that is, a responsive peace, which means that, even if I'm in peace in Unitary Perception, I don't become an indifferent person. I can be in peace, but not indifferent. Not indifferent to my wife's pain, to my friend's pain, or to what is going on in the world. You can be in peace while still being aware of all that is happening, even when what is happening is not very pleasant. So, Unitary Perception is peace, but a responsible, responsive peace. Unitary Perception is also called true, non-imaginary life. True, non-imaginary life.

And also, one of the things JK said with a certain frequency is that man has given an excessive importance to sex—or what is known as sex. I believe that sex has disappeared from mankind a long time ago. But to what is known as sex, JK said, we give so much importance to it because the orgasm is the only exit the ego has, besides Unitary Perception. Because, for a moment, during orgasm, there is no self. And there is no fear, anger or sadness in that moment. Fear, anger and sadness appear after the orgasm. And that has made us give an excessive importance to sex, and caused sex to become rather a problem. And it still is, for instance: the fact that teenage girls in the US are pregnant, and their number has risen by 30% in the last year. It's terrible, above all, between other things, for the country's economy. For each child, eight hundred dollars are given to the mother, and fifteen-year-old girls already have three children to receive the twenty-four hundred dollars they pay them for those three children. That is, the state is subsidizing teenage pregnancy. And that's partly because the orgasm is the only exit the ego has, and partly because it is a way for teenagers to survive in the US. And, is that a sign of love? Well, many teenagers come to my office, when I tell them:

—Why don't you live with the father?

—Well, I don't know who the father is.

—How can you not know who the father is?

—Because it was a party, and I slept with four or five guys that night.

—Ah....!

—I don't know who the father is.

Unitary Perception does not *unify*. Unitary Perception does not unify anything. We simply realize that everything is united. Watch out for the word “unify”! And remember that, in the act of seeing, 80% of what we're seeing is memory, and to see with memory is not to see.

To see with memory is not to see! In order to see someone, we have to see them now. Remember my colleague: “I saw the road as I'd always seen it,” and he almost died, his car was totaled. He almost died. Not seeing with memory, breaking free from the past. To see now, in Unitary Perception, independently from the hypnosis of the past, independently of thought, of imagination. Action that is free from hypnosis can only happen in Unitary Perception. The seeing is the doing. We believe that seeing is not doing. But if we see well, that seeing well is doing. If we see well, we're carrying out the best social activity we can do, because if we're seeing in Unitary Perception, we are doing, due to the peace brought about by that Unitary Perception, the best contribution to society. The best political contribution: our peace, from living in Unitary Perception. That is the best political contribution.

And it's good to remember that the Greeks had two ways of speaking about the self, the “I.” Identity for them was twofold; first, legal identity, which they called *nomos*, which has been translated as name and as law. That is, a person's legal name, Rubén, is the *nomos* identity, the Greeks said, a legal name to make you responsible of what you do and what you don't do. And that was not the only identity for Greeks, there was also *logos*. Rubén was also *logos*, that is, a part of the whole of universal mind. I mean, besides having a name, Rubén, which makes me legally responsible, I am something, I have an identity, I'm also something that *is what I am*, a primitive Christian would say: I am what I am. Meaning I am like God,

similar to God. I am what I am, and that is logos. Being a part of God or part of the whole of universal mind, implying that the mind in Rubén is not his, but belongs to the whole universe. So, it is very important to understand that identity is not only our name or our legal responsibility, it's much more! The history of identity is very rich and important to know.

And let's not forget that when we say *mom*, four things are happening at the same time in the META process. That is why we call thought "META process." When we say *mom*, there's a memory of mom. What memory? From today, when she is ninety years old, or from when she was twenty and men on the street would catcall at her? Memory. Which memory? An idea I have of her, either good, bad, nice, ugly, according to what I'm remembering, and an emotion that depends on what I'm remembering and the image I have, and a visceral expression caused by the word *mom*, and that can be proven with instruments. This means the META process is what is happening at the same time in Precinct C when we say something, like *mom* or Mexico, Irak, Afghanistan, i.e., there are words with emotional load, when we say God, *dad* or *mom*, those words are so loaded with emotions, and when we say them, don't forget that the whole META process is working, at the same time. And when we say *mom*, I insist, there is the remembrance—(M)emory—, the image (E), emotion (T), and autonomic activity (A): blood pressure rises, you sweat a little, because your skin's galvanic resistance is lowered, etc. That's also important to remember, with all the things we've said, which we'll continue to deal with in more depth.

We've also said the "I" or ego is actually constructed by memory to give itself continuity. Memory gives itself continuity with the ego. So, what else is in the ego? There's a nucleus in the ego that is the suicide and the homicide, and why do we say this? Because every time the ego perceives itself as something that's going to end, the suicide and the homicide appear. The example I give is that of the couple: that girlfriend we love tells us "I don't want to see you again," then starts the feeling that something mine has ended, something of great importance in my ego, that ego will not continue, so the suicide

and the homicide appear. Or “we no longer need you in this job, Mr. Perez”: the suicide and the homicide.

I had a patient in Miami who was cut in two by a train, sliced in two, on Christmas. This kid was playing in a railroad car in Miami, where a locomotive was gathering cars to leave, and he got on a car with other friends, but he fell on the rails, the train passed and practically cut him in two, he lost an entire leg, his other leg was flexed so he lost half of it, his genitals were saved, his anus too, I think, but he was cut in half. And he was one of my first patients, that’s why I remember him so much, and back then I had Dr. Wise as my supervisor in the treatment. So, one day I come to his room—he had received a million dollars in compensation, because it was Amtrak, a renowned US railroad company, so Amtrak had given him a million dollar compensation, and this boy’s room was full of girls for some mysterious reason (laughter), so I get there, ask the girls to leave and tell him:

—So, how’s everything going?

—Fine—he says—, everything’s fine; only the astronaut suit was damaged, but the astronaut is perfectly fine.

I thought “Oh, this is terrible, this kid is really disconnected from reality!” And we were having lunch with Dr. Wise in the cafeteria at Miami University...

And he was regarded as one of the greatest psychoanalysts in Miami at the time, and we had lunch, on Thursdays I think, to review the case I was seeing on Wednesdays, so I get there and tell him, during lunch:

—I’m worried about this kid, because he keeps saying that the astronaut is okay and only the astronaut suit is damaged. What I want to tell him is to stop playing around with that astronaut-and-suit deal. Tell him he is (I don’t recall his name now, I think I even had a newspaper clipping) John Doe, and that he needs to stop playing around with the astronaut. He tells me:

—Don't even think of doing that!—Dr. Wise tells me. I tell him:

—Why not? Shouldn't we bring him back to reality?

—No! —he says—, in some cases, you have to protect that denial defense mechanism.

Because we all have denial as a defense mechanism; for example, I went to Argentina after the Trelew massacre, when everyone was fighting with everyone and people would disappear, and my father would say everything was fine. My father was denying what was happening, as most people do. And that kid was denying his situation, by saying “The suit was damaged, but the astronaut is fine.” Dr. Wise tells me:

—Don't tell him anything about the astronaut. You have to keep the astronaut there, and you have to keep the damaged suit.

I tell him:

—Why? Am I not lying to him if I do that?

—No, you're protecting the only thing he has, which is the denial mechanism. If you take denial away from him, what do you think that kid will get?

—Well, but, they gave him a million dollars, the room is full of girls...

—If you take the denial defense away from him, forget everything else you see outside, forget about the million dollars, forget about the girls. If you take denial away from him, what does he have? He's cut in two, completely disabled (Ah! Of course, he had lost an arm too; he had only one arm, half a leg, he had saved his genitals and had lost half of his intestine.)

—What do you think he has?

—Well, he has himself, we should emphasize that he has to...

—No, no, no. We have to emphasize denial, because if you take denial away from him, that kid is going to commit suicide. So, keep that denial in therapy.

It was a big surprise I had, treating my patient and having my supervisor tell me to protect denial, which is the most primitive defense mechanism. The defense of a baby, the defense of a one, two or three-year-old child. The defense of a schizophrenic, denial and projection, the most immature defense there is. “Nothing’s wrong here.” In a war-torn country: “Nothing’s wrong here,” or in a child who was sliced in two: “The astronaut is fine.” It is denial, but without denial... my supervisor tells me: “If you want to take denial away, you could lead him to suicide.”

So then, something similar happens with the ego when your girlfriend says she doesn’t want to see you again: the suicide and the homicide. I cannot keep denying that things weren’t going all right with this girl and I. Or “we don’t need you in this job anymore. We’re re-structuring this company”: the suicide and the homicide. No place for denial.

And then, we have in our culture a great deal of influence from philosophy and metaphysics, because philosophy and metaphysics have been overvalued. And what is emphasized in philosophy and metaphysics? They emphasize cause...

Audience: Subject.

RFG: Cause. Not only subject, but everything that is cause and effect. There is even a law of cause and effect that is associated to a Hindu word: *karma*. And speaking with Krishnamurti, he tells me that is a bad association. *Karma* does not mean cause and effect; *karma* simply means action. Action! Karma-yoga simply means: *to unite with God through your action*, through the things you do. It has nothing to do with cause and effect. But in metaphysics and philosophy, cause and effect are emphasized a lot, besides emphasizing the subject, as you said. And the subjective and the objective, etc. On the other hand, in Unitary Perception our emphasis is in right now, and we don’t emphasize any cause or effect, so what we’re saying becomes

completely counter-cultural, completely anti-philosophical and anti-metaphysical. That's why I say philosophy and metaphysics are distractions to Unitary Perception. They are! They are products of thought that emphasize Precinct C. How do they help us? I don't see them helping us in any way.

Another identification I make is between the word *metanoia*, which was used, possibly in Greek, by Jesukristos, which means *let's go beyond all the known* (it does not mean *repentance*, it does not mean *conversion*; it means "let's go beyond all the known") and Unitary Perception. I believe they are the same word. After an analysis I made of the Gospel and the things Jesus said, I believe Jesus, when he said *metanoia*, was saying Unitary Perception. And there is no resurrection without *metanoia*. So, *metanoia* is, obviously, the most important thing in life. Same with Unitary Perception. You can see this easily in John, chapter 3, when Jesus asks Nicodemus to be born "from above." Sadly, in Spanish this is always translated as "again." "You have to be born again," and the subtlety of the word *anoten* (which means "from above") is lost. You have to be born *anoten*, Nicodemus, which means you don't have to be born "from below," not reincarnate, but be born from "above," that is, from Unitary Perception, from *metanoia*. And at the end, Jesukristos makes it clearer when he tells him: "Do you hear the wind blowing among the leaves, Nicodemus? Someone born from the wind is like that." He said you have to be born from above and from the wind—*pneuma*. "So it is for a man who is born from the wind, who does not know where he comes from or where he goes to." He's saying: it's not about reincarnating, which is the metaphysical belief that if we don't liberate ourselves spiritually in this life, then we will do it in a future life. Actually, when you see where humanity is going today, it is clear that reincarnation is not one more opportunity, but one less, if mankind continues this way.

So: to be born again, to be born from the air, obviously, to me, that is a synonym of Unitary Perception. And if I say: Unitary Perception is the most important thing in life—which I say as many times as possible, because I firmly believe it, I am convinced it is so—and I say: Unitary Perception is the most

important thing in life, what do you need to see that it is true? You need an intellectual quotient, which I reckon to be around 130. Otherwise, I don't think you can understand the fact that listening and feeling the weight can be the most important thing in life. And due to the multiple implications the transformation of perception has, a certain intellectual quotient is needed. What else is needed? You need to read what has been written about Unitary Perception, understand it, talk about it, like JK said. "Talk about it, get together for dialogue." Even if you don't like to talk. Many people don't like to go to a meeting for dialogue. And JK insisted: "Get together, have dialogues!" Even if you don't like to meet and have a dialogue, do it! And of course, to live the fact that Unitary Perception is; that is fundamental. If you live it, you start to understand that that peace, that energy, is the most important thing in life. As JK told me:

—Why do I have to listen?

—Do it and see what happens!

So he discourages my addiction to thought and to the search for explanations of thought and he's telling me: "Do it and see what happens." He's telling me to leave thought and see what happens. And I repeat that Unitary Perception is living in creation, not only in the created.

Something that is engraved in education, which I believe comes from Catholic catechism, is to give speeches to your children, to people, for them to understand things. And it is not through speeches that things are understood. Catechism means what? It has two Greek words: *catas*, *ecos*. *Catas* means below and *ecos* means echo. It means you say, for example, "I believe in God, the Father almighty," and children have to repeat it: "I believe in God, the Father almighty." "I believe in the virgin Mary," and children repeat: "I believe in the virgin Mary." That is, what the priest is saying has to be repeated verbatim, and that was the way of educating. *Catas-ecos*, the echo down there. It implies what? It implies hierarchy! *Catas*, below, implies that those who are below have to echo those who are above. It means they don't have to think, only repeat. Speeches

don't change us. Then many times, at home, for example in the United States, there are, say, old-fashioned Christian families where if a child says a bad word, they wash his mouth with soap. Then they give him a speech about what it is to be a liar, a long speech, and the child ends up in prison, ends up as an antisocial. And the father wonders "why did he end up in prison if I did everything I could for him?" No, what you did was to give him lots of speeches. But you didn't give the child what he needs, which is affection.

And Unitary Perception is Precinct B. It is contagious peace. If a person is in Unitary Perception, they pass it on to others. Peace is passed on to others. So the change is happening right now, if there is a person in Unitary Perception. Besides, Holokinesis is there. When someone is in Unitary Perception, all of humanity is included because of Holokinesis. Do you understand the difference between passing peace on to nearby people and Holokinesis, which is to "transmit" peace to a person who is far away? That's understood, right?

Audience: And that it's not at distance...

RFG: Well, ultimately, it is not at distance, even if the person is far away. It's not distance. Distance is not the relevant factor, but the holokinetic change, which is contact with everything at the same time.

And we also say that behaviorism has its place in therapy. Javier, do you remember what the place of behaviorism in therapy is? We tell psychologists who come to work at the CPH that behaviorism has a function, a place, do you remember what it was?

[Short pause with no response]

Mental retardation. That is, if the child is retarded, don't try to give him anything other than behaviorism. And to the poor parents you can give a rule from behaviorism to modify the child's behavior. We resort to behaviorism due to the child's limitation. It is not a substitute of Unitary Perception...

Parents need Unitary Perception, and some behavior rule, from behaviorism, for their retarded son. But parents need Unitary Perception.

Audience: An adult with deep mental retardation too, right?

RFG: An adult with deep mental retardation will benefit from behaviorism. Of course, the thing is that behaviorism works through induction, i.e., someone has to regulate your behavior. It's very difficult for a person to regulate their own conduct, especially someone with retardation.

Questions or comments? We have ten minutes.

Audience: Today I understood something I hadn't understood long ago. And it is "the seeing is the doing." So I understood the phrase "seeing is doing" as: in the act of seeing, you will be aware of what you have to do. But today I got the other meaning, which I find very important: the seeing itself is action...

RFG: Right! Action, JK would say!

Audience: But, if he says "doing," that's dynamic, so you understand that seeing prepares you for doing, and it's implicit, whereas "seeing is action" has an immense meaning in itself.

RFG: Immense!

Audience: I understood that today.

RFG: It is not preparing to do; it is *doing!* And it is the action par excellence that we undervalue, because we think seeing is not doing. What? Seeing, is that all? It's all done with seeing? If you see in Unitary Perception, you're making the greatest political and economic contribution to the planet. Not only to family, to the whole humanity! Just seeing in Unitary Perception is the greatest contribution, because we're contributing with our peace, our energy. Yes, a subtlety in that "seeing is doing." We only live in the "preparing to do because we see" aspect. No, no, no, the seeing itself, right now, is the doing! The act of seeing is the most important of actions.

Seeing and listening at the same time, seeing as a synonym of Unitary Perception.

Any other question or comment?

Audience: I had another one.

RFG: Yes.

Audience: At the beginning of the class, you said Holokinesis is the movement from here to here between the implicit and explicit orders of the universe, and that happens in the same space. So, space is of the explicit order, because the implicit order is multidimensional, so the fact that Holokinesis happens from here to here in the same space is a feature of the explicit order only, because it is manifested, that is, the electron goes and comes back, and since it is not perceptible it comes to the same place, but it doesn't go to the same place, it goes to wholeness and comes back to the same place. I don't know...

RFG: Yes, what I was pointing out...

Audience: Can you repeat that for Argentina?

RFG: Well, what we are saying is a comment about what Holokinesis is, the movement from here to here. What I wanted to specify about is the language we use to refer to Holokinesis. That we say "from," "to" or "between," and those prepositions are, due to their nature, egocentric. Because it's "from" Rubén, who is observing, "to" that which I am observing. *From, to...* the movement of Holokinesis is from here to here, but how? I am stealing the words from the movement from here to there, to talk about movement from here to here. It makes no sense from the epistemological point of view, it's actually a very big epistemological paradox, even an epistemological infringement, because we're putting egocentric language in the explanation of something that is so new that we don't have a language for it. And that is what I wanted to show at the beginning, that when we talk about Holokinesis, we're talking about something so new that we don't have the language for it. Hence the examples of "from, between and to," which we use

when we need to describe the movement from here to here. Those words are actually insufficient or erroneous, but we need to use them to get an idea, without forgetting that the prepositions *from*, *to* and *between* are “crutches” that help us understand something which has nothing to do with *from*, *between* and *to*. Is this understood?

Therefore if I say “I look at you,” it means that, from here I look at you over there. There is a movement from here to there in my act of seeing. But in Unitary Perception, there is no here-there, because I am seeing you in the brain. In the same way, when we speak about Holokinesis, which is the movement from here to here, the electron disappears here and appears again here, so we say, yes, what happened is that the electron, in Holokinesis, moved from here to here, but I am stealing the words *from* here *to* there from what I said before. From Rubén to Jesús, while that language cannot be applied completely, appropriately here; it is a language we stole from a movement that is not this one. Am I clear? We are using prepositions that are based in the only thing we’ve ever known, which is movement from here to there.

Audience: A language with time and space, where...

RFG:Of course. If I go to Spain, I’ll move *from* here (Mexico) *to* there (Spain).

Audience: That implies time and space.

RFG: It implies time and space, but what I want to say, to emphasize, is that that movement from here to there is the only movement we knew. And all our language is based on that movement. When we want to talk about the movement from here to here, we have to use that language... which doesn’t apply to this, but all we can do is just to be aware that that language does not apply. Because we don’t have another! We don’t have another language because movement from here to here appears only in 1986, and we still lack the language to talk adequately, epistemologically, about movement from here to here.

Language itself is alluding to the only thing we've ever known, which is to move from here to there.

Audience: Horizontal conflict.

RFG: That is part of horizontal conflict.

Audience: That is why we don't understand... the subtlety of that language.

RFG: We don't understand it because we're in horizontal conflict, separate, from here to there. I'm here, Jesús is over there. I'm here, Cecilia's there.

Audience: That is why thought's last stronghold is paradox, for example, that we talk about silence but we use language.

RFG: Right, and Holokinesis is David Bohm's paradox of movement, an apparent contradiction. And if we are aware of all this, then the language we use is not so important, because we know it is the best language, fortunately or unfortunately, it is the only language we have, so we use it, but always with the exception I just mentioned. You understand this, right?

Any question or comment from Buenos Aires?

Audience: Rubén, if today you had to see that kid who lost [half] his body, would you also agree with Wise about his treatment? What he told you about...

RFG: Yes, besides doing what Wise told me, which was very good, I would give him something I didn't have back then, which is Unitary Perception, thus I would be giving him a true, non-imaginary life that could eventually make him not need denial, but the fact of protecting denial at that moment when there was nothing more than psychoanalysis, at that time, in that therapy, was the right thing to do. And today, would I protect denial? Yes, in an extreme case, but adding Unitary Perception, undoubtedly. Am I answering?

Audience: Yes, perfectly. And here's a question about metadepression: you said there is a genetic hypnosis.

Also, you see, if there is a genetic hypnosis in a family, that has a stronger tendency: if your father has diabetes, you'll get diabetes, and could it be that this is causing, or has caused in us or in people to come—that genetic depression has more influence after metadepression? Or has it nothing to do? I don't know if I'm making myself clear...

RFG: Yes, the thing is that we should make a difference between depression and metadepression, because we don't have to give antidepressants to a metadepressed person. I think the number of metadepressed people is on the rise. I would say, in broad terms, because there haven't been any studies of this, but roughly, I'm under the impression that, at least in Mexicali, which is where I move around, 50% of people have metadepression, that's if I keep it moderate and restricted (laughter). Because if we have to talk about our carpenter, our architect and our lawyer, well, no (laughter).

If we talk about professionals, we're in bad shape, but if we talk about the general population, I don't know how many of them are metadepressed, but it should be much more than 50%. But in Buenos Aires, how many are they? More than in Mexicali, because there is more people? We don't really know, but approximately, at least half of the population is metadepressed. Listless, no longer caring about excellence, punctuality, responsibility. It is like a psychological prostration, as the Peruvian psychologists said, and it's all over the world, not only here. And we should differentiate it from depression because they won't benefit from antidepressant medication. Am I answering?

Audience: Yes, perfect!

Audience: Would someone who is starving also suffer from metadepression?

RFG: I have seen the most curious degrees of adversity worldwide, because, thank God, I have traveled throughout the world, and I had a patient in Alaska who told me he was depressed, but he was taking an antidepressant and he felt good. His (economic) drama was, as he told me:

—On the fifteenth day of the month, I run out of money. The money they give me on the 1st is all gone by the time the 15th day comes. No more money.

—How do you manage to eat?

—Well, in the supermarket, they already know they have to give me coffee and bread. Sliced bread and coffee.

—And that's what you eat?

—Yes.

—For how long?

—Fifteen days.

So this patient had coffee with sliced, toasted white bread, for fifteen days, every month. And I tell him:

—Geez, and how do you feel with that?

—Oh, I thank God for the coffee and bread. I am happy; I see my girlfriend and I'm happy, and I see the birds...

The man was happy! So I say, adversity is not the only thing that makes people fall; it is probably attitude, it is probably that actually, the stress you're under overwhelms you, but in his case, it seems stress had not overwhelmed him to the point of falling into metadepression. No! He was alright. However, I have seen people from wealthy classes—because I have worked in luxury hospitals—who were suffering much more despite facing much less apparent adversity. Is that attitude coming from a gene? It is such a big stress. The mere fact of having to protect a fortune, the fear of being kidnapped, makes stress become so large in a wealthy person that they fall into metadepression, whereas that patient who only ate toast and coffee didn't fall. So, I have seen it all, and coming back from the hospital in Bakersfield, I would comment the cases with Cecilia and tell her this. These little girls—I was the director of youth services, so I had two Sections in the floor, one for children of ages one to twelve and another room for teens, from

twelve to twenty-one. And I told her these depressed little girls have everything, yet they think themselves in the most terrible situation.

Audience: Lots of suicide, precisely...

RFG: And many suicide attempts; many of them had fallen into the habit, the trend, of cutting their arms with a razor blade, playing with that, where the veins are. “No, I only cut myself because it’s in fashion to cut yourself,” real close to the veins. And there’s a whole trend about that, I don’t know if they call them... eno?

Audience: *Emo.*

RFG: *Emo!* And it’s a whole trend, I found out from you later; emos.

Okay, so, there are cultural trends, but those cultural trends, like emos, why are they like that? Why do they have those features that go near suicide? Could we say there are socioeconomic and psychosocial situations that make those trends have certain features that were absent in trends from, say, 1950? All this deserves to be studied. I don’t know if there are more questions or comments in Buenos Aires.

Audience: Yes, I have one. Rubén, in the case of this young boy, when they asked you what you would do or tell him now... when you give him Unitary Perception, aren’t you taking denial away from him?

RFG: Back then, I gave him what I had to give him: psychoanalysis under the supervision of a prestigious psychoanalyst from Miami. Besides being a good psychiatrist, he was a good teacher and a good supervisor. And he gave me the right piece of advice: protect denial in extreme cases like that one. Because otherwise, he could commit suicide. What would I do today? Protect denial and teach him Unitary Perception. And where will Unitary Perception take the individual? We don’t know! We don’t know. That is, we know it gives lots of peace immediately, and energy in a little time,

but, where will Unitary Perception take us? I think it favors receptivity to the sacred, receptivity to enlightenment, I believe, and it would take him there today if he was lucky enough to receive Holokinetic Psychotherapy, that young boy. Would Unitary Perception take him to enlightenment, because he is in an extreme situation? JK himself said: “Those who can listen to this teaching are those who believe they have lost everything.” He’s likely to listen better than many others who don’t want to listen. We’re making assumptions, right? But I would undoubtedly teach him Unitary Perception today, of course! Where would it take him? That’s speculation. But undoubtedly, to a good psychological place. And to renounce denial, that is also very difficult to determine because denial, by definition, is unconscious, and it serves a purpose that, in this case, is the preservation of life itself. By reducing anxiety, it preserved life.

Audience: If we had an education in Unitary Perception, would we still develop the defense mechanisms that we normally create to deny reality, pain and suffering, or would we live in a state of consciousness that wouldn’t require those defense mechanisms to be built and preserved during all our lives?

RFG: Sadly, we don’t have Freud to answer that question, because that is a question Freud should answer.

Audience: But he did not know about Unitary Perception.

RFG: No; he said that much of what happens in the human mind depends on psychosocial conditions. Freud himself was a product of a time, the Victorian times. And Freud’s moral was a Victorian moral. In Freud’s time, women fainted...

Audience: Hysteria.

RFG: Hysteria! Today, women don’t faint. Why don’t they faint now? Because women have many orgasms today (laughter), which they didn’t have in Freud’s time. The woman is now “liberated,” and in their sexual promiscuity, they have many orgasms, tons of orgasms, so they don’t need to faint to release their anxiety. They do that through orgasm. Is that

good? Well, I think it would be good if it hadn't completely destroyed the family and sex itself. I think that sex itself has been destroyed by feminism and all sex-related ideologies. Denying homosexuals the need to receive a treatment is a crime to me, to remove the diagnosis and say it is just another [kind of] human being. I think that's a crime, a crime of the Diagnostic Manual (DSM), a crime of the political action of the homosexuals that managed to remove the diagnosis. Does this mean I am a chauvinistic homophobe who hates homosexuals? No! The love I have for human beings makes me think that homosexuals would be better off with a good treatment, especially Unitary Perception. And so on, right? I mean, there are so many diagnoses that existed in Freud's times that have disappeared due to the way in which we live. Why do I say sex has disappeared? Because sex has a very free physical expression today, but it lacks affection, so it's become a flesh market. You get into a nightclub, or whatever you call it, and men are there choosing their women, or women choosing their men, that's a flesh market! It's no longer sexuality, it lacks the affective side, i.e., that you get closer to a woman for all that woman is, not only the way she looks; you get closer for a thousand psychological reasons, including the affection that seems to be absent in sex today. Now, if you take affection away from sex, you can no longer call it sex. We're talking about a physical, genital expression, yes, there are less Victorian faintings, yes, because there are more orgasms, and is that good? I don't know, because family... 70% of couples end in divorce, which means 70% of the children grow up in loneliness, with no family. And isn't sex itself lacking affection, besides the physical expression, which is wonderful? Isn't the affective side, which is just as wonderful or even more, lacking? That's what I ask, then, yes, there's a lot of sex, but I think lots of sex is similar to no sex; I was in Nicaragua, and I would ask begging children: "Where's your dad?" "Well, my daddy Gomez, my daddy Martinez, my daddy Perez...", because his mom had had many boyfriends and many children, each to a different father. So there was daddy Gomez, daddy Perez, daddy Martinez, and I said, well, lots of fathers is the same as no father, right? In the same way, lots of sex—without affection—is the same as no sex. Right? It's the same.

See you next Sunday at 10 a.m. Mexicali time, 2 p.m. Buenos Aires time.

[Due to technical problems the class ends with less recording time].

TOPICS - CLASS 6

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 6 (341)
- REVIEW OF THE EXAM ON PREVIOUS SUBJECTS (PSYCHODIAGNOSIS, SLEEP, THOUGHT AS HYPNOSIS, STRESS, ETC.) (341)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 5 AND 6 OF THE BOOK *HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY* (THE ONLY SCIENTIFIC PARADIGM IN PSYCHOLOGY) (344)
- THREE DOGMATIC PREMISES(348)
- THE EXPLICIT ORDER EXISTS EVEN WITHOUT AN OBSERVER (349)
- QUANTUM PARADOX AND THE PARADOX OF MOVEMENT (353)
- THE HOLOGRAPHIC MODEL AND MEMORY (354)
- BOHM AND THE QUANTUM THEORY (352) (356)
- MOVEMENT AND DISPLACEMENT (357)
- A NEW WAY OF DOING SCIENCE (360)
- IS THEORY KNOWLEDGE? (361)
- THE PROBLEM OF MEASURING (365)
- WHAT ROLE DOES LANGUAGE PLAY IN FRAGMENTATION? (368)
- KNOWLEDGE AS AN ABSTRACTION OF UNIVERSAL FLUX (369)
- THE HOLOGRAM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH HOLOKINESIS (371)
- COMMUNION CANNOT BE FORMULATED (386)
- CHILDREN AND ABSTRAC THINKING (388)

- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN *TEOREIN*, *EIDEN Y OPSETAI* (390)
- ABOUT THE SEMANTICS OF WORDS (392)
- THE IMPLICIT ORDER AND THE EXPLICIT ORDER ARE IN THE SAME PLACE (393)

CLASS 6

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, August 29th, 2010.

Rubén Feldman González (RFG): Sixth class of the Sunday Presential Course. We're going to review the exams that were taken, which show us what? Out of nine people, three passed it. This means what? That we forget that the Course, Seminar or Workshop is a support for study, reading. The important thing is to read.

Here, in a previous class, we spoke about how important it is to read. That a single fact, like Unitary Perception, is seen from many different disciplines. Which allows the teacher, once he graduated, because he has read, to speak in any Faculty of a University. From Philosophy and Literature to Law, Physics and Psychology, because there is a language for each of the disciplines to talk about Unitary Perception. Very important, then: remember that all academic events are a support for the study and reading of the written work. Very important.

Let's start with Jesús, who took an exam (which we had done earlier, but he wasn't here that day) about Psycho-diagnosis. He scored 82. Now, of course, in Mexico and I think in Argentina too, it is an honor to score 82, i.e., it is a very good exam. But, for the International Academy of Sciences [IAS], which sponsors us in order to have teachers, that's not enough. The IAS demands 98. And here in this Course we demand 90. What was Chuy's mistake?

What is the theory of the DSM? Do you remember? None. You answered “psychoanalytical,” and that was the mistake. You chose “psychoanalytical”, and actually, there is no theory. The DSM has no theory, because it's meant to simplify diagnosis to an extreme point, in such a way that a child who finished elementary school can make a diagnosis, thus de-

professionalizing the field of mental health. So, there are mental health centers already working without any psychologist or psychiatrist.

So, remember, the theory behind DSM? None. No theory. And then we have the questions about sleep, right? And thought as hypnosis.

You answered: “None of the above.” And it says: 1. “Hypnosis was started by Mesmer in 1777,” 2. “There is sensory hyper-connection with the environment,” 3. “Is frequently seen in India,” and 4. “None of the above” -which you chose, Natzio. Actually, there is sensory hyper-connection with the environment. Hypnosis is a sensory hyper-connection with the environment. That's why it is not sleep, which is the opposite. During sleep, there is a sensory semi-disconnection with the environment. In hypnosis there is hyper-connection. That's the importance of this question, to see the difference between hypnosis and sleep, which many people don't see, because the word *hypnos* in Greek means *sleep*. Therefore, don't get confused by the etymology. And then... Karina.

You also scored 100 in the previous exam. And this time you scored 90. You passed. Where did you go wrong? Ah... “Sleep is regular.” ¿Why is sleep regular? 1. “Because it is recurrent,” 2. “Because it is reversible...” -recurrent means that we sleep every night at 10 pm. Sleep is reversible... -this is Hartmann's definition of sleep. Sleep is reversible because, say, at 7 am you wake up. And third: “Because it gives the same readings every time,” which is the right answer. And you, Karina, chose “because it is recurring.” “Sleep is regular because it is recurring,” but no, actually, it is because it gives the same readings every time. That means we'll always have, say, S-sleep first followed by D-sleep, unless there is depression, in which you go straight to D (desynchronized) sleep. You understand this, right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Javier passed the exam too. Ah, with the same mistake as Karina. “Sleep is regular...” You chose “because it is

recurrent,” and actually it's because the readings are always the same.

Lénica made a mistake. Hypnosis presents a sensory hyper-connection with the environment, and I think you answered “none.” And also S-2. Well, S-2 is curious because it represents 50% of sleep, you chose 20%. And the curious thing is that S-2 represents... 50% of sleep is S-2.

Audience: Most of sleep...

RFG: So most of it... half of sleep is S-2. Well, and S-4 is a 16%. Except in people who exercise, in which the percentage of S-4 grows.

Yolanda scored 80, that is, a tremendous grade for Mexico and Argentina, but not for IAS. The IAS, Yolanda, is very demanding.

Then, again: “Hypnosis presents a sensory hyper-connection with the environment,” unlike sleep: our senses seem to get somewhat disconnected with the environment in sleep, but not in hypnosis. It's the opposite for hypnosis, you are more connected.

Also, the mistake of “sleep is regular because...” because it always gives the same readings. S-1, 2, 3, 4 and D, except in depressed people, who go straight into D. We don't define sleep as regular because it is recurring and reversible.

And “Sigmund Freud studied unconscious memory and the defenses.” You answered something else. And “in old people, Unitary Perception can only happen unintentionally during wakefulness.” But no, there is no difference for old people. The right answer was #2: “Unitary Perception can only happen intentionally in wakefulness.” As in anyone.

Well, “Sigmund Freud –says Chuy– studied conscious memory and behavior.” And while he does, he's mainly known for studying unconscious memory and defenses. Remember. What we care about in Holokinetic Psychology is that Freud studied the unconscious and the defenses, which are all unconscious by

definition. Especially denial and projection, which are the most common and most primitive ones, to adaptive regression at the service of the ego, e.g., playing the guitar or... other defenses. Like transference, which is very common “I’m mad at mom, but actually, since I don’t want to fight with mom, I pick on my girlfriend, my wife or a female workmate, etc.” Transference. I’m angry at mom, but I transfer that anger to my wife, for instance, and I don’t realize it. And that is the defense that we call transference. You understand this, right?

Very well. “Hypnosis is a sensory hyper-connection with the environment.” Many answered “none of the above.” “S2 is 50% of sleep.” And “sleep is regular...” Why is sleep regular, Jesús?

Audience: Because it always gives the same readings.

RFG: Right. Not because it is recurring and reversible. Recurring: always at 10 pm. Reversible: always at 7 am. That doesn’t make it regular. It’s regular because the readings are always “S” then “D” in anyone, “S” then “D”. Except for depressed people, who go straight into D-sleep, no S-sleep is recorded; they go right into “D,” and “S4” is the restoration which the untreated depressed person lacks, of course.

[Repetition helps you learn].

Audience: And those who drink, right? Alcoholics.

RFG: And alcoholics, yes. Or those who take benzodiazepines: substances used for their sedative effects. Tafil® is used in Mexico a lot, Alprazolam in Argentina. Dalmane® was very much in use in Argentina, to sleep. All those sedative and sleep-inducing substances erase “S4,” you have to take that into account. Antidepressants don’t erase S4 sleep.

Okay, Blanca, who, we must say, passed the first exam with 100 points, was wrong about hypnosis too. Sensory hyper-connection with the environment is hypnosis. Low sensory connection with environment is sleep.

Audience: And also about D-sleep... that a depressed person enters D-sleep directly.

RFG: Yes. In major depression, sleep begins in... -you chose "S2." Actually, it begins in "REM," that is, in "D." Rapid Eye Movements, or De-synchronized. And "Sleep is regular..." You already know why: same readings every time. Not because it is recurring (every night at 10) or reversible (every morning at 7).

Eduardo, I think you got a better grade than in the first exam, right? Yes. Eduardo is getting better.

Well, in the first answer, there was no mistake, actually. No mistake. What happens is that you said Hans Selye studies stress, and you said that was the only thing he did, but the second option is also true. That's why the third option is the correct one "both answers." He clarified that there are many causes for a same response (which is stress) and claims that stress, if left unchecked, complicates with gastritis, arthritis, fall of immunity, suicidal and homicidal ideas, metabolic syndrome and arterial hypertension. That's also true. Both are true.

And then "Hypnosis..." the same mistake too. Remember: hypnosis is sensory hyper-connection with the environment, greater sensory connection with the environment, unlike sleep, which is a poorer connection of the senses with the environment.

[I repeat and we learn].

And also sleep is regular, not because it is recurrent like those who got it wrong (everyone) said, that is, because it appears at 10 every night, but because it always gives the same readings: "S" and "D", "REM" and "Non-REM".

Okay, so we've made a quick review of the mistakes. Now we can move on to chapters 5 and 6, which was our homework reading chapters 5 and 6 of the book *The New Paradigm in Psychology*, the only new scientific paradigm in psychology [today the revised book is called *Holokinetic Psychology*] Any

questions or comments about those chapters, 5 and 6? 6 is about Holokinesis.

Audience: In the homework, well, rather, in the foundations in Physics, there is a paragraph I didn't understand. Can I read it?

RFG: Sure!

Audience: “Both time and space have disappeared in the domain of frequencies. Therefore, the ordinary limits of space and time, and places in time and space are suspended and have to be 'interpreted or manifested' when the transformation to the domain of image takes place.” I didn't understand that last part: “when the transformation to the domain of image takes place.” That's not clear to me.

RFG: Yes, that was my first book (this is my pretext). This was my first book. And I was using many words to say little, which is a habit I got rid of as I wrote more and more. Today, I try to say much with few words. Because if you say much with few words, you don't want to show off, you just want people to understand what you are saying.

So, how would I say that today? I would say that, in Holokinesis, time becomes irrelevant and space... becomes one. Therefore, Africa, Argentina and Mexico become irrelevant. I mean, the important thing is that space is all one, and that's what we need to understand, something for which there is no image, not even a word.

We say “space is one” for others to understand what we're trying to say. But there are no words to say space is one, that is, the domain of image is the domain of the word too. There is no true way of expressing irrelevant time orally. Domain of the image. How do we imagine irrelevant time? I imagine absolute time by saying “it's twenty past ten.” I imagine relative time, by saying “Well, but it's twenty past two in Buenos Aires.”

So, absolute time: “it's twenty past ten in Mexicali.” Relative time: “it's twenty past two in Buenos Aires,” because their position is different. Their geographic position. So, we have a

way of imagining absolute time and relative time. But how do we imagine irrelevant time? If it is not relevant to consciousness –hence the name irrelevant–, it is hard to bring it into the domain of images and words. Do you understand?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: First question of the homework. We have difficulties to make Holokinesis be imagined and verbalized. You remember what we said, right? That a professor makes a serious mistake in a class when he says Holokinesis is a movement of great speed. What do you say? It cannot be. Speed is from here to *there*. Holokinesis is from here to *here*. There cannot be speed. So, very well, that professor was already electrocuted... no, no! (Laughter). Then, we see that we can make mistakes because we're talking about something new. But there is no speed in Holokinesis. Why? Because it is a movement from here to here. And to measure speed, you need movement from here to there.

Now, then, we see there are difficulties in expressing what Holokinesis is. In the last class we saw the big problem we have when saying Holokinesis is the movement “from” here “to” here. “From” implies the presence of an observer. From the observer to the observed. Because the observer has always conceived the world from here to there. From him (the observer): that's the linguistic structure of Sanskrit.

The linguistic structure of Sanskrit: the self, the verb and the object. So, Spanish comes from there, as most European languages, with a few exceptions.

But, when we say Holokinesis is the movement from here to here, we are, again, facing a language problem. Why? Because we borrow the preposition “from” and the preposition “to” from a previous world-view in which movement has always been from here to there, and now we're talking about the movement from here to here with the language of movement from here to there. That's understood too, right? Because we have to use language to understand what we read and study, otherwise, we don't understand.

I insist: workshops, seminars and courses are a support for the individual study of my written work, please don't forget that. The study of the Written work can't be avoided if you want to understand this in a complete way, from every human scientific discipline of study.

Any other question about the homework?

Audience: I have a doubt. What is the importance of centripetal and centrifugal movements in the teaching of Unitary Perception?

RFG: Well, originally, in neurology they talked about a centrifugal movement. This, for example [*moves his arm*] is a centrifugal movement. Why? Because the motor brain (which is the anterior), the motor area of the brain –for my arm to move, there has to be a centrifugal movement from the brain to the arm through the nerves. And “centripetal” would be when I touch this bottle to see if it has reached the temperature I like, which is room temperature. So, the bottle's heat or cold goes centripetally to the brain. That's all, actually. You understand that, right? Yes.

And what Unitary Perception does is to be in the brain between both movements, between both movements. That's another, more subtle way of understanding Unitary Perception. This is understood, right?

Audience: Yeah, I thought it was related to Physics, but you made it clear it wasn't.

RFG: No, no. Neurology.

Audience: Yes, Neurology, right?

RFG: Yes, yes. The beginnings of Neurology.

Audience: Unitary Perception is “between”...?

RFG: Right, it would be between them because, when everything [perceptible] is perceived, it's in both. When everything [perceptible] is perceived, Unitary Perception is in

both or between both. Prepositions are deadly, because we're speaking about new things where prepositions don't have a clear place. Because all prepositions belong to movement from here to there. So we face the problem of prepositions, which we will have to tolerate, because if we start making up prepositions, we'll clash (I say) with the Royal Spanish Academy [*which regulates the Spanish dictionary*], and we have enough problems to add that one. Okay, then, any other question?

Audience: When you talk about the three premises: local realism –the theory of local realism– are you referring to the same paradigm? You say: “our habitual scientific way of thinking stands on three dogmatic premises: realism, inductive inference and Einstein's separability or locality.” You're talking about the old paradigm, right?

RFG: Of course. Old paradigm.

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: It means everything has its place.

Can you repeat? Well, if the recorder picks you up, right?

Eduardo's question comes from page 125 of “The New Paradigm in Psychology”¹: “Our habitual scientific way of thinking stands on three dogmatic premises (that is, that they must be accepted without proof): 1. Realism, 2. Inductive inference and 3. Einstein's separability or locality.” What is realism? “A doctrine that states that the regularities in observed phenomena are caused by a physical reality whose existence is independent of the human observer.”

Bohm... and before Bohm, it was proven that the observer is not separate from the observed. And a good example is the EPR experiment, in which an observer can change the spin of an electron. It means the observer is not separate from what he

¹ Currently on page 143 of the book “*Holokinetic Psychology*” - Spanish

observes, as stated by scientific realism, which assumes the observer to be always separate from what he or she observes. Is that clear?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: It means we have three scientific dogmas, and we have to review them so they stop interfering, right? Second, inductive inference: “a valid mode of thought which can be applied freely, in such a way that legitimate conclusions arise from consistent observations.” Okay, that is the basis of Cartesian experimentation: that we see several things, we see, we experiment and then make conclusions according to what we saw. So we can say “Okay, tuberculosis is produced by Koch's bacillus.” Oh yeah? Then how come 98% of the people have Koch's bacillus...? Ah, it means we have a problem with inductive inference, right?

So we have to see that there are many causes for a single thing, as Selye said (and he was the first one to say it). And in tuberculosis, we see one more time that several causes are needed, not only the bacillus, to produce the disease. And a population with very low immunity is needed to produce a tuberculosis epidemic, like the one taking place in Texas, for example. And you need poor nutrition for immunity to fall. So we have several causes for tuberculosis too. And inductive inference [another scientific dogma] fails in this case too.

And third, Einstein's locality. Essentially, it meant no influence could propagate faster than light. Newton had said it already, and Einstein said it again. So, a man named Bell appears with his mathematical theorem, which states that all points of the universe, points that seemed to be discrete or separate (the word he uses is discrete or separate) are actually already united. For example, the Sun is supposed to be eight light minutes away from Earth, but actually it's already in contact with Earth. That is what Bell proves with his theorem. And in the University, there are still people who ignore this. So don't be surprised if you go to a university and they tell you you're speaking nonsense for mentioning this, which is a mathematical thing: Bell's theorem. And there are many more

pieces of evidence that you will find when studying, which prove that the fact of no influence being able to spread in the universe faster than light is actually wrong; it's wrong.

Am I answering? I'm answering, okay. Any other question?

Audience: ...whether the explicit order exists when the observer is not there...

RFG: Ah, of course.

Audience: But about this reading... the explicit order does not exist as an object, but it does exist as energy and matter.

RFG: Right. Say, this glass exists even if Rubén does not exist.

Audience: This... can you repeat that?

RFG: Whether the explicit order can exist without the observer, implicitly, right? You said that.

Audience: Yes, yes, well, you're answering my question there.

RFG: Yes: the explicit order can exist without the observer. Of course, because this glass does not need Rubén to exist. It's like the mind: it does not need the brain to exist. We have something very important for Unitary Perception there. That is, the mind does not need the brain to exist, and sodium does not need the brain to exist. And the brain does not produce mind or sodium, but mind and sodium function *in* the brain.

Audience: Yes, but in these chapters precisely, we've seen that objects are constituted in observation. That is, for this bottle to exist, there has to be an observer who sees it, because otherwise, it'd be pure energy and pure matter, impossible to differentiate from the air around it, and from all other matter and energy in the universe. So, what I'm trying to say...

RFG: Well, what you have just said is a philosophical assumption.

Audience: It's philosophical...

RFG: Of course, it's not something scientific. That's why I say: be careful with Philosophy, because Philosophy can be an obstacle. Or rather: it is. Philosophy *is* an obstacle in the study of science. And let's not forget that Unitary Perception is science, the most delicate, cutting-edge science. Therefore, let's not get into Philosophy, right? That cost me, for example... I have a friend, which you know here; he teaches Philosophy and we had long Internet dialogues. And I tell him "well, if you want to continue with the dialogue, you'll have to let Philosophy go" (laughing). And I didn't get another email from him for a long time. So I just assumed that he was another lost soul, right? Then I meet him in our Congress, in Guadalajara if I'm not mistaken, and he tells me "I have abandoned Philosophy." Well. So, in order to let Philosophy go, you have to understand, for example, what he has just asked [about the dogmas of science]. These three things we mentioned have to be understood. Why? Because otherwise, you won't drop Philosophy. Because these three questions we just clarified: locality, inductive inference, etc., are philosophical. They are the philosophy of science. So if we insist on that philosophy of science, then... poor science! Poor science. I say Philosophy is an obstacle. The only thing we can salvage from Philosophy to delve more into Unitary Perception is Epistemology: What sees is all there is. Ah, now we're talking. Epistemology was a part of Philosophy but it's the only thing that we can salvage from Philosophy. What sees is all there is. Ah! And that is Unitary Perception, okay, now we're talking. And is that Philosophy? Well, it is the *salvageable* part of Philosophy, which is Epistemology: how we know. Epistemology studies how we know. Yes. Are we clear? Any other question?

Audience: A doubt. In quantum theory, contradiction is in the wave function.

RFG: Of course. Do you see it?

Audience: Can you repeat that?

RFG: Karina says that, in quantum theory, contradiction is in the wave function. Of course. I mean, when de Broglie says... - 1929; European fascism was emerging together with anti-

intellectualism and anti-everything. So de Broglie, a French man, dares to say the electron is a particle and a wave at the same time. It means we can find it here, but also here, here and here [*makes a waving motion with hands*]. So, of course, the first thing you say is “that guy is crazy,” as they say about anyone who says something new. But a more careful analysis shows that de Broglie is a genius, who gave quantum theory the push it needed to start moving in Europe. And luckily, after him came people like Planck, Einstein, etc., who gave quantum theory its final push. Schrödinger, the great Schrödinger, who left Germany to avoid collaborating with Hitler's fascism, goes... where? Dublin. Schrödinger, the great German teacher, moves to Dublin to teach; he leaves his chair in Berlin, which was one of the most coveted professorships of Physics in Europe. Why? To teach quantum theory. No longer in Berlin, but in Dublin. This is answered, right?

Audience: Yes. So is that why David Bohm drops quantum theory, due to those contradictions?

RFG: No! That contradiction is the essence of quantum theory. And people said “this guy is crazy.” That's the first thing people say about a genius who says something new: “this guy is crazy.” I mean, about Columbus, they said “this guy is crazy, he wants to reach the Indies through the opposite side.” And turns out he was the first one to arrive by sailing in the opposite direction. And in the same way –and this is a metaphor– when de Broglie says “the electron is a wave too, i.e., you can find it here but also here, here and here [*makes a waving motion with his hand*]: “this guy is crazy.” No. It is the beginning of the acceptance and the deep study of quantum theory, which continues with Planck –I've been to the Planck Institute for Brain Research in Cologne: wonderful. And also Schrödinger and Einstein too, and well, many others, Fermi, etc., they delved a lot into quantum theory. I don't know if I'm answering. I've answered, right? That which seemed so absurd, ridiculous, paradoxical, -actually it *is* paradoxical. It's called the quantum *paradox*, which is one of the most brilliant things science has. The electron is a particle and a wave at the same time. And is it paradoxical to say Holokinesis is the movement

from here to here? It is the paradox of movement. There is the quantum paradox in 1929 and David Bohm's paradox of movement in 1986: Holokinesis. What's that? Movement from here to here. "What? This guy is crazy." Of course, they say about him the same thing they said about de Broglie. Today some people still say Bohm was crazy. But let's not forget that -the dates are there, right? [*points to whiteboard*]. Galileo, a hundred years after the death of Copernicus, was teaching not Copernicus, but Ptolemy, who had died in 127 AD, who said the Earth was the center of the Solar System. So that's a big paradox, but a moral paradox, and I think science has more moral paradoxes than scientific paradoxes: that Bohm is still not understood, that it was so difficult for us to accept the quantum paradox, those are a part of science: scientific paradoxes. But what a paradox it is that Galileo taught Ptolemy a hundred years after the death of Copernicus; Ptolemy, who had died in 127 AD, who said the Earth was the center, while Galileo was fully aware that the Sun was the center, and he taught it that way out of fear of being burned by the Catholic Inquisition. Ah! We have to know all these things about science, for us to understand why science moves so slowly. And that, after 1986, they're not talking about David Bohm in universities, at least not in the systematic way he should be talked about. So, am I answering?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Any other question or comment?

Audience: I still cannot understand how the holographic [brain] model can explain motor function. The example given is that of a right-handed person who tries to write with his left hand, and it says something about Sir John Eccles, who had said the synaptic potentials in the nervous system don't happen by themselves. That a wavefront is formed in dendrites and axons.

RFG: Yes, but that is orthodox neurology. Neurology in its highest expression.

I don't see what the question is, though.

Audience: In what way does the holographic movement explain how the brain functions?

RFG: Ah! Well, we'll talk about that now. Karl Pribram was the first who dared say memory is holographic. Because Karl Pribram... I had the fortune of knowing him, he visited us here, in the class I taught here at UABC [Baja California Autonomous University], so we went with Cecilia to pick him up at the San Diego airport, and drove him back to the same airport, and he was at the opening act of the IAS [International Academy of Sciences] in Guanajuato. And Karl Pribram was the first one who started talking about the hologram in neurology, and he says memory is holographic, so it's in the whole brain. "What? This guy is crazy." You understand, right? Another pioneer. "This guy is crazy. What? Memory is in the whole brain? What?" Yeah, so Pribram would tell you: "You go into a movie theater, you're looking for your friend, who invited you to the movies. You arrived a bit late, he's already sitting and you recognize him from behind. How can you recognize him from behind if you've never seen him from that angle?" Do you understand? Well, the answer is: because the brain works as a hologram.

Audience: Is that what they call plasticity, or is it something else?

RFG: Plasticity. Plasticity, okay. Plasticity implies many other things, but in its essence, it's partly this.

Audience: But plasticity does not involve the holographic view, right?

RFG: The one who came up with plasticity has no idea of the holonomic view. That's why I say it's *partly* this, because it's not all this. Yes, that's right. I mean, things are discovered that become fragmentary, and they put them in a box called "plasticity," but they forget about Karl Pribram, who had seen this much before and explained it in a non-fragmentary way. So, plasticity is a box, but if we have the holonomic view of brain functioning, plasticity is just one more thing within the

holographic brain functioning. Do you understand? Any other question or comment?

Audience: Let me see if I get this straight. If the brain works in a holonomic way, it means there are different memory points. There are medications to forget certain traumatic events, right? What happens there?

RFG: No. No, those medications, if they existed, would be unethical, but they don't exist as far as I know. But if they do exist, they're illegal. What medication can make you forget? None that I know of, actually. None that I know of. But if it existed, it would be unethical.

Audience: So, memory might be erased, but it can appear again.

RFG: Sure, as it happens, for example, in a high blood pressure attack. Blood spills into the language center –close to here for a right-handed person [*pointing at the left side of his head*]. Because it's over here in a left-handed person [*pointing at the right side of his head*], and here in a right-handed person [*pointing at the left side of his head*]. If the burst blood vessel is here [*pointing at the left side of his head*], language is lost. And why is language recovered? Because there are other parts of the brain that take that function.

[There is a cut in the video and the class is resumed with another subject.]

Okay, the question is whether Bohm was well informed about quantum theory. Of course he was. And one of the things he said is that, even from the quantum viewpoint, we have to stop seeing universal matter as billiard balls, i.e., as separate atoms. I have a very good paragraph from Bohm here about how he understood atoms. Listen to what he said about the atom, okay? Bohm stops thinking about the atom as a billiard ball and defines it by saying: “the atom is a poorly defined cloud.” It's no longer a billiard ball. “The atom is a poorly defined cloud that behaves like a wave...” There's the quantum paradox. “...and as a particle at the same time...” We know that from de

Broglie already. “It means it is neither independent nor permanent.” It's not a hard, therefore long-lasting billiard ball, independent from every other ball. And Bohm is saying that the atom, being a particle and a wave, is a poorly defined cloud, not independent as a billiard ball, and not permanent, because its function depends on the context or environment in which it moves. It means that sodium will work differently; that atom called sodium will function very differently as sodium chloride than as sodium nitrate. So are they two different atoms? No, it's the same **atom**, but with another cloud shape. Am I clear?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Okay, and it's not separate from its environment, the atom depends on its context. So the atom is a cloud that changes its shape according to what it will be. If sodium will become sodium chloride, it is an atom with one shape, and if it will be sodium nitrate, it's a cloud with another shape. Just imagine... I'm answering your question, right?

Audience: Yes, yes.

RFG: Yes, see the beauty of Bohm's explanation when he talks about the atom! Of course, and he went on about the atom, right? With me... I was constantly fascinated. One of the things that fascinated me a great deal was when he said: “so the atom then contracts –as a cloud, it contracts too– it contracts into a particle, then expands into a wave, and in order to be a wave, it has to extend over the whole universe.” It means the atom is occupying the whole universe, and at the same time contracting into a particle. It is a beautiful thing to listen to Bohm talk about the atom and say things like what I just said, which sound kind of fantastic, like science fiction, but they are nothing more than reality, seen in a new way. Is this answered?

Audience: Yes, yes, it's clear now.

RFG: Javier?

Audience: But those movements... it is implied that they are without displacement, it's only to explain.

Audience: Can you repeat that?

RFG: Whether they are movements without displacement? Well, for the sodium atom to be sodium chloride or nitrate, there has to be displacement.

Audience: What I understand from what Javier says is that, in order to explain it, you understand it as displacement, but ultimately, it is not precisely a displacement.

RFG: Ah, well! We shouldn't assume there is no displacement because the atom occupies the whole universe: careful. Doesn't the human being occupy the whole universe, when our vitamin D depends on the Sun? Careful.

Audience: That could be philosophy.

RFG: No. It's not philosophy to say vitamin D depends on the Sun. Your vitamin D and my vitamin D depend on the Sun.

Audience: That's the question, I mean, whether things exist in themselves or wholeness exists. So, when do things exist in themselves, and when is the wholeness relevant?

RFG: Well, JK said that already. He said: "We can look at it fragmentarily, as something separate from the human being, or we can see it as it is –it's the universe." We can see it in both ways: fragmentarily (as always) or the way it has to be seen: the human being is the universe, the human being is not separate from the universe as proven by EPR, as proven by Bell's Mathematical Theorem, as quantum theory itself is proving. De Broglie has proven it already. I mean, if it is a particle and a wave, okay, then it occupies the whole universe. Tremendous. All of this is tremendous. It's hard to digest and to swallow, because we have another education about all this, and a completely different perspective.

Audience: I'm still interested in what Javier said about there being no displacement.

RFG: It does not mean the previous perspective is disposable. This perspective complements the previous one, the Cartesian

perspective. But this perspective should not be thrown away just because it seems fantastic. No, it is a tremendous perspective because it explains countless events that, otherwise, have no explanation.

Audience: So there is no time or space. If we're saying there is no time or space...

RFG: In Holokinesis.

Audience: In Holokinesis...

RFG: If you say “there's no time or space,” that's philosophy. But if you say “time and space are not [relevant] in Holokinesis,” ah, that's science. Yes. Do you understand that? We have to say where time is irrelevant, because it's irrelevant in Holokinesis, but it's relevant to say it's now fifteen minutes past eleven. Very relevant.

Audience: There is a notion that a wave is something that moves like this, right? [*making a gesture with hands*]. So there is displacement.

RFG: Or, like this [*making a waving gesture with hands*], if you want.

Audience: Or like this, right? [*making a gesture with hands*]. Radially.

RFG: Sure.

Audience: But when... if we polish this a little, right? I mean, if the electron is a particle and it's a wave, when you say “wave,” you don't mean something that goes like that [traveling], or is it something that travels...

RFG: Yes!

Audience: ...in space and over time.

RFG: Ah, of course! Of course. [*In the explicit order*]. De Broglie said this when Bohm was still maybe five or six years

old, you see? I mean, de Broglie said tremendous things that made him live in poverty for a long time, because what he said was unacceptable. And when Bohm is born, fortunately, de Broglie was widely accepted, as well as quantum theory.

Any other question or comment?

Audience: Question and comment. So could we say that, from the explicit order, we see that everything is separated? I mean, that the explicit order is the place of concepts like time, measure, as you said, displacement? Whereas, from the implicit order, all these concepts like time are irrelevant, there is separation in the...

RFG: In the implicit order, space is one, time is irrelevant and measure is only inferable.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Therefore, it is irrelevant.

Audience: But then, would there be a new way of making scientific experiments based on Holokinesis?

RFG: Of course, but they are not separate from observation, and they don't stop being consensual. So we don't move away. Even if all we've just said sounds like science fiction, we're not moving away from science, because everything we're saying is just as consensual as Cartesian observation.

Audience: But there is a new way of making science, I mean, scientific experiments, with Bohm.

RFG: Which doesn't depend on Cartesian coordinates. It does not depend, right. There are experiments that don't depend on Cartesian coordinates.

Audience: So it's no longer the same way of making science, which is not linear, Cartesian.

RFG: Right, it's another way of making science, that's why they say Bohm's arrival means the ending of a science and the

beginning of another one. And there's the ending of a psychology and the beginning of another one, which we are studying here. Yes. Well, any other question or comment?

I have some “bombs” here. Like those water-filled balloon bombs that cause a lot of discomfort when they hit you (laughing).

Audience: Bomb questions.

RFG: What?

Audience: Are those bomb questions or bomb comments?

RFG: Bomb comments. Because they are comments like the ones we'd made before. For instance, if we'll delve into the study of Holokinesis... Holokinesis is a theory, so... Chuy, is theory knowledge? Bohm used to say a theory is still not knowledge. Why isn't a theory knowledge? Because a theory is a way of seeing. A theory is a way of seeing.

I give an example from the Gospel, of how John describes the moment in which he sees the empty grave of Jesus. And in Greek... -in Spanish and English, the word is “see” and “see.” See. Only one verb. But in Greek, there are three verbs. It means there are three ways of seeing the empty grave of Jesus. John gets there and says in a very humble way “I ran and beat Peter to it. I got to the empty grave first.” (laughing) –this shows us John's human side, about him beating Peter. And says “I *blepen* the empty grave.” “I took a glance at the empty grave.” *Blepen*: a glance, a quick look. “And when Peter gets there, he entered and *teorein* the empty grave.” Ah, this is another word to say “see”: *teorein*. And there is another word for those who are in metanoia, which is *eiden*, which is to see as you see in Unitary Perception, or if you want, how you see from Precinct A. Ah! But this means there are three ways of seeing. Well, I think Bohm refers to this when he talks about theory. There are ways of seeing. So John has one theory when he sees the empty grave of Jesus, and Peter has another one. Do you understand? And there is a third way of seeing the problem

or issue, which is *eiden*. Three ways of seeing, three theories about the empty grave of Jesus.

And look at what Bohm said: “A theory is a way of observing...” I'm translating from English, so bear with me. “A theory is a way of observing that is always changing.” Therefore, it's not true or false. The important thing about a theory –Bohm said– is being useful, not being true or false. Useful for what? For us to see reality in a different way, and then we'll have to check if it is true or false. But for the time being, it is a new way of seeing.

“A theory is not actual knowledge.” Beautiful, huh? A theory is not actual knowledge. It is simply a way of seeing. Nothing less than a way of seeing.

“A theory establishes its own differences and distinctions.” That is, it describes the necessary differences between things, what we call notions of order. For example: Descartes saw time as absolute, as also did Newton later. But Bohm sees time, he SEES time, he has a theory of time that is different: irrelevant time. He does not see time like Newton did –absolute time. Ah! It is a different way of seeing.

And Freud sees the mind as thought –conscious or unconscious. And how does Holokinetic Psychology see thought? As one of the ways in which the brain works, not as all that Psychology is. Way of seeing? Sure. But it's important to understand that these complement each other. And let's add that Unitary Perception is not thought, and that thinking about Unitary Perception is not Unitary Perception. You understand this, right?

Audience: Yes, sure.

RFG: Any question or comment about this? Because we're about to talk about Holokinesis. Therefore, we know Holokinesis is a theory and we should be clear about what Bohm thought a theory was.

Audience: The difference between knowledge and theory. For example, if we speak about Holokinesis. What is the knowledge and what is the theory?

Audience: Can you repeat that for Argentina?

RFG: Whether Holokinesis is knowledge or theory? It's a theory, Bohm's theory. Now, he formulated it mathematically in 1986, which turns it into a fact. It is like Bell's Theorem, which mathematically states that there are no discrete bodies in the universe; all the bodies in the universe are connected right now. That is, a star is not 120 light years away from us, it's already connected with us. [Those are two truths, not only one].

So it's good for us to see how Bohm saw what a theory is. He made a difference between real knowledge and theory, which is a way of seeing.

And what did Bohm say about the particle? The particle. Let's not forget that, in science, Physics studies everything with particles.

“Let's see, what is the particle of gravitation?” Scientists gather in a congress.

“Let's see, what is the particle of gravitation? –Well, let's call it graviton.

–Right, okay. And where is it? –Ah, who knows. (Laughter)

–And who's seen it? –Nobody. But we have the graviton particle already.”

Because that is the way we've been taught to think about everything, and when we find gravitation (which can't be explained with particles), we make it up with no problem. Especially when I'm a scientist like Oppenheimer, I can afford to simply make up the graviton particle. “And what will you do, Yolanda? Argue with me?” Know what I'm saying? “I'm Oppenheimer, will you argue with me?” So they invent the graviton particle. Where is it? Ah, I don't know. Nobody

knows. But that's not all. When Bell's Theorem comes along and says:

“Sirs, there are no discrete or separate bodies in the universe; they are all already connected. See, here is the mathematical demonstration of Bell's Theorem.

–Ah, interesting. So, what is the particle?

–What? Particle for what?

–To say everything is... (I'm adding the stutter for extra drama)
To say everything is united at the same time.

–Well, let's call it tachyon, the fast particle.

–Okay, very well. –Where is it?

–Ah, who knows.

–But, hasn't anyone seen it?

–Nobody.”

Do you see what I mean? So it means we have a particular view of the universe, whether we like it or not, whether it's true or not. I mean, we have a particular theory of the universe. First we have to know what a theory is to Bohm, and now we have to know that we see everything in particles, even when they don't exist, and if they don't exist, we name them, even though we don't know where they are or if they even exist, but they have a name. Gravitation has a particle called the graviton. “And the fact that the Sun is already connected with us and not only eight light minutes away is because of the tachyon particle.” See what I mean? Nobody's seen it. It's a theoretical particle that nobody ever saw.

The two words are united: “theoretical particle.” And Bohm said: “We see everything as if the universe was a bunch of billiard balls.” Careful, because that's not the case. What were you saying?

Audience: It's not scientific.

RFG: Of course not. The graviton and the tachyon are not scientific. They respond to a particularistic theory of Physics, even if the particle doesn't exist, but we've already named it in case it appears. *If* it appears, because maybe it's like Osama Bin Laden, who can't be found anywhere.

Then: fragmentation. What are we talking about? We're talking about fragmentation, right? That we don't have particles, so we make them up.

And Bohm says: "What is fragmentation? The unconscious habit of confusion regarding what is different and what isn't." The unconscious habit of confusion regarding what is different and what isn't (laughing). Watch out for Bohm! "And dividing the indivisible is also fragmentation." Just pick up a book by Wilber about consciousness, I think there are a hundred and fifty forms of consciousness. I don't know how many according to Wilber. So he divides the indivisible and becomes a best-seller. And if you speak with someone who's read Wilber and they tell you "Yes! This consciousness and that consciousness and..." And they are like the tachyon and the graviton, particles that don't exist, but have a name.

And says Bohm about fragmentation: "Fragmentation is confusing what comes from thought with what doesn't come from thought. The word God is not God, because the word is not the thing." He stole that from JK, but it's related to fragmentation. "He stole it" is a humorous expression, of course. Fragmentation is confusion about what comes from thought and what doesn't come from thought.

And then we have the problem of measuring. Measuring. For it to be scientific it has to be measurable. The word "medic" comes from "measure". Medic is the one who measures. "How many milligrams of antidepressant do you need."

Now, "the perception of the essence of all things is measure. Perception of the essence of all things, proportion which is perceived by the mind." That's measure. "Reason is a

perception similar to artistic perception.” Reasoning. Artistic perception is a way of reasoning.

What is tragedy? “It is that which is beyond all measure.”

Audience: Tragedy?

RFG: Tragedy. For example, reading a good Shakespeare play. You'll find tragedy. Everybody dies at the end. Hamlet. Did you see the movie Hamlet? I read the book three times, and I want to read it a fourth time. He's a great poet. I think Hamlet is one of the pinnacles of literature, a great tragedy that says many things. And one of the most important things is Ophelia's death, Hamlet's girlfriend, who says, before committing suicide: “Ah, what man can be and yet isn't.” Ophelia in Hamlet, a great play. But it's a tragedy. Why? Because it goes beyond all measure. There is a ghost, that is, a dead person telling Hamlet to kill a particular person. It is implied that we all act according to orders by the dead, and that we're hypnotized by the dead, by the living and that our actions are a product of hypnosis, if you want to see Hamlet that way. And tragedy is what? That which is beyond all measure, all proportion. Hamlet is a good example because everyone dies at the end, in five minutes.

And 5% of humanity possess 95% of the world's riches. That's a tragedy, because it goes beyond all measure, beyond all proportion, that only five human beings own the Earth.

Audience: 5%.

RFG: Out of a hundred people, five own lands, ninety-five don't. That's a tragedy because it's beyond all proportion.

Audience: But it's not, right? Because you're measuring: five, ninety-five.

RFG: Sure, but measure is a proportion, and when it's out of proportion, tragedy begins. Definition of tragedy based on measure.

Let's not forget that when we say the word “quantum,” that's a measure based on the meter, because we're talking about phenomena occurring at 10^{-37} meters.

So, what is meditation? It is the measuring of the process of thought. We talked about this with JK and with Bohm. Meditation is the measuring of the process of thought. That's why JK renounces to keep talking about meditation once we define it, because he realizes that he hadn't been talking all his life about meditation, if we define meditation as the measuring of the process of thought, which is different from seeing thought while we perceive sound. That's no longer meditation, because meditation is the measuring of the process of thought, whereas Unitary Perception goes much beyond.

Or adjusting to an external pattern, that is measure too. For example, the meter. The meter gives rise even to the quantum aspect, 10^{-37} meter: we enter the quantum aspect. When we measure from 4000 through 8000 angstroms, light is a measure based on the meter, etc. And when we compare with the kilo, we're adjusting to an external pattern.

Then, saying, for example, “Jesus said,” is that adjusting to an external pattern? What do you think? No?

RFG: And the meter is also something external to which we adjust.

[Cut in the recording, which is resumed with a comment about the New Testament].

RFG:..... ...Paul said we all have Kristos in our mind, that Kristos is a part of everyone's mind. [End of Second Chapter of First Corinthians]

And there are two world-views, at least the most mentioned ones: western and eastern. The western one is based on measuring and the eastern one is based on not measuring, based on wholeness. For instance, the Sanskrit word “matra” gave rise to “meter,” but originally, “matra” meant “to measure”, and it gives rise to the word “maya,” which means illusion.

Which implies that to measure is an illusion. And it's based on that... there are eight fundamental philosophies in India, and I think all eight of them are based on this, that every measure is an illusion.

And in Hebrew, there is the word... the Arabic word *shalem*, which is “all” and *shalom*, which is “peace.” So they are based on totalities.

And in the Western world, it's always comparison to an external pattern: technology, the development of market, the atomic bomb, the universal theory of gravity, the theory of relativity, everything requires measure, and the meter as a pattern, even when we speak about the quantum aspect.

And what role does language play in fragmentation? When we try to talk about Holokinesis, we've seen all the problems that arise with prepositions. When you try to talk about anything, language can be a bridge or an abyss... language can be a bridge or a barrier. So, we have to see the role of language in fragmentation, and even in the difficulty of defining Holokinesis with language, if we look at the prepositions we use to describe Holokinesis: movement “from” here “to” here. Well, if it is *here*, there's no “from” or “to.”

There are very interesting things in English, for instance... – based on Sanskrit, where you must have a subject, a verb and an object: “I see you.” Subject (I) – see – you. Subject – verb – object. But in English: “It is getting dark.” We don't mention the subject in Spanish: “*Is getting dark.*” Gerund and verb are enough, but not in English; you still have to keep the subject in English: “It is raining.” What is it that rains? “It.” Not for us (Spanish speakers): “Is raining.” And that's all. Bohm always wondered. “It is getting dark. And where is that *it* that is getting dark?”, Bohm said. So “it is raining” [*translates into Spanish, adding the subject “eso” - it*]. “What is it that is raining?”, said Bohm.

Yes. And well, there are many things about language. The subject-verb-object structure from Sanskrit in our language, together with the two world-views we've just seen: one that

measures and one that refuses to measure; the Western one and the Eastern one, and all those problems implied in language tend to impose themselves strongly in the way we talk. Sanskrit writing, the world-views that measure and don't measure: Western and Eastern, for instance. So, all of that imposes itself in the way we talk, even in those cases –as we've seen in the definition of Holokinesis– in which a bit of attention will reveal the inappropriate use of language. So, however inappropriate, many times we need to use it like that.

Very well. All of this is in page 37 of a very important book by David Bohm, perhaps the most important one, called “Wholeness and the Implicate Order.”

Knowledge. It is important to see the definition of knowledge too. According to Bohm, what is knowledge? We shouldn't be surprised to get a new way of saying what knowledge is. “It is the abstraction of the flux of the universe” (laughing). I'm sorry. “It is *an* abstraction of the flux of the universe.” Knowledge is that. And he says “not only is everything changing, –even knowledge–, but also, all is flux.” So knowledge is changing and it's in flux, as everything, he says. “And everything changes, even the interaction among particles. And all is flux, which is the immediate relationship between all the things in that ocean that is movement. And there are no invariable elements in knowledge.” You know that Bohm spoke about hidden variables. So Bohm says “there are no invariant things (things that don't change) in knowledge.” For instance, the sky is not always cloudy. The sky might be cloudy but it's not always the case. That is, there is nothing in the universe that doesn't change.

“Thought should work in parallel with intelligence, as a radio receiver.” So, he sees intelligence as universal consciousness, and thought should work in parallel, as if it was a radio receiver of the universal consciousness. That's how David Bohm understood right thinking, as a receiver of universal consciousness.

And in Physics, said Bohm, there are diverse notions of order. Notions of order are: time, space, movement. Those are three

notions of order. We order our whole lives with time, space and movement, which are notions of order. So, Bohm said “one of the things we need in Physics is analysis.” That is, decomposing something we’re observing into parts so we can describe it better. It was said that the movement of matter could be heavenly or earthly –this is from the history of Physics, nothing more than the history of Physics, for us humans to laugh at ourselves a bit. Bohm said “the movement of matter began to be defined as heavenly and earthly. Heavenly movement was that of the epicycles.” Which is... the orbital movement of celestial bodies is epicycles, that is, circles on circles. That is what Ptolemy said when he found out that orbits are not circular. The most circular-like orbit is that of Mercury, but it’s not circular either.

And the movement of matter in a vacuum was distinguished from movement in a viscous medium. Galileo makes a bunch of discoveries in a vacuum, and, I don't know if you've seen Galileo's tube, in which a vacuum is created, then a stone and a feather are dropped, and both fall to the ground at the same time, because objects in a vacuum fall to the ground at the same speed, independently of their weight. That was discovered by Galileo. So, movement has to be seen in Galileo's vacuum and in a viscous medium, which is the atmosphere. The atmosphere is a viscous medium because it has oxygen, nitrogen, carbon dioxide, etc. And in Europe, they also said it had smoke from Churchill's cigars. They used to make that joke about the composition of the atmosphere (laughing). Bohm told me that.

And universal gravitation... i.e., that everything falls to the center of the Earth. There's no mistake there. And Ptolemy said everything is falling towards a center, which is the center of the Earth, because Earth was the center of the Universe. But now we know there are several centers towards which gravitation falls, or rather, towards which bodies fall due to gravitation. Not only towards the center of the Earth, as in the Earth's surface. Newton himself said there was universal love, and they told him not to use that word, so he used the word gravitation. Because he called gravitation “universal love,” because all the

bodies in the universe attract each other, Newton said, and that proves there is love in the universe, since all those bodies are attracting each other. They talk about universal gravitation, which means they are being attracted towards diverse centers, not towards the center of the Earth only.

And Einstein's theory of relativity, relative time and the speed of the observer. We've seen that: time depends on the observer. It's not only absolute as Newton had said.

And after Bohr and Bohm, we have to speak a little bit like JK. The observer is the observed. The observer is not separate from what is being observed. That's epistemology, but also science.

And in the hologram, in the hologram –to finish this first part and continue with this in the second part of the sixth class, we have seen that it all begins with the hologram. How did all this start? How did Holokinetic Psychology start? It starts with Holokinesis, when Bohm sees in the bubble chamber that the electron disappears and appears again in the same place, and says “what is this?”. So he starts to do research into it, something which nobody had done; despite many people seeing it, nobody had researched it. Bohm investigates and thanks to the hologram, he's able to explain the fact, the phenomenon. Why did the electron disappear and appear again?

And thanks to the hologram, he explains what happened with the electron, but now he doesn't call it hologram, but Holokinesis. He says it's no longer something in the plane, like a hologram, now it's movement in space, in the whole universe. Ah! So, what is a hologram? Do you all know what a hologram is already?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: We'll give at least the basic thing ... so you can study this in the written work without trouble, the explanation is in “The New Paradigm in Psychology” [book which today is called “Holokinetic Psychology”]. You'll understand this much better after what we're going to say about the hologram here, in

the second part. Because you really need to know few things about the hologram to understand what you have to understand about Psychology. Any question or comment before the break?

Audience: Maybe in Argentina.

RFG: Any question or comment in Argentina?

Audience: Yes, hello. The connection failed when you were talking about... “Jesus said this or that” is adjusting to a pattern or measure. Could you repeat that?

RFG: Yes: when we say light is electromagnetic waves ranging from 4000 to 8000 angstroms (light that is visible to the human eye), we're using angstroms, which is a measurement based on the meter, and therefore, we have the meter as a pattern to talk about light, and to talk about the quantum [aspect]. That's our reference: the meter. So there is an external pattern to which we adjust, in this case the meter. Then there is exegesis, right? In religion we say that “Jesus said” means adjusting to an external pattern. And someone reminds us that Paul said Jesus, or “Kristos”, is something within the human mind, not something external to the human being. Therefore, knowing what Jesus said is not adjusting to an external pattern if we know that Kristos is a part of our mind. Like the speech center, it is a part of the brain. The same is true for Kristos, according to Paul.

Now, these are the subjects that come up when we talk about the meter and Western civilization, which is based on measure, while the Eastern civilization is based on wholeness. Then we're seeing that both measuring and wholeness are necessary, and the fact that Bohm discovers Holokinesis is the fact that introduces wholeness even in the Western civilization, which is based on measure. And I think that might be one of the reasons why Bohm is ignored. But all of this was to introduce what we'll talk about in the second part, which is Holokinesis. What the hologram is and what Holokinesis is, in order to understand why we have said that seminars, workshops and courses are only a support for the reading and study of the written work. This is very important. Is this clear?

Audience: Yes, wonderful. Thank you very much Rubén.

Audience: “Two plus two equals four.” Is that a knowledge that might change? We spoke about knowledge being something that changes. That is rather a fact, right?

RFG: (Laughing) It's a fact, of course. And the interesting thing is that Bohm said Mathematics was a perfect illusion of certainty (laughing).

We have to stop saying Psychology is $2+2=5$ and $2+2=3$; now, with the scientific Psychology, which is Holokinetic, we can say that $2+2=4$ in Psychology too, and that is indisputable. Once we define Unitary Perception, it can't be something different for Chuy, or for Rubén. It's the same. It's the same. That's what we mean with $2+2=4$. Despite all we've said about knowledge, that it is a changing flux. Okay, but Unitary Perception is the same for everyone, just like $2+2=4$. It's not a different thing for each person, no.

Because there is a romantic school in Europe (born in Europe) based on the idea that each person has to find their own way of reaching God, or that each one has to find the way to seduce a girl, for example. Those are the principles of romanticism: that each of us should manage to...

Audience: ...create his own path.

RFG: And each person has their own path. And is that something we're against? No. What we're saying is: it's not true that each one of us has their own way of finding Unitary Perception. There is only one way. Rubén cannot do Cecilia's Unitary Perception, that's true. So, is it true that each one of us has to find Unitary Perception? Yes, that's true. And it's always the same. But Rubén cannot do it for Cecilia and Cecilia cannot do it for Rubén, that's also true. It is important to clarify these things so we don't fall into romantic philosophy, which can only cause confusion.

I don't know if there are questions from Buenos Aires, before the break.

Audience: No, Rubén.

RFG: Then, we'll take a fifteen minute break. What do you think?

Audience: OK.

[Fifteen minute break].

RFG: Sixth lesson, second part. We'll talk about the hologram. We have drawn two little squares here which represent what? The photographic negative (left), and the holographic negative (right). This is, of course, a simplification. Why do we simplify? To help you study this subject, because this is the basis of Holokinesis and the basis of Holokinetic Psychology.

The square on the left side contains the photographed object, which is an inverted person. Head down and feet up. And you need light to get a photographic negative. You also need a lens. The lens is what inverts the object's image; it appears inverted in the negative. And there is also a point-to-point correspondence, which means the object's nose is represented in a point of the negative, that is, the person's nose. The nose point in the negative corresponds with the nose point in the photographed person. That's called point-to-point correspondence. Each point of the object corresponds to a point in the negative. And everything we see there is explicit; that's the explicit order.

Now, let's look at the holographic negative, always simplifying it to make study easier. Don't forget the study is the fundamental thing. What do we see in the holographic negative, which is the little square on the right? The other was the photographic negative. Don't forget that the hologram is a photographic technique too. In the holographic negative, you see spirals and stripes of light interference, because two light beams are used. One of them comes from the photographed object and the other doesn't. They are two light beams that converge in the negative and make interference. What light is used? Not sunlight or light from lamps. They use laser light, which is amplified light. LASER means *light amplification of*

stimulated emission of radiation. Something like that. Laser is amplified and stimulated light. To make a hologram you don't use light, but laser. Neither do you use a lens; you use mirrors. And there is no point-to-point correspondence. First of all, we can't even see the object in the holographic negative. Where is the photographed object? It's not there. There are stripes and spirals of light interference. You can't even see the photographed object. It looks like a bad photo. But if you shoot a laser beam through this negative, we will see at the focal point, behind the negative, the full statue of light of the photographed object, which can be this person. The whole light statue of the person will appear at the focal point back there. But there is no point-to-point correspondence. The nose of the photographed object (person) is in every point of the hologram, I mean, of the holographic negative, and his foot is in every point of the holographic negative. So, there is no point-to-point correspondence as in the photographic negative. Then, where is the photographed subject in the negative? It's in the implicit order of the hologram. So, obviously, there is an explicit order: the light interference [patterns]; and an implicit order which we can't see, but we can infer. How can we infer it? I insist, by passing a laser beam and getting the light statue of the photographed object. So we say: Whoa, the object can't be seen in the hologram, in the holographic negative, but it has to be there, because we get the light statue of the object when we shoot a laser through it. So we infer that the object is there, but it's implicit, not explicit. So obviously, the hologram shows us that, besides the explicit order, there is an implicit order.

Now, why is this important? Because David Bohm tells me, on the first day we met, after making me study the hologram –for a whole night, it wasn't so simple as this, as it should be, simple as this, in order to understand it for Holokinetic Psychology. He told me:

“No, if you don't know about the hologram, we can't talk.” So I go and study the hologram. I return. And as I returned so soon, he tells me “No, no, you have to read about the hologram.”

“I did.” Ah, he liked that a lot. There was an instantaneous affinity with him, we became good friends. And he tells me:

“I was looking at the electron in the bubble chamber. It disappeared. It appeared again in the same spot. I told Einstein, Fermi, all the people who were there, and they tell me: “–We've seen that already, no problem. –Okay, where can I read about this?” says Bohm. “–Nowhere. Nothing has been written about it.”

So Bohm begins to study all this. He begins to study this back in 1940-43, when he abandons the Manhattan project, which was the project to build the first nuclear weapon, the first atomic bomb. He abandons that because he refuses to build weapons, and he begins to study this.

This was back in 1943, which was the time in which Denis Gabor, thanks to Leibniz, is making the hologram dream come true. But he has no money, he's in Hungary, Denis Gabor is in Hungary. They gave him the Physics Nobel Prize later, but he was still a poor Hungarian man trying to prove that with a dot of light of great intensity we could take a picture not in the plane, but in space, like a statue. And of course, the Hungarian government was at war and wouldn't give him money to prove this crazy idea. But later, I'm not sure if in the 50's or early 60's, in the University of Michigan, two individuals, Leith and Upatnieks, using Gabor's model, discovered the first hologram. So Denis Gabor comes into the spotlight and gets the Nobel Prize in Physics.

And when David Bohm finds out about this, he goes “Eureka! I found it! Here's the explanation of what happens to the electron that disappears and reappears in the bubble chamber, in the same spot.” The electron, like everything in the universe, has an implicit order, like the holographic negative. The electron has... in the whole universe, there is an implicit order, not only in the plane of that negative. In the whole universe there is an implicit order, therefore the electron has an implicit order, like this glass has an implicit order, and so do we.

The implicit order is in the whole universe, and in that implicit order, all is one. We're all one too. We will see that in the prolific evidence that exists about it. Scientific evidence, of course. So David Bohm goes “Eureka!”. “I found out why the

electron goes, and why it comes back. Because it goes to its own implicit order and returns to its own explicit order, where I can see it.” Okay, so he starts writing about it, and they did to him everything short of a slap in the face. He lived in Brazil, teaching with his wife Saral. Saral didn't like mosquitoes, she complained a lot about mosquitoes, so he moves to London University and continues his exploration at the London University. There he writes that marvelous book, “Wholeness and the Implicate Order,” which I think was printed by Kairos. Right? Kairos, in Spanish, if I'm not mistaken. And if you want it in English, Kegan Paul. Original in English.

David Bohm took the great leap of starting to talk about this in the university. And of course, he didn't tell me this way, but in Rubén's way of interpreting things, they did to him everything short of a slap in the face. That's my humorous way of seeing it. And he was really... he felt alone and scorned for talking about this. I met him in 1978, thank God; I thank God for that privilege. I met him in 1978 thanks to JK and to a letter I wrote him, and he says “Come whenever you want.” As soon as I had money, I went to London. He treated me like a brother, except for the first day when he forced me to study the hologram, I hated him... no, no! (laughter). And when I return the next day, something happened with group mind which I will omit so we don't get distracted, but it's in the written work: he's in group mind with his wife, a fact I found out about during my first breakfast with him. During my first breakfast with David Bohm, on the second day I see him, I saw that he and his wife are in group mind, usually misnamed telepathy. And he went on talking about Holokinesis, no one could stop him, not even breakfast, or group mind; he was completely focused, passionately talking about Holokinesis. I'm under the impression that nobody had listened to him for a long time, and I was the first one to listen to him. That's the impression I had, after a long time. And I sincerely believe I was there because of the affinity that developed and the friendship that was born, from someone who was listening to him. Who was that someone? Rubén. Why did Rubén listen to him with such zest? First, because JK had recommended me to listen to David Bohm carefully. Second, because each thing this man would

say did not only fascinate me, but also took away from me every previous point of reference. Every previous point of reference. So I was as in a sort of mystical cloud, talking about Physics, actually. I was as in a cloud, and I was like that the whole time I spent with him, those first twenty days we were together.

So, well, what did we talk about? What did we say? He says “what you see in the hologram is in a plane. There is no point-to-point correspondence, because all the points are in all the hologram.” Well, Leibniz said that already: in the *monad*, which is the universal unit, the whole universe is replicated, and in every point of the universe, the whole universe is replicated. Leibniz said that. Now, he [David Bohm] proved it mathematically in 1986. I met him in 1978, and I had eight years to see –we would meet two or three times a year– and I could see how the concept of Holokinesis developed mathematically during those eight years. That's the great privilege. And at the same time, I was seeing –because we agreed from the start that this had to be the origin of a new Psychology, born from Physics and not from Psychology– so I was seeing in those eight years how could all of this translate to Psychology. Luckily, Bohm and I met three times a year to have dialogues about this, and soon JK –Jiddu Krishnamurti– joined those dialogues. So, out of that blessed collaboration, a very polished language emerges, which is the one you see when you read the written work. [Note: David Bohm and JK do not use the polished language of Holokinetic Psychology.]

So, what is the explicit order according to Bohm? It is everything manifest in the universe. Because there is an non-manifest (implicit) universe and a manifest one. He said: “The explicit order is that we can grab with our hands.” He even said: “manipulation comes from the word hand.” And it's the order to which Descartes or Descartes [*another pronunciation*] talks about when he talks about the Cartesian coordinates and researches into phenomena in a Cartesian way. And all this, the Cartesian way of understanding the universe in the explicit order, is based on the movement from here to there. Don't forget that Bohm's Holokinesis can be summarized by saying

that it's the movement from here to here. We've already seen the problem with the prepositions “from” and “to,” but we'll use them knowing it's a limited language to explain the unlimited.

So Descartes and all the science that studies the explicit order are studying movement from here to there. Movement is one of the notions of order, like time and space. All that Physics studied until David Bohm appeared is in the explicit order. For the first time, someone talks about the implicit order, the non-manifest part of the universe, in a scientific way. What is, then, that implicit order? Bohm says: “You can't grasp the implicit order as if it was a billiard ball, as if it was something solid, because it's movement.” And being movement –Heraclitus had already said this in a philosophical way) Bohm says it in a scientific way. In the movies, for example, there is a movement every eight frames, it means the eyes miss it –still in the explicit order–, it misses eight frames in the movement of cinema celluloid. The eye has its limitations, even in the explicit order. But here we're talking about something that cannot be grabbed or seen, which is the implicit order, and it's only inferable.

And Bohm says “the movement of light is transporting movements from two orders in the cosmos.” The movement of light is transporting movements from two orders in the universe. It means when a light beam reaches us from the star, say, Antares, that beam contains the explicit Antares star and the implicit Antares star. Then Bohm says: “What you saw in the plane as the holographic negative is in the whole universe, it's in the whole space. And that movement from here to here is within Rubén, within David, within all of us and in the entire universe.

And Holokinesis,” says Bohm, “is like an immense sea of energy, but only one energy. An unnamed energy; it has never been named.” Because of course, nobody had talked about that energy before. How could they name it? Luckily it wasn't named like the graviton and the tachyon. So, there is a single energy, that of the implicit order, which is like an immense sea of energy in the whole universe. And that movement from here

to here between the implicit and explicit order of the whole universe is in the whole universe and is always present in the present. And that movement, I insist, goes from here to here in the whole cosmos. And that immense sea of energy is perceived as flux or as a void, but it becomes explicit in all the forms of energy known in Physics: gravitation, electromagnetic energy, weak force, which is the one joining the particles of the atomic nucleus—especially weak force, which joins the electron with the nucleus. Electromagnetic energy, such as light, electricity. Gravitational energy, which can't be studied with the graviton particle; it's a wholeness, etc. Sound itself. All the energies of the explicit order have their origin in that single energy of the implicit order.

And Bohm said: “Void is what makes it possible for things to be and happen.” The void which is not empty is the void of the implicit order. Void is what is full of the one energy of the implicit order, and from that “void” (between inverted commas) everything comes. It makes all things possible. And that void [*N. the same word is used in Spanish for “void” and “empty”*] is not empty, but rather full; it's full of energy. And he, Bohm, said this, and repeated it frequently: “In a cubic centimeter...” That is, in a die, right? In the size of a playing die, “...in a cubic centimeter of atmosphere...” and even in the stratosphere, beyond the atmosphere, which contains oxygen, nitrogen... “...and even in the vacuum, where there is no oxygen, nitrogen or anything, a cubic centimeter of that universe has more energy than all the matter in the universe.” Because matter is not even 1% of the universe. Most of the universe, let's say, 99.5% of the universe, is energy. And we've talked about mind as the interface between matter and energy in the universe, just like sodium, just like light.

Now, the implicit order is undefinable—it is only inferable—and can't be measured. Why? Because there's no pattern that is external to the implicit order, because the implicit order is in the whole universe. There's nothing external to the implicit order. Therefore, there is no pattern to measure it with, obviously. We can measure this ball or this computer in comparison to the meter: “this must be fifty centimeters,”

because it's in the explicit order and we have a pattern, which is the meter. But in the implicit order, which is all there is in the universe, there's nothing to compare it with. So there is no measure for the implicit order, it's only inferable and there is no external pattern to measure it with, because, I insist, there is nothing external to the implicate order. Therefore, it cannot be defined completely with words, for all we have just said, to define Holokinesis. We have the problems of prepositions and the fragmentation of language with the structure of Sanskrit, which is narrower than some languages, for example, of the American natives. For instance, I had a dialogue with a Mayan in Guatemala, which you can read: "Dialogue with a Mayan." He tells me that in the Tojolabal language, the word "I" does not exist, and they say "we" instead of "I." And I've seen examples like that, I've read about them in other languages not derived from Sanskrit. So we're now in a jam with the Sanskrit origin of Spanish or most European languages; we're in the jam of prepositions, with which you can't explain Holokinesis properly (as we've seen), let alone the implicit order. It means this is an order; in the language of Holokinetic Psychology, this is an order (the implicit) that is beyond words, and we need to perceive it without naming in Unitary Perception. Is all this clear? Any question or comment? It's clear, right? A bit hard to digest at first, at least for me it was. Hard to digest.

And well, talking with Bohm, as I said, was a mystical experience while we talked about science. And we talked about things like the Philadelphia Experiment, or things that are crazy by themselves, and he had an explanation for everything. And Holokinesis can give explanations to things science couldn't, including things that happened in the Philadelphia Experiment. For example, group mind, which is telepathy, when two memories overlap, two memories overlap: John's and Peter's. So John remembers things from Peter's past and Peter remembers things from John's past. Is this fantasy? It seems fantastic, but it's real, and Cecilia and I discovered it as soon as we got married; it's a fact. And Bohm lived that way with Saral, his wife. And when we talked about it with Krishnamurti, Krishnamurti smiled and said: "That is only the

tip of the iceberg” (laughs). There's a whole iceberg underwater that is much larger than that group mind.

Audience: That sounds like what Bohm said, right? In a cubic centimeter of empty space...

RFG: There's more energy than in all matter. In a cubic centimeter of empty space, there is more energy than in all the matter in the universe. That's a tremendous thing to say. And I would tell him: “I can't wrap my head around that cubic centimeter thing...” He says “How much electromagnetic energy is there in a cubic centimeter of space? As much as comes from all the stars in the universe. Only light coming from every star in the universe is passing through that cubic centimeter of vacuum. Let alone the other energies, gravity, electromagnetic energies other than light, gamma rays, beta rays.”

Tremendous, right? That there is an implicit order which is only inferable, and that the hologram is just one of the fantastic things in the implicit order. But, Bohm said... I said: “Okay, what is the use of all this?” He said: “Well, we'll be able to travel to the stars.” I tell him “That's a bit pretentious.” “No,” – he says-, “when we find out how plug into the implicit order, we won't need oil or nuclear energy. Just our plug into the implicit order, which is not so far –Bohm said– will be enough to get free energy for everyone, like Tesla said.” Now, I wouldn't be surprised if someone gets hold of said plug and charges you for that energy (laughter). But, what I mean is: that was possible in Bohm's mind, he would say it, if we find out how to tap into the implicit order, the energy problem is over, because all the energy is there, and all the energy of the explicit order comes from there. Therefore, we only need to plug into the implicit order to travel to the stars. And then he would say: “well, actually, we can't imagine...” –he told me in another moment– “we can't even imagine the advantages of discovering the implicit order, because it transcends the imaginable.”

What are the repercussions in Engineering or Architecture, or Physics itself?

Audience: In Medicine.

RFG: In Medicine, in Medicine. Now that we have some knowledge about what goes on in the cell at the molecular level, molecular medicine –what goes on in the cells–, there are tremendous advancements. Imagine when we move to something even finer, which is the holokinetic, or at least the quantum aspect, when the quantum becomes more explicit than it already is in Medicine. I believe all genetic diseases can disappear, for instance. What's in store for us if mankind doesn't commit suicide is tremendous, the things that will be seen by the grandsons of the current generations are incredible for us, and even unimaginable, said Bohm.

And Bohm was one of those who defended the environment, and spoke about multiple-story farms, with cows in one floor, agriculture in another floor, irrigation for cows and agriculture comes from above with its own pressure thanks to gravitation. If the water is in the fourth floor and the cows are in the second, and agriculture in the first, that water irrigates thanks to gravity, etc. And that's all in the explicit order, he said. If we apply the energy of the implicit order to all this, well, human life will become very easy. And that's where Bohm's idea comes from... he calls it Socioentropy: the measure of disorder in society. That is, it's not difficult to measure disorder in society if we have a unit of pain... Look at this carefully. This is not implicit order; this is explicit order. If we had a unit of sorrow, Bohm said, –which was the dukkha, taken from the Buddhist language. A dukkha is a unit of sorrow. So, the death of a loved one is, say, ten dukkhas. So the invasion of a country to another, bombings and collateral damage to civilians can be measured in dukkhas. And if there was a socioentropy, which is the measure of disorder and sorrow in society, then scientifically, by measuring it, we could reduce all that, which requires the complete dismantlement of society as we know it and the creation of a wholly different society. Well, that's like hearing JesuKristos talk. I believe JesuKristos came to make a peaceful revolution, for feudalism to end and for humans to have communion, that's the way I see it. And not even JesuKristos could do it. But Bohm imagined things like these,

which are tremendous in their implications. Measuring sorrow. No one had thought of measuring sorrow, and dukkha units, and defining the unit of sorrow. Death of a loved person: ten dukkhas, etc. Of course, this implies much more.

In the 19th century there were two researchers: Michelson... Have you heard about Michelson-Morley? Well, so one day a young man asks these people about the future of Physics. "I want to study Physics because I'm passionate about it, and I want to find new things in Physics" and Michelson tells this young man: "No, don't get into Physics, because in Physics everything's already discovered." 1890.

Audience: Was Morley a Physicist?

RFG: Yes. And he tells this young man not to get into Physics, because everything was discovered. Turns out that in 1929, the Quantum paradox appears, the Theory of Relativity in 1905 and Holokinesis in 1986. So, a hundred years after Michelson, things are still being discovered. Michelson was wrong. But Michelson gives Einstein the base to end the idea of ether. Ether was the bus which light rode, or rather, the viscous medium in which light traveled. That ends with Einstein. There is no ether. So, is Holokinesis replacing ether? No! They are two completely different things. Completely different. Why different? Ether transports light and it doesn't exist. Einstein proved that there was no such thing as ether in 1905. And Bohm says "it means now we're talking not about light-carrying ether, but Holokinesis, of which light is born." It's not luminiferous ether. "Fero" means that which carries. Like Cristoforo, an Italian name (Christopher); Cristoforo means "he who carries Christ." Cristoforo Colombo – Christopher Columbus. Luminiferous means "light-carrying, that which transports light." Ether was luminiferous because it carried light, transported light. There is no ether. So we have to talk about luminigenous Holokinesis. The Holokinesis of which light is born –"gena". So it's not luminiferous ether, but luminigenous Holokinesis.

The EPR is another demonstration of all we're saying. Who re-imagined the EPR experiment? David Bohm. Bohm, Einstein,

Podolsky and Rosen's experiment. He showed me the paper, and his name was crossed out, so I ask him: "Why did you cross out your name?" "The journalists asked me for this paper and it was embarrassing for me to have so many names, so I crossed out mine." That was David Bohm. And it gets published as Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Experiment –re-imagined by Bohm. What is it about? If the spin of an electron over here changes, even due to being observed in the bubble chamber, the spin of all electrons, contiguous and remote, five thousand kilometers, changes too. This has been proven scientifically. And it's another... it's called the EPR experiment, re-imagined by Bohm and then demonstrated several times, and it's another thing that proves reality is undivided; reality is undivided.

It can also explain group mind. Bohm said that, if there is, in my brain, an electron that is a particle and also a wave, it means that, as a wave, it's also in your brain. And the electron in you can, as a wave, reach me. It means we are, electronically, one. And Bohm says: "Why don't we know each other?" The EPR and the fact that the electron is particle and wave explains group mind and the possibility of telepathy, which is the wrong word to say group mind –telepathy. Because it's not *teles* –at a distance– but here. It's here [*points at his chest*]. And group mind is a secondary contingency of those who take Unitary Perception seriously. J. Krishnamurti says that in his 18th dialogue with Anderson. Dialogue 18 with Anderson. And what does the EPR mean? It explains group mind and it explains that the universal reality is undivided, not divided, and space is one. Does the EPR explain Pentecost? Then we have a new exegesis of Kristianity, because Pentecost can be explained. Because you read about Pentecost –when I was a kid–, we read Pentecost with Father Juan. "So they all spoke and they could understand each other, Arabs, Jews, Greeks, Romans, they were all having a party and speaking in their own language, but understanding one another." "Whaaat!? Go sing to Gardel," we would say. "Go sing to Gardel" is an Argentine saying meaning "I don't believe you, get out of here!" So we said those were fairy tales. But now, with the EPR and group mind, can we consider Pentecost as a fact, a

real fact, and not a fantasy? Of course we can. People who lived in Metanoiaia, that is, in Unitary Perception, who gather in a congregation, called an *ecclesia*, we're talking about Thyatira, Ephesus, Laodicea; we're not talking about the Catholic church or the Baptist church or... no, no. We're talking about the original church. People who took life seriously and would not send their children to war. [They would rather die than kill.]

So, the definition of communion, does it have something to do with all we're saying? The EPR, the implicit order. Of course it does. And Pentecost was an act of communion to the point that they would understand each other, no matter what language they spoke. Yes, it's possible, of course it is. And it's scientifically possible with the EPR and the implicit order.

How is that different from a choir, a parade and a dance? What is the different between what we're saying and a choir, a military parade or a choreographed dance where several people are doing the same thing at the same time? Because communion is to do the same thing at the same time. Two or more people doing the same thing at the same time: communion. And is there communion in a choir? Is there communion in a military parade? Is there communion in a choreographed dance? If you speak to a person who sings in a choir, they will tell you it's one of the most beautiful experiences they've had, because it is similar to communion. Why similar? Why not call it communion? Because communion is a spontaneous act, not a directed or formulated act. Do you see that? Communion can't be formulated, planned or directed; there is no communion director. There is a choir director, but not a communion director. And a good military parade needs a general or someone who has trained them, but it's not something spontaneous; it's directed. The same applies for a choreographed dance. You need a twelve-year training to be a good dancer. And you need other people who've studied dance for twelve years, a good choreograph, good music, good lighting and a proper theater in order to have a good show. But is that communion? No, because it's all directed and planned. Very different from the description we have of Pentecost, in which all was spontaneous, everyone understood everyone

without having planned it. Or with group mind: I called Ceci from Caracas and asked her: “Why do I have to call you again?” She says: “Because my grandma has just died, I'm going to Mexicali.” She was in the US. “Call me to Mexicali.” Ah, was that planned? No! Group mind is not planned. It's spontaneous, that's why it is communion.

So, communion, to take communion is a rite that mimics communion, imitates it, but it's not communion. Communion comes, let's say, by divine grace; it's spontaneous in nature. There is no communion director. Intelligence tells you that. Either there is communion or there isn't, but you cannot plan communion.

On top of all this, David Bohm talks about hidden variables, which are all those variables –and he has all of this mathematically formulated in his book “Wholeness and the Implicate Order”. There are variables acting in a phenomenon that we ignore. For instance, they ask me: “Tell me, Doctor, how many Holokinetic Psychology professors are there? You've been talking about this for 32, 33 years.” I answer: “Well, twenty.” “What? You've been talking for 33 years and there are only 20 professors?” We might have one more today. “And why is that?” Maybe it's because an IQ of 130 or more is needed to understand all we've said. You need a basic knowledge of physics, a basic knowledge of language, for us to understand each other when talking about these things that sound like science fiction, right? But we know they are not science fiction, especially those of us who have lived them. So, they are not science fiction, but facts. These are not half or even a quarter of the facts that happen to those who take Unitary Perception seriously. But, you do need an Intellectual Quotient of 130 to understand what we've said. Yes. Can a child under age twelve understand it? No. Because they don't have abstract thought, according to Piaget. Thought has a natural course of development.

And what other reason is there for there being 20 professors and not 20000? Because of hidden variables. I simply can't understand how people don't get excited, get passionate and start studying when they hear about this.

Audience: Rubén, do you think the fact that children can't have that abstract thought is due to the way in which they are educated?

Audience: Can you repeat that, Rubén?

RFG: Yes, Eduardo is asking a tremendous question. Whether we could, perhaps, with a non-authoritarian education, have children whose abstract thought appears earlier than age 12, that's what you mean, right? What Piaget observed is that abstract thought begins around age 12, approximately. Piaget's work was extraordinary, without a doubt. I studied in the Miami Jackson Memorial Hospital, in the child service founded by Piaget. He came wearing his old shoes to found the building. They told me the whole story. So, we studied Piaget deeply, and his study of how thought develops is impeccable: pre-operational, operational, and... finally, at age twelve, abstract thought. Is that always the case? Could it happen more quickly if there wasn't an authoritarian structure at home and in society? That's a great question. It would be nice to answer "yes" some day, but for the time being, this question remains unanswered, because non-authoritarian homes and societies are nowhere to be seen. They don't exist. It's what Jesus proposed, a society of communion, not of authority, not of hierarchy. A society of friends, not hierarchs. But that was lost. The original Kristianity is lost, now we have the Christianity of hierarchs, bishops, cardinals and the pope. We don't have the original Kristianity of the church, where all were one, everyone was equal and nobody was better or worse than others. And people with problems were helped, not put in a hole. And people who stood out for their wealth and their intelligence were considered a better servant, a better slave to everyone else than all of us. "So, what is your prize? Your prize is the gift you get from God: that he made you smarter, more capable of earning money, better at all those things; bring the money you earned and place it in the shared fund." That's how the first Kristians lived. Acts 4. This is not from Rubén; it's in Acts, chapter 4, of the New Testament. That's how they lived. Nothing to do with hierarchies, nothing to do with divisions. There wasn't even poor or rich people, they were all equal, there was economic

equality. That's the society Jesus wanted, not the one we have, not even the Christian churches we have, which are, at best, a shadow of what JesuKristos proposed. We could stop here for a bit to have a dialogue.

Audience: One question, Rubén. For example, you go somewhere to teach this, and when the workshop is over, someone tells you: “I believe in anarchy, and I think what you are saying... could be the basis for what I think.” What would you tell them?

RFG: I've been told that.

Audience: Can you repeat that, Rubén?

RFG: Yes. You give a conference as a professor of Unitary Perception, and someone in the audience tells you: “Ah! What you're saying is what I believe in. It's what people like me believe. It's the same as what we anarchists or communist or fascists are saying.” And the answer is no. Because what we're saying is not a product of thought. Do you see that? Rubén's peace is the greatest contribution Rubén can make to the peace of the world. Do you understand that? Not that Rubén will join a party. Either anarchist, communist or fascist. You see? Or what we have in Mexico or in Argentina. No! It's about being in peace yourself, and that is the greatest political and economic contribution you can make to humanity. Now, you have to answer “no” to that person, because what we're saying is not an idea from thought. What we're saying is the contingency of communion, peace and love, which come from a fact that is not from thought, and we call it B to differentiate it from C, which is thought. We call it B to differentiate it from C, which is thought, memory and I, because in the brain, there is another movement that is not from thought, that movement which will give you true peace and love: that you can look at a person without words, without a single word, I look at you in complete silence. What I have discovered, and I say this in the name of the most Sacred, is love. When I look at Cecilia without words, or I look at you or anyone without words, I get nothing but love. But if I start with “Ah, yes, this guy is a son of a...” No, no! Do you understand? You start putting words

and the relationship is ruined. But if you look with a clean eye... That's in the Gospels. To look with a clean eye, that is, without thought, brings out nothing but love. That's what we're talking about, not a product of thought. And that's what we have to be clear about in the first place: to live it, that peace, that love, to live them by ourselves to the point when nothing matters. Nothing matters.

Audience: That would be, with the original innocence and not original sin, which is always...

RFG: With original innocence and not original sin, says Cecilia. Of course. Pope Innocent III said there was an original innocence which we have forgotten, and we only remember original sin. Okay, let's see if we remember original innocence, which is Unitary Perception. So, yes, someone will tell you: "Ah, what you're saying..." No, what I'm saying is not a product of thought. And that political party you're talking about is a product of thought. Do you see the difference?

Audience: Yes.

Audience: There's a question from Buenos Aires.

RFG: Yes, go on.

Audience: Hello Rubén. Speaking about seeing, we want to clarify the difference between *teorein*, *eiden* and *opsetai*. *Blepen* is clearer.

RFG: Yes. That's in the written work. John runs to the grave of Jesus, it was empty and he says "I *blepen* the empty grave." That is, I took a glance at the empty grave. *Blepen* means a superficial sight. The Greek word *blepharon* means eyelid, and *blepen* means *as in a blink*. "I saw the empty grave in a blink, in a superficial, quick way." Then Peter arrives and John says in his Gospel: "Peter then arrived, went inside and *teorein* the empty grave." He saw it in another way, no longer *blepen*. He sees it more carefully. He has maybe an idea of what is going on there. And *opsetai* was the way of seeing of those who were

in the Sacred. Those who lived in Metanoia could see in *opsetai*. I don't know if I'm answering.

Audience: And *eiden*?

RFG: What's that?

Audience: Eiden.

RFG: Ah! *Eiden*. Eiden is a beautiful Greek word that, of course, gives origin to the word *idea* in Spanish, English and many other languages. But it's very easy to see this in English: I-dea, I-dea. Seems related to I-God, right? Deus. I-Deus. Zeus. I-dea. I-God. But no, actually it means "I see." And another interesting fact is that what we call an idea today is not what the Greeks called an idea two thousand years ago. Idea was the act of me seeing, which is very different from having an idea about something: if I have an idea, like we said before, of Eduardo, then I don't see him. I can no longer see him because I have words, opinions about him. And that's the main way in which friendship and love between two people gets broken: having an idea of the other. So, I have an idea of the other, and I'll no longer see him or her with the same love, or perhaps with any love at all. But if I look at them with clean eyes (clean from thought), from that seeing only love will emerge. So, careful with "idea." Semantically, which is another branch of language study... the semantics of the word has changed from the Koine Greek (year 0), when it meant "I see" to the semantics of Spanish (2010) when *idea* is a part of thought, that is, part of what prevents us from seeing. "I saw the road as I had always seen it." That is, "I have an idea of the road, and I crash into a Coca-Cola truck. Because the idea I have of the road and seeing it as I have always seen it prevent me from seeing." So it's a paradoxical word. Etimologically, it means "I see", but semantically, after 2010 years, it has changed to the point of meaning the opposite. The opposite of what it meant 2010 years ago. Is this clear?

Audience: Yes, thank you Rubén.

RFG: Yes, semantics play a role in this too. It's important to follow the semantics of words, because they change their meaning. We reject many things we read in the Gospel because they seem stupid, but we have to put ourselves in the place of the writers and see that they were trying to say something quite different from what we think. For instance, Jesus in the cross says: "*Lmana sabactani*." And this is translated as "Why have you forsaken me, [God]?" But actually, *lmana sabactani* is an expression still used in Palestine today. If a guy is getting married, and he tells a friend "Look, I'm getting married," his friend tells him "*lmana sabactani*," which means "you were born for this." "You were born for this," i.e., "this is your destiny –deal with it." (Laughter). That's what it means. It has a funny relation, like "I was born for this, so I have to put up with it," and it is still used today in that double way. "You were born for this, deal with it." *Lmana sabactani*. And Jesus is saying *lmana sabactani*, as always, in that light-hearted, funny spirit: "I was born for this, so I have to deal with it." That's what Jesus is saying. He's not saying "[God], why have you forsaken me?" That's the way it is mistranslated in the Gospel. So, careful with semantics, because we're talking about Aramaic words that remained in the Gospel. JesuKristos is speaking Aramaic when he says *lmana sabactani*. And in today's Aramaic... there's not much change of semantics. It's the same Aramaic as two thousand years ago, and it means the same: "I was born for this." Am I answering?

Audience: Yes, thank you Rubén.

Audience: *Eiden*. It got distorted so much that now... the word "idiot" comes from there too. Too much *eiden* makes you an idiot.

RFG: Well, actually no. The word idiot has a different origin.

Audience: Is it not *ideos*?

RFG: No. It's *ideos*. *ideos* means "of his own". For example, *ideos* means "belonging to me and no one else." *ideos*, for example, if I told you "this ball is *ideos*," that means "this ball is only mine." So in Europe, *ideos* meant "someone who can't

get out of himself.” In other words, those who can't be a Kristian and put themselves in others' shoes. Kristians, by definition, are those who have compassion and put themselves in others' shoes. Idiot means the opposite. Idiots are those who can't get out of themselves, who can't put themselves in others' shoes. And curiously, the word “crétin,” which comes from French if I'm not mistaken, is the word the French used to say Kristian. Right? Crétin. Is it like that? So crétin in French is Kristian, but what does cretin mean in Italy and Spain? You tell me, what does “cretino” mean in Spain?

Audience: Idiot.

RFG: Idiot. So Kristians, who could put themselves in others' shoes, and who renounced to all that was their own, were paradoxically considered idiots, like those who can't get out of themselves. Extremes touch. Those who get out of themselves, like Kristians, and give their life, living in love, are considered idiots. Cretin. Beautiful, beautiful. All this is beautiful. This is the semantics of the language. All we can learn from language and society and sociology from the original viewpoint, the original sociology. Not today's, which has its own characteristic of complete degeneration of mankind.

Audience: Going back to Holokinesis. When you say: Holokinesis is a movement between the implicit order and the explicit order, but you don't separate them.

RFG: No.

Audience: That means Holokinesis is a sea of energy where both the implicit and explicit order are.

RFG: Right, they are in the same place.

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: The explicit order and the implicit order are in the same place. They are not in separate places. It's like... do you remember the article “Kosmon and Ouranon,” which is the basis for understanding the New Testament? Kosmon is the world that human beings created, with all its problems, and

Ouranon is heaven, ruled by God or by the Holy Spirit or JesuKristos –Kosmon is ruled by Satan. But they are in the same place, that's what we lost sight of, that they were not originally in different places, which gives you the clear idea that Kosmon and Ouranon have to be studied in Psychology, because their etymological origin is psychological. Because if Kosmon and Ouranon, let's call them good and evil, Satan and JesuKristos are in the same place, which is our brain, then it clearly means we should be watchful to see where we are, if we're in Kosmon or in Ouranon. Or if we are... we can say we're in the explicit order, but of course we're also in the implicit order, which is in the same place. Is this clear? Yes. It's difficult to see that Kosmon and Ouranon are in the same place. Because we usually say “Ah, yes, Heaven” and point at the sky. But no. Heaven is a mental state within us. Same with hell. Where is hell? It's within us when we have any kind of problem: fear, anger, sadness, conflicts. Let alone the conflicts we can have with other people. Internal conflicts, which are enough to ruin our life. Fear, anger and sadness ruin our life.

Audience: That's why Bohm defined the undivided wholeness, right?

RFG: Right.

Audience: The undivided reality...

RFG: Right. Undivided reality.

Audience: ...in a flowing movement...

RFG: Movement flows in the undivided wholeness, which is not divided, that is, not separated, Kosmon here and Ouranon there, or the explicit order here and the implicit order there. No. The order of the electron [*grabs a sphere to exemplify*], both the implicit and explicit order are here. The explicit order is what you can touch, and you can only infer the implicit order. Thanks to the hologram, we can infer it. You understand this, right?

Audience: And thanks to Unitary Perception, you can live it.

RFG: Exactly, because what I see in Unitary Perception is this: when I take it seriously, and sometimes there's the opportunity of going out or... And I say, no, I'll just stay and see what happens. And I remain in that stillness, with a complete stillness and only listening... This morning when I woke up, I was afraid of moving my arms because I felt like I could take off and fly. Why? Because yesterday I was in a great stillness, a very deep stillness, and listening. It gives you energy! It is like plugging yourself to the implicit order, in Holokinesis, Unitary Perception. It gives you energy, it's very important to see this, to see it for yourself, not because Rubén says it. You see it for yourselves, try it and you will see.

Audience: Actually, I believe there is no understanding without Unitary Perception.

RFG: No.

Audience: Because it's all... cognitively repeating what so-and-so said.

RFG: Of course.

Audience: We talked about how... “we are all one” is in vogue today, but since there is no Unitary Perception, there is no full comprehension; if we're all one and I hurt myself, I'm hurting all of us.

RFG: Exactly.

Audience: So there is no understanding for those who repeat “we are all one” because there is no Unitary Perception.

RFG: Exactly. If I haven't lived Unitary Perception, I can't know its value [and realize we are one].

Audience: That's right.

RFG: So, I say it is the most important thing in life because of what I see and feel. Now, you have said that those who haven't lived it cannot understand. Well, what does original Kristianity say about it? Watch out for dead letters; letters live only with

the Spirit. It means we have to give our Spirit to letters, which are otherwise dead. That's in the Gospel already. Otherwise, it's a dead thing.

Audience: Krishnamurti would say that “where the word is, That is not, but where That is, word may or may not be.”

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: Cecilia quotes Krishnamurti saying that where the word is, That (the Sacred) is not. That, for Krishnamurti, JK, was the Sacred. But where That (the Sacred) is, word may or may not be. That's brilliant, brilliant. It's from JK.

Yes, all of this has to be examined and talked about, for that sacred moment to come, in which you live, in which you live. Then nobody can take you away from that path which isn't a path, but your life. It's your life. It's not a path; it's your life.

I still have relatives who tell me:

—So... have you dropped that crazy perception thing yet?

—No.

—You're still crazy?

—Yes. —(Laughter).

—Does this mean you don't have a dime in your bank account?

—Well, no.

I must have about... I don't know, 300 dollars, right? I think I have about 300 dollars in the bank. Cecilia knows better than me, but that's more or less the number, close to that. Why? Is it because I don't know how to make more money? No. It's because I chose not to make more money, so I can do what I'm doing. Because if I chose to make more money and had to go abroad, etc., I wouldn't be able to do what I'm doing, which I consider the most important thing in life. To transmit the most important thing in life as much as it can be transmitted, for

others to take it or leave it; it's the most important thing in life. Therefore you choose to do this.

Audience: I think that's very important, that each of us ask ourselves if this is the most important thing in our lives.

RFG: You can't know that, not until you live it. When you live Unitary Perception and see the rise in your energy, and the rise in your peace... ah! You would have to be quite stupid to abandon it, I don't think you can drop it, abandon it, that is, forget about it. You don't forget.

Audience: If you drop it, you haven't lived it.

RFG: If you drop it, it's because you haven't lived it, never had it. Yes, it's like... there is a beautiful saying: *“Did your wife leave you? –Yes. –Ah, then you never had her. She didn't leave you, she simply realized she had to go, but she was never with you.”* Beautiful, beautiful. Yes. Any other question or comment?

Audience: Is there anything giving continuity to what Bohm taught? Today? Any movement or...?

RFG: Nothing. Nothing. That's why I say, if it doesn't come from us...

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: Eh?

Audience: Can you repeat that for Argentina?

RFG: Yes, the question is what is left from Bohm, what movement. None. None.

Audience: You mean, within science, the field of science?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: There even seem to be people interested in preventing people from knowing what he [Bohm] says.

Audience: There are many.

RFG: Yes, and there are many because... why? Because what he says, I think it's what today a JesuKristos or a Buddha would say, what David Bohm says in the social field, in the individual field, beyond Physics; he's saying things that imply taking people like Buddha and Jesus seriously. And I think that's inconvenient for many people.

On the other hand, from the viewpoint of science itself, it would imply such a big change that it would be extremely expensive. So, there's also that, right? He might have detractors because of economic interests, if they understand even a little bit of what he's talking about.

And his big “mistake”, between inverted commas: to quit the Manhattan project, which was seen as treason back then. Because it was unpatriotic to abandon the project to protect the homeland, which meant producing the atom bomb. Well, if he was a traitor, he would have simply gone to the Soviet Union while it still existed, this was back in 1940, I mean... before that, it was before 1940. The Soviet Union existed, why didn't he go there? Because he wasn't a traitor, he simply didn't want to build weapons, because the Soviet Union would have probably asked him for the same thing: “Let's see if you can build the weapon for us.” Undoubtedly, they would have asked him the same. What did he do? He went to Brazil with a letter from Einstein, and when his wife disliked the mosquitoes, they moved to London. That's where I met him and where he died. He died in London. He died while he was paying the taxi driver. He had told his wife: “I'm on the edge of something.” His wife, Saral, told me this. “I'm on the edge of something.” And she thought it was the flu, so she told him “Don't come on the subway, take a cab.” The cab arrived, he was paying the driver and died of a heart infarction. Yes. He was 72, I think. Really an untimely loss for humanity. A tremendous loss for humanity. Because if he had lived ninety years like Krishnamurti... can you imagine? Yes.

Well, I don't know if we're overextending. Any question or comment from Buenos Aires?

Audience: No, thanks Rubén.

Then we'll stop here and see you next Sunday at 10 AM
Mexicali, 2 PM Buenos Aires.

TOPICS - CLASS 7

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 7 (REVIEW OF TOPICS) (402)
- PARADOXES IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (403)
- A METAPHOR ABOUT THE IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT ORDERS (404)
- INTRODUCTION TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT (404)
- EGO FUNCTIONS (405)
- EXAMPLE OF AN EGO FUNCTIONS CURVE (406)
- EXAMPLE OF A PATIENT'S INITIAL ASSESSMENT (410)
- PERSONAL DETAILS AND PRESENTED PROBLEM (411)
- PERSONAL AND FAMILY HISTORY (414)
- DEVELOPMENT OF THE PATIENT (416)
- MEDICAL HISTORY AND HISTORY OF MENTAL DISORDERS (416)
- INTRODUCTION TO THE PATIENT'S MENTAL STATE (418)
- APPEARANCE AND CLOTHING (419)
- CONFIDENTIALITY (419)
- M.E.T.A PROCESS - DOES PATIENT COOPERATE WITH PSYCHIATRIST? (422)
- ASSESSMENT OF SENSORIUM (423)
- DIAGNOSIS IN 5 AXES, TREATMENT AND PROGNOSIS (425)

- QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS (428)
- READING: THE COHERENT LANGUAGE OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (434)
- DIALOGUE ABOUT THE READING: THE COHERENT LANGUAGE OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (443)
- THE FOUR ASPECTS OF REALITY EXPLAINED WITH THE METER (450)
- THE ATOM AS DAVID BOHM DEFINED IT (453)
- NEW EXEGESIS FOR THE PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD WORKERS (455)
- TO WHICH ORDER DO THE FOUR ASPECTS BELONG? (457)
- IS MIND A FIFTH ASPECT OF THE EXPLICIT ORDER? (457)
- CONSCIOUS CONTACT WITH HOLOKINESIS (459)
- FINAL COMMENTS ON HOLOKINESIS AND HOLOKINESIS (460)

CLASS 7

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, September 5th, 2010.

RFG: Seventh class of the Sunday Presential Course. We should remind you that, since I've been invited to give a workshop in Barcelona, I'm leaving on the 11th. So we won't have classes on [September] 12 and 19. But I beg you to continue reading *The New Paradigm in Psychology* [Holokinetic Psychology], as a sort of homework. The Sunday after the 19th, Sunday 26 I think, we'll go over the mistakes you might make in today's exam about Holokinesis, which you will take at the end of the class. It consists of ten questions; we can do it in ten minutes.

We asked some questions here about psycho-diagnosis. There wasn't any mistake... there were some in the written, but not in the oral exam. So we're happy, because you seem to have grasped the basics of psycho-diagnosis.

As always, we remember we're doing this course while keeping in mind the immense and growing divisions in mankind, and believing we're contributing with THE exit from human divisions that lead to war and misery, and that exit is Unitary Perception. We always say the most difficult thing is to differentiate Precinct B of brain functioning from Precinct C. It seems easy, in its definition, to tell the difference, but in fact it is very difficult, because sometimes you're taking a shower, as has happened to me, and you believe you're listening to water on your skull, but you're only thinking about listening to the water on your skull. That is, you have to tell the difference between thinking about listening and listening. That difference is very important. That's why we say it's not easy to differentiate between B and C.

Another paradox is that we're speaking about the silence of Unitary Perception, of the peace of Unitary Perception, that

brain functioning in which words are not necessarily present, and there can be an immense silence. We can't avoid the paradox of talking about the silence of Unitary Perception, but we do all this for it to spread, to disseminate. Don't forget that we also speak about Holokinesis with the language of absolute time, because language was born with the conception of time as absolute. *Yesterday*, *today* and *tomorrow* have always been notions of universal order. So, when we say Holokinesis is the movement FROM the implicit order TO the explicit order, we're using two prepositions that may imply time and distance, neither of which –time or distance– exist in Holokinesis. We have to be aware of those paradoxes, which are actually mistakes we have to make knowingly. We can't make up a new language; we have to manage, with the language we know, to explain this, which is, many times, beyond language, and we would need to use a language that is time-free, which is very difficult, and hypnosis-free, which is also difficult, because we were all born in this madhouse called Earth, and we all have a loose screw, don't we? (laughter). Let's not fool ourselves.

We should be very... not tolerant, but rather, compassionate with one another, in order to see our mistakes and shortcomings, and if possible, to help each other overcome them.

So, we say there is a quantum paradox: that the electron is a particle and a wave. There is a religious paradox: those of us who are Catholic have been taught since childhood that true life begins after death, that is, Resurrection begins after we die. What we're saying in Holokinetic Psychology is that Resurrection –as JesuKristos taught already– begins during life, before death, in something JesuKristos called “metanoia,” to go beyond all the known, which I sincerely believe is Unitary Perception.

I've written a book in English, the first one I wrote in English, called *The Great Leap of Mind*, which is of course Unitary Perception, that leap of mind. “And why” –they have asked me– “did you title it that way? What is the great leap of mind?” Well, it's Unitary Perception, which is what? To leap from here, the explicit order, to here, the implicit order. Both the

explicit order and the implicit order of Rubén are in the same place where Rubén is, and in the same place each one of us is. The leap of mind goes from the explicit to the implicit order in the act of listening, seeing and feeling the weight in Unitary Perception.

I always give [a metaphor]... –I hope you see the image. Can you see my arm in the image, in Buenos Aires?

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Yes.

RFG: Ah, good. This movement [*moves his arm to and fro*] requires energy. What I am doing is a metaphor for you to understand why we say all the energy exists in the implicit order, and that energy becomes multiple in the explicit order, turning into gravitation, electromagnetic energy, nuclear energy, etc., etc. This movement takes energy, but this movement [*moves his arm to and fro again, but in a shorter distance, like trembling*] takes much more energy. The movement of trembling takes much, much more energy.

So, imagine the energy that movement from here to here takes. It's all the energy there is in the cosmos. All the energy in the cosmos is in the movement from here to here, which is Holokinesis. From that energy, which is one, the greatest of all the energies in the cosmos, the multiple energies of the explicit order explicate, so we can see, hear, touch and detect them with instruments: gravitation, sound, electromagnetic energy, nuclear energy, weak force, which keeps the electron in the atom, etc.

Today we will talk about ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT, also called CLINICAL HISTORY, a subject they have asked for repeatedly, because many of you here are going to give therapy, and those already giving therapy will benefit from all we're going to say here. I recommend you to buy a book, if it was still available, by Leopold Bellak, that's B-e-l-l-a-k, called *Ego Functions in Schizophrenics, Neurotics and Normals*. It is a book that comes from psychoanalysis, as its name shows, but watch out, because this man writes in a very popular way, and when he says “neurotics,” he's referring to a diagnosis that's no

longer in the DSM, but you will see how valuable that book can be.

Among the ego functions Leopold Bellak describes, there is, for instance, *reality testing*. Reality testing is, for example, to know the difference between sleep and wakefulness, knowing they are different things. We know they are very different. We know, for example, there is a difference between fantasy, imagination and non-imaginary reality. To imagine water is not the same as drinking water, which will quench your thirst, whereas imagined water won't quench your thirst. All of that is an Ego Function called REALITY TESTING, which the psychotic person lacks.

Now we will see what Leopold Bellak does. Leopold Bellak makes a sort of grid where he writes, for instance: "Schizophrenic patient," say, "John Smith." And each of the ego functions is assessed in a column with a score from 1 to 10. Actually, it's 1 to 13, but we'll say 1 to 10. The schizophrenic patient would get a 1 out of 10 in the reality testing ego function, while someone who runs an enterprise, or a university professor, would get a 10 in reality testing.

Then we have another ego function, the SENSE OF REALITY, which is, for instance, a girl who suffers from anorexia nervosa looks at herself in the mirror and sees herself as fat, but she's terribly skinny. The sense of reality, another one of the ego functions described by Bellak, is failing there. This means a girl with bulimia or anorexia would have, in that grid [*created by Bellak*] with the ego functions –say, this "Mary Jones" with bulimia would get a 1 in sense of reality, while a person who eats in a normal, balanced way, etc., would get a 10 in reality function –sorry, I mean in sense of reality, which is the second ego function described by Bellak. Do you follow?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Then comes regulation of drives, especially anger, which Freud called "*thanatos*" and sex drive, which Freud called "*libido*." In the regulation of drives we can have an individual who is a great painter, who has managed to

sublimate, as Freud said, his hostility, his sexuality, etc., in painting. So he regulates his drives or desires of expressing anger or expressing sex through a good painting. What score would that painter get in regulation of drives? 10. A schizophrenic who attacked the therapist gets a 1. A man with bipolar depression who gets drunk and beats his wife would get a 1 in regulation of drives. Do you follow? So what Bellak did was to quantify ego functions, something that seemed impossible.

Then come ADAPTIVE REGRESSIONS IN SERVICE OF THE EGO. You make a regression in service of ego in order to adapt to the world, that is, to reduce anxiety. When you sing, paint, play the guitar or play football, you're making an adaptive regression in service of the ego. A schizophrenic could get a 10 in that function. And, say, a very intellectual person who's absorbed by its work could get a 1 in adaptive regressions in service of the ego, because he (or she) is not expressing their ego in that function: adaptive regression. That is, to behave like a child: adaptive regression, to reduce anxiety.

Then there is the great function of the ego, which is, as I see it, the most important contribution of Sigmund Freud: DEFENSES. Remember, the defenses are unconscious and coping... a coping mechanism is conscious, while defenses are unconscious. For instance, you can DENY UNCONSCIOUSLY, which is a defense, or you can deny consciously, which is a coping mechanism. Example: "everything is fine," "everything is fine," as people say, those who say you have to think positive. "Everything is fine." That's a coping mechanism, because it's conscious. But, say, if a schizophrenic thinks everything is fine, that's unconscious, an unconscious denial.

In the same way, if I feel angry at someone and I say "that person is angry at me," I'm using the defense called PROJECTION. I project my hostility onto someone.

There's also TRANSFERENCE or DISPLACEMENT, which is the hostility I feel towards, say, my new boss, whom I barely know, because I'm transferring or displacing (unconsciously, without knowing it) the hostility I had towards my dad, which

looks a little bit like this man, my new boss. It has happened in some enterprises that there is a transference to the boss which makes working in that organization much more difficult, because the employee is hostile towards the boss, because he has transferred the hostility he feels against his father to his new boss, since it's much easier, much more innocuous to be hostile towards your boss than towards your dad, who is a very important figure in a person's psyche.

Then... **SUBLIMATION**; what is it? The two intrapsychic forces Freud describes, which are *eros* and *thanatos*, love and hate... Eros is the energy of love, Freud said, and thanatos is the energy of hatred. Those two energies can be sublimated, for instance, in art, in work or in a way that is productive and not harmful to society, to family or personal life.

JUDGMENT is another ego function described by Bellak. A depressed patient, as in the case of my first bipolar patient, who wasted all his savings, three hundred thousand dollars. He ran a large company in Miami, I was at Miami University back then, and he spent his whole fortune in one night at Hotel Omni. His wife and most of his family abandoned him, except his son, who brought him to Miami University for us to see him. He was my first bipolar patient. He lost everything in a single night, including being fired from his job at the company. This man lost everything in one night – why? Because he had a manic episode, within the bipolar disorder or bipolar depression. What did he lose? He lost judgment: the capacity to anticipate the consequences of our actions.

What is judgment? To anticipate the consequence of our actions. If we lack judgment, we can go through the same as this man, who lost it all in one night because he lost judgment. Remember: judgment is the capacity to anticipate the consequences of our actions and words.

Then there is Bellak's **SYNTHETIC INTEGRATIVE FUNCTIONING**. It's not Unitary Perception, but the capacity the mind has to unite eros and thanatos without them causing anxiety.

As I said, Bellak measures each function in a scale of 1 to 13. There is a grid in which you can draw curves. We have a schizophrenic who has a 10 in *adaptive regressions*... –he plays the guitar well. But in *reality testing*, he has 1, so the curve goes down a lot. In *sense of reality*, he has 5 points, the curve goes up again, but not much. In *adaptive regressions*, he's good at playing the guitar, the curve goes up again. Regarding defenses, he's using, of course, the most primitive ones: *denial and projection*. A score of 1, the curve goes down again. So thanks to Leopold Bellak, we can take a glance at the functioning curve of this person –let's call him John Doe– in Bellak's grid; we can see, at a glance, how his ego is functioning in all these functions we've mentioned. A schizophrenic, I repeat, might have a score of 12 in adaptive regression in the service of ego because he can play the guitar, but a score of 1 in defenses, because all he does is denying and projecting, and a 3 in judgment, because he lacks proper judgment.

And if we see a curve that doesn't go above 3 in any of the functions, that patient has to be hospitalized. If the patient is above 7 in all functions, it means he can go home. If he is between 8 and 12, he can work. I have never seen in a schizophrenic a curve that goes above 7. Therefore, to say that giving a schizophrenic a job is part of therapy is to me a social crime, because that person is not able to work. Working is nothing but an immense source of stress for a schizophrenic, it can do nothing but harm to them.

Audience: And between 3 and 7, is there another, more profound assessment?

RFG: Right, between 3 and 7, you have to see. Of course, if he's a schizophrenic, like the case I presented, see if he's taking his anti-psychotic medication, because maybe he's telling you he is, but his mother tells you he's not. When they have a very low curve in Bellak's assessment, they are most likely not taking their medication, which is the most common diagnosis in DSM: non-compliance of treatment, not taking their medication. It's very common in any patient, whether it is because they lost the prescription –something I find

unbelievable, that a person can lose their prescription—, or because they missed their appointment. We had a patient like that here recently, who lost a wonderful treatment that was going very well. He's still alright, luckily, but he lost a wonderful treatment and now he has just a good treatment, not a wonderful one, like the previous. Why? Because he missed an appointment, he forgot to come here. Fortunately, he came later with his parents and he's alright now.

They lose the prescription, miss their appointment. Why does a patient stop taking their medication? Because they don't believe in medicine; because they don't believe in the physician, that's very common in schizophrenics; high price of medications is a factor too. Zyprexa, for example, which is a very good anti-psychotic, costs about ten or twelve dollars a tablet. If they have to take two per day, that's twenty-four dollars a day. I think in Argentina that would be... four times twenty-four, that's ninety-six pesos a day, if I did the math right . [2010]

When giving a treatment, in the case of a schizophrenic, with an anti-psychotic medication (without which the patient will live in a roller-coaster) the psychiatrist should ask himself: Can we trust this patient to take his medication? For instance, I lost my trust in this patient. Is the patient trustworthy? Well, I lost my trust in this patient, who's going to become an engineer within a year; he's twenty-three years old and depressed. I gave him the best treatment, because I prescribed the best medication, the best antidepressant out there, which you can't skip a dose, but he missed his appointment, he forgot. Can I still trust that patient? No! Why would I give him a medicine he can't ever forget to take? If he forgets to come here, will he also forget to take his pills? Almost surely. So, I will give him a medication he can forget, which is not as good as the one he can't forget. Perhaps the efficiency of the treatment won't be as high as with the other medication, but this patient can't be trusted. And if a patient takes a medicine that you can't skip a dose of, then skips a dose, then keeps taking it, that won't help him at all. He's wasting his money.

The psychiatrist has the responsibility of measuring how trustworthy the patient is. We had another patient, also

depressed, a very devout Catholic who, on top of depression, was suffering because she had committed marital infidelity and told her husband, so they were both in a very painful tragedy, and she even attempted suicide with the same medication. Can I keep prescribing her that medication? I can't. So the psychiatrist needs to have confidence in the patient, and needs to know when to have confidence and when not to have it. It's not easy to be accurate at that.

So, we have initial assessment or clinical history. Besides Leopold Bellak's grid that I just described, we have the written clinical history, which is of enormous value. For example, a child under custody, a child with no parents under custody of a judge through social workers, through an orphanage. How can we trust that child to take his medication for attention deficit, for example?

A child with attention deficit in an orphanage, under custody of a social worker, who in turn responds to the judge who gave him or her the child's custody because the child has no parents... How can the psychiatrist trust that child to take his medicine? He's in an orphanage with personnel working in eight hour shifts. So, every eight hours, the caretakers change. This means the child has to deal with three different people within twenty-four hours. Do we know if the person who checks in at eight PM will give the child his medicine? Do we know what the child has to take, in case of depression? In the case of attention deficit, do we know if the person who arrives at seven AM will give the child the medication for attention deficit? It could be an ignorant, anti-medical person who believes medications are diabolical, and refuses to give them to the child. We have a very complicated situation there. We can trust the child, but we can't trust the situation he's in. So we have to visit the school, talk to the teacher, see if the teacher herself can give him the medication, as long as it's legal. That's not legal in some states of North America.

And who will inform me about the child in that orphanage? Either if he suffers from depression or attention deficit. Is the attention deficit patient giving me the information, telling me he's doing great at school, but when I talk to the teacher, she

tells me he's a mess? Or the depressed person who tells me he feels good, but his wife tells me "He's a mess, he's not okay at all: he doesn't sleep, he doesn't go out and he has no energy for anything."

How does the psychiatrist manage to trust the person taking the treatment? It's not easy. It depends on the patient, on the parents in the case of children, on the spouse in a married adult, and with single adults, when you see them alone, it depends on who? We should be very careful if we're trusting the patient with the medication we're giving them.

So we have, luckily, the PATIENT'S ASSESSMENT. Let's look at it; the most complete assessment I know is the one we'll see today. It starts with what? With personal details. It starts with personal details: "John Doe."

Audience: This John Doe guy lives at the clinic (laughter).

RFG: Yes, yes. I say "John Doe" because there's nobody here with that name.

Let's begin with PERSONAL DETAILS. "John Doe, age eighteen, born in Mexicali-México, male. Born on January 4 1968 at 9 PM, weighing 3.2 kilograms. He weighs 76 kilograms today. 1.77 meters tall. General practitioner: Pedro Alonso, from Mexicali, phone number so-and-so, who operated on his nasal septum ten months ago. Maximum education: senior high school (called secondary school in Argentina) at such-and-such school, patient's phone number at home is so-and-so, cell phone is so-and-so, email is so-and-so." Personal details. I have the obligation to know how to get in touch with the patient in case an emergency prevents me from seeing him, which hasn't happened to Rubén, but it has happened with other therapists, who suddenly tell you "I can't see this patient due to serious personal reasons," so we are obliged by professional responsibility to get in touch with the patient and tell him: "This appointment is canceled and rescheduled for such-and-such a date."

Do personal details end there? No. “Father: John Doe senior, age forty. Mother: Mary Baker, age thirty-seven, both with a maximum of primary education (sixth grade). Seen for the first time by yours truly, RFG MD, psychiatrist-neurologist.”

Personal details end there, yes. That's the end of personal details.

Now, it's good to have this, which I think I've sent to everyone, do you all have it?

Audience: Yes.

It's good to have this in hand at the beginning of therapy, so you don't miss any of these details. Eventually, you'll incorporate it, so you won't need to recur to this... was it *machete* [*cheat sheet*]?

Audience: *Machote*.

RFG: In Mexico they call it “machote”, “machete” in Argentina –cheat sheet. I don't know if they still use that word in Argentina. But you need this cheat sheet at first, to have a complete assessment, without missing any detail.

Now, after personal details –to see how I manage to get in touch with that patient in any case, etc.– comes the problem that the patient presents, which might not be the real problem.

PRESENTED PROBLEM: what was it in the case of John Doe? “My mother poisons my food, my father is a homosexual and my neighbors are plotting with the FBI to kill me.” Dun-dun-dun! (laughter). “Dun-dun-dun” is what the psychiatrist says, not the patient (laughter). That's the presented problem. An experienced psychiatrist has, by now, a clear idea of what the diagnosis might be. It's one of only two or three diagnoses. Of course, you think of schizophrenia, bipolar disorder or some very serious schizotypal personality, etc. But the first thing to think of in this case is schizophrenia.

Next: history of the presented problem. So: 1) PERSONAL DETAILS, 2) PRESENTED PROBLEM, 3) HISTORY AND DURATION

OF THE PRESENTED PROBLEM. History and duration. “It's been two years already –the parents say–, since 1984.” But, why didn't you come before, when this boy started to say all those things? Ma'am, how do you feel –you ask her– when your son says you're poisoning his food?” That's why I say the family suffers more than the patient.

[Stops briefly to regulate the air conditioner]

Ah, we'll turn it off. Shall we turn [the air conditioner] off? Some people are cold already.

We continue with the history of the presented problem. It has been two years of this situation already. The parents waited two years before taking him to a psychiatrist. Talk about patience! And “he started doing cocaine two years ago,” which leads us to think that maybe he's like that because of cocaine. Cocaine abuse produces psychosis.

Audience: Silicosis?

RFG: Psychosis. Abuse of any stimulant, like amphetamine or cocaine, produces psychosis. Ah, then we have another likely diagnosis, perhaps it is due to excess of cocaine or amphetamine.

Aggravated since septum surgery. Why? Because surgery means a tremendous stress for a schizophrenic, which is our “suspected” diagnosis. Surgery causes stress to anyone. That stress triggers the psychotic symptoms. Why? That operation was ten months ago. The parents and the patient deny a history of diseases or suicidal-homicidal ideas. You always have to ask about suicidal and homicidal ideas. It can be in history and duration of presented problem or any other moment. In personal history, at some point, you have to ask if there have been suicidal or homicidal ideas... or attempts. That's worse, right? Ideas or attempts. Curiously, in this case, there is no history of abuse, both parents are very good people, two field workers. The mother is full of despair since she heard her son say she's poisoning his food. The father, in despair because he had dreamed his son would be this or that. No history of abuse

or incest –which is not rare. No history of fractures. Fractures are sometimes produced by abuse, from who? Progenitors. No history of burns either, which could also be due to abuse. No scars, which could also be due to abuse. And no negligence or carelessness from the progenitors; they are both simply in a state of deep despair.

Then comes PERSONAL HISTORY and FAMILY HISTORY. We start with the history of development, how the matrimonial history of the progenitors and family history developed; the patient's medical history; educational history, what grade he reached, his grades, etc.; legal history, whether he's been arrested for crimes, felonies, misdemeanors –minor or major crimes, that's legal history. Military history: in the past, the military service was compulsory in Argentina and I had to do it; sixteen months. Luckily, I think it's no longer compulsory in Argentina. But in the United States, it is important to ask about military history. Anywhere, because some people don't leave the military service in a good psychological condition.

Then... PERSONAL AND FAMILY HISTORY , informed by whom? Who is giving us the information on this history? We have to clarify. Is this coming from the patient, who we can't trust too much because he abuses a stimulant like cocaine? Perhaps amphetamine too and the parents ignore it, because this information came from the parents. Who's informing? The patient, mom, dad; the patient and both progenitors are informing. Can I trust that information? All of this should be in the clinical history, that is, in the patient's initial assessment, and every time we assess him, see him in therapy or whatever. To me, the patient has little reliability, because not only is he a drug addict, but also, he seems to suffer from psychosis, undoubtedly, and his parents are not very educated, both reached sixth grade and started working in the fields. Even if the progenitors are reliable, they might not be completely reliable, because they are not very educated, and the less educated people are, the more prejudices they have: racial prejudices, prejudices here and there. The patient –can I rely on him if he's doing cocaine and has said the things he said? No. Therefore, restricted reliability.

MARITAL HISTORY OF PROGENITORS: “Okay.” What does “okay” mean? There are four things you should inquire about with a couple: how’s communication, how’s tenderness... –you ask John and Mary, the couple: “John, how’s tenderness in your relationship?” “Erm...” “Mary, how’s tenderness?” “Fine, fine.” “How’s communication, Mary?” “Fine, fine.” “How’s communication, John?” “Very good.” “What about fun? Do you have fun? Do you? How’s your sexuality? You don’t have to answer, but if you answer, I’ll be able to help you more.” So, four things to ask a couple about: communication, tenderness, fun, sexuality. From that we can make a marital history of the progenitors. “It’s all right.” Okay to the four questions.

The three of them live in a house with two bedrooms. They’re lucky because it’s only one child sleeping in a room just for him. That’s a luxury in any country, including the United States. There are two bathrooms in the house, which is a luxury too. If we take all the houses in the world into account, having two bathrooms is a luxury. There’s a dining room, a living room –you have to ask what the house is like–, a small backyard, a one-story house. Nobody smokes or drinks alcohol in the house, which is something you have to ask in family history too. Diet is normal, which means it’s not a vegetarian diet, or a special or macrobiotic diet. No, it’s a normal diet; they go to the supermarket, they eat until they are full, and eating is not a problem. They are more afraid of hunger than of food (laughter).

The paternal grandparents live in Mexico City and the maternal grandparents in Morelia. Paternal grandparents in Mexico City and maternal grandparents in Morelia. So they are far from the grandparents. There is no support from the grandparents for these two progenitors who have a pretty dysfunctional son.

Audience: How old is the son?

RFG: Eighteen. I saw him recently, he’s in his thirties now. He’s doing well.

There were never moves or separations of the patient and his progenitors.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PATIENT: He spoke and walked at age one. Is development affected? No, it's normal. Education was normal, he never repeated a grade. That's quite normal in the United States, but it doesn't mean the child knows something, because promotion is social in the United States. He's not promoted for what he knows, but for his age. "Is he nine? Third grade." There are no exams, nothing. So there are kids in sixth grade in the US who can't read or write, who were promoted *socially* and not *educationally*. That's our future right there.

Good development, talked and walked at age one. Normal education, did not repeat any grade. Why? Because there was, I insist, social (not educational) promotion of the child.

MEDICAL HISTORY: Use of cocaine at age sixteen. Never vaccinated; never hospitalized, which could be a miracle for a schizophrenic person. No history of accidents or surgery except what? Nasal septum, ten months ago by Dr. Pedro Alonso from Mexicali. You have to know who operated him, because I wanted to phone that doctor, so he could tell me what he knew about that patient and that family. Why? Because reliability is restricted –by education, by the problem, etc. I want to know who operated on him, I want to speak to that person.

Family and progenitors deny history of tuberculosis –you have to ask all these questions. History of Tuberculosis? No. AIDS? No. Diabetes in the family? No, which is rare for a Pérez family, i.e., a Latino family. Latinos –I know this because I've worked in the US for more than twenty years– are the most diabetes-prone group. Anglo-Americans, Afro-Americans and the Chinese have less diabetes than Latinos. That is, diabetes is seen more frequently, statistically, in Latino people.

So, no tuberculosis, no AIDS, no diabetes, very good. Allergies: bronchial? No. Skin? No. Intestinal? No. Epilepsy? No. These are the questions you must ask. Arthritis? No.

HISTORY OF MENTAL DISORDERS: In the families of both of them (mom and dad). "No". People of restricted reliability tell me that. But suddenly, it turns out the maternal grandfather is an alcoholic. Watch out, because alcoholism overlaps

genetically with several mental diseases, especially epilepsy. Alcoholic grandfather, epileptic grandson, very common. Epileptic grandfather, alcoholic grandson, very common.

No history of mental retardation or delinquency. No history of mental retardation or delinquency. No police records. Interesting, because he's been doing drugs. It's rare to find a person who does drugs and has no police records.

The patient denies use or abuse of heroin, which is the most terrible, the most addictive drug. Denies use or abuse of amphetamine, LSD, PCP –“angel dust”; each drug has its popular name –, there was no mixing of drugs or alcoholism in the patient either. He's used cocaine as we've said, since age sixteen. Never medicated by any physician, except what Dr. Alonso may have given him for the nasal septum surgery, surely local anesthetics. He never used natural products, something you have to ask. “No, I've never used anything.” “Do you use any natural product?” “Oh, yes, Saint John's Wart, lizard tails, male iguana fat, etc.” (laughter). So you have to ask that too. Many times you get tremendous surprises.

No history of alcoholism or mixing drugs, never medicated by a physician, never used natural products, which is rare nowadays. Neither did he take other people's medicines. We're already getting a picture of all the questions you have to ask. “Have you ever been medicated by a physician?” “No.” “Weren't you ever prescribed anything?” “No.” “And have you ever taken your mom's, your dad's, your uncle's or your brother's medicines?” “Ah, once, some antibiotics.” Ah, just a trifle (laughter). At a time when antibiotics are said to require a prescription, but in the past, you didn't need a prescription for antibiotics in Mexico.

Audience: Pharmacists gave them.

RFG: Pharmacists gave them. Of course, the physician gives the prescription.

Neither did he use other people's medicines. Sexually a virgin; this was expressed by the patient himself. “But –he said– I use

Penthouse a lot.” A free association. Denies any sexual promiscuity. Is that credible? You do believe that from a schizophrenic: that he has restricted sociability, because he has alogia, abulia and blunted affect. He has no female friends, and therefore no sexual promiscuity; I can believe that from a schizophrenic.

After that, comes that great chapter of initial assessment or clinical history that is MENTAL STATE. How is this patient, John Doe, mentally? How is John's mental state? What do we have to look at in mental state? Aspect, clothes, intellect, memory, attention, orientation. Are there hallucinations? Are there delusions? Are there illusions? All of these questions are pertinent to the diagnosis with the patient's answer. How's his insight? I mean “Do you need a medicine?” “No.” In a scale of 1 to 10, that's 0 insight (laughter). How's judgment? Have you ever committed a disproportionate, tragic or dramatic act?

So, mental state in the case of John: sings of psychotic delusions. Why do we say that? Do you remember what the problem he presented was? Do you remember?

Audience: That his dad is a homosexual...

RFG: That his dad is a homosexual, his mom poisons his food, and what else?

Audience: The FBI...

RFG: The FBI is out to get him.

Audience: They're his neighbors.

RFG: That his neighbors have the FBI go after him, etc. That is, lots of paranoia, which is a delusion, one of the delusions. Signs of psychotic paranoid delusions. He denies auditory or visual hallucinations: “I don't hear voices, I don't see things,” but, is he reliable? Restricted reliability. The patient knows that if he says he hears voices, they will say he's crazy. But many times you can hear voices and it's not madness, it can be simply depression, nothing more and nothing less than depression.

There's incoherence between complaints against progenitors and great comfort during the interview with his progenitors in front of the psychiatrist. What am I doing? Simply seeing that this boy, who tells me his mother poisons his food, is comfortably seated between mom and dad, whom he accuses of terrible things. What do we see there? Incoherence. What is the basic thing in a diagnosis of schizophrenia? Incoherence! In this fact, there is an incoherence which I have already written down. Then there is incoherence of speech, but there's also the incoherence of him saying terrible things about his parents while he's comfortably seated between them.

Audience: In clothing too, right?

RFG: Right, right. Now we'll go into clothing. Clothing should be coherent with gender: male or female, i.e., that he's not a man with woman clothes. Clothing should be coherent with the season, i.e., he shouldn't be wearing a fur coat now. If the patient shows up in a fur coat, when the temperature in Mexicali reaches 50°C [120°F], would be kind of incoherent, kind of incongruous. Coherent with age. Once I had an old lady who showed up in a miniskirt, and I say "Good heavens" (laughter). Good heavens (laughter). That's why I tell Ceci, who has recently got her degree in Human Relations –she's a psychologist –, I tell her: "You won't have a single moment of boredom" (laughter). That's the good thing about being a therapist: you'll never be bored.

Then, suddenly, without asking him anything, in that comfort between his two progenitors (whom he accuses), he says "I sing just like Vicente Fernandez." The patient tells us this. This is all real. Immediately, to reduce the tension of the dialogue, I say: "Okay John, now you have no choice but to sing something from Vicente." Of course, he sang "The King." "Go ahead, sing something." So he sang in the session, terribly out of tune (laughter). It means we have another incoherence here: "I sing like Vicente Fernandez." Well, he sang the same song, but terribly out of tune. Another incoherence. Why? Grandiosity. And grandiosity is seen in whom? In those who have a way of seeing themselves that is poor and a way of presenting themselves which is rich. Incoherence. I see myself

as poor but present myself as rich. Curiously, he sings “But I am still the King.” “Nobody wants me, nobody loves me, but I am still the King,” something like that, right? The song he chooses goes together with that incoherence between the way in which he presents himself –grandiose– and the way he perceives himself –poor.

History of abulia (lack of will) and alogia (lack of language) of the patient at home. What does the mother say about him? “Ma'am, tell us about your son.” “He doesn't speak and spends hours hiding in his room.” Denies insomnia and anhedonia. That is, he's denying insomnia and problems of energy; he's denying the two fundamental symptoms of depression. He has good appetite, there is no constipation. I tell the patient that any act or word that imply danger to himself or others unbinds me from confidentiality or professional secret. Don't forget that. Telling the patient: “I will keep professional secret –also called “confidentiality”– unless you do or say something that shows me you will do something against yourself or any person in society.”

Audience: Do you tell that to a potentially dangerous patient or... ?

RFG: No, no, to everyone.

Audience: Every patient.

RFG: To every patient you say: “This is a secret, our relationship is confidential unless you prove to be a danger to yourself or others.” This is a law in the United States, called Tarasoff-Mavroudis, from the Tarasoff case. A girl who goes... Sorry, it's not the girl who goes to the psychologist, it's her boyfriend, and he says he will kill this Tarasoff girl. The psychologist says nothing and the boyfriend goes and kills her for leaving him. Since then, in the United States, in California, there is a law that forces you to make these questions in every case. It's called the Tarasoff-Mavroudis Law, because it happened twice, with a girl named Tarasoff and another one named Mavroudis.

Aspect: slightly obese; incipient, sparse mustache, rigid position, sitting between his progenitors, very still, with his hands crossed during the whole seventy-five minutes of this assessment session.

What do you call that? When there is immobility for seventy-five minutes, rigid and with few words. *Catatonia*. That's called catatonia.

His clothes are clean and appropriate for his age, sex and season (it was autumn). I'm not surprised that he's dressed properly, because I see how concerned his mother is about him, the only child, and his father is concerned too. They will make sure he will leave the house properly dressed to see the doctor.

He's laconic, with a poor vocabulary. Inexpressive, typical of... whom? A schizophrenic. Laconic means that he talks little, it comes from Sparta. Laconia was the Greek province where Sparta was, and Spartans spoke little as a law, which is also a law when you've been married for twenty years, and the husband must speak little (laughter). Just kidding (laughter). Just kidding, just kidding.

Audience: Is catatonia related to schizophrenia?

RFG: Catatonia, of course. Actually, it's pretty difficult to see a catatonic person who's not a schizophrenic.

Audience: But, for example, there are situations...

RFG: Drugs.

Audience: ...sudden news. Some people go catatonic; widows who suddenly...

RFG: Yes... the young man who came here, whose girlfriend had left him, was catatonic. I ask him: "How many times a day do you think about your girlfriend?" He says: "Every now and then." I tell him: "You liar, you spend the whole day thinking about her." He was catatonic, immobilized by sadness.

Audience: But not necessarily schizophrenic.

RFG: No, no. But if there is catatonia, you should consider schizophrenia, if all the other elements gather.

Rigid position, laconic, poor vocabulary, inexpressive. Poor vocabulary means he's poorly educated: despite having reached the grade corresponding to his age, he can't read or write. And because his vocabulary is too poor, he has no expression, which is known as flat or blunted affect.

Intermittent eye contact. When a patient looks at you in the eyes, that's a good sign. When they don't, watch out. Staring at the floor, there is no movement of dyskinesia. Dyskinesia would be this [moves his tongue in and out of his mouth], any problem, especially constant tongue movements. That's called dyskinesia.

Audience: What does that say about the patient?

RFG: It could mean excess of medication, especially the old ones.

Audience: Ah, yes, I remember. Some people stayed like that, right? I've seen them.

RFG: Some people remain like that. The tongue won't stop.

Stares at the ground, no dyskinesia movements, which are mouth movements, they can be neck movements.

Audience: The neck too?

RFG: The neck, like this. [*moving the head*]. Very common, very frequent, I mean. And tongue or mouth movements. They move their tongue or mouth a lot.

META PROCESS, that is, is he cooperating with the psychiatrist? He never stopped cooperating with me, he answered all the questions. There are other schizophrenics who don't tell you a single word. But he is restricted in what he says, he thinks a lot before saying things —paranoia— and he's

not very spontaneous. I tell him jokes and he doesn't laugh with them (laughter). Watch out for counter-transference: the psychiatrist may become the patient's enemy. He didn't laugh at my jokes, but that also means... can he laugh? Has he ever laughed? That is, the schizophrenic, due to his blunted affect, is likely to have never laughed, never laughed.

He tries to compose phrases and gets stuck, or leaves his sentences unfinished. Careful with unfinished phrases, which is a custom in Northern Mexico (laughter).

Audience: A schizophrenic society (laughter).

RFG: No, no. You always have to differentiate if it is cultural.

Audience: But... No, no, nothing, go on (laughter).

RFG: Unfinished sentences might be a Northern Mexico custom, but be aware it might also be this, which we are suspecting. He tries to compose phrases and gets stuck. Incomplete phrases. I wrote this down right here, you'll read it. I hope you read it and have it as a guide for you to make a complete assessment of the patient. I wrote: "Common in Northern Mexico," incomplete phrases. That's very common in Northern Mexico.

Volume and rhythm of verbal expression are normal. That is, he's not yelling and not speaking too fast. He speaks faster when he accuses his parents. Paranoia.

Paranoid delusions of grandeur and persecution. "Sometimes the TV speaks to me," another information he gave me without my asking. That's called "ideas of reference."

Then comes ASSESSMENT OF SENSORIUM, which means to evaluate memory, attention, intelligence and... what am I missing? Memory, attention, intelligence and orientation. I have to assess memory, attention, intelligence and orientation.

Orientation: who am I? Where are you? What city is this?

Audience: Person, time and space.

RFG: Orientation of person, time and space. What time is it?

I reckon his intellectual quotient is average or below average, even if he's not retarded. I reckon his intellectual quotient is below average. Recent memory is good, attention is good. The first thing that gets affected is recent memory, that's why it is good to tell the patient: "Please repeat this number: three, eight, six, five, four, zero, nine." Have him repeat it.

The problem of attention, the problem of memory... The first thing to fail is recent memory. Remote memory is not lost.

Audience: In attention problems?

RFG: In Alzheimer, dementia. In attention problems, in schizophrenia, in depression, the first affected memory is recent memory, not remote. That's why you tell them: "Repeat this six numbers: three, eight, six..." That's more valuable than asking them who the first president of the US was, or the first presiding of Mexico; that's easy to remember if there has been education.

I reckon his IQ as average or below? Recent memory is good. Recent memory is more important. I insist, remote memory, generally, is good. The last thing you lose in dementia is remote memory, memories from your childhood.

Attention is good in this four-people session. We're four: two progenitors, one psychiatrist and the patient, and in spite of that, the patient never lost attention. On the contrary, he was very attentive, completely still: paranoid catatonia not to miss any piece of information.

Well oriented in person, place and time. He refuses to express three wishes. Sometimes it's good to tell the patient "Tell me three of your wishes." He refused. He looks fearful, sad and angry. Typical, typical. Denies sadness, anger and fear. Another incoherence. If I see he's sad and angry, and he tells me he's not, we have a third incoherence already. Do you remember the three incoherencies? Do you remember, Karina?

Audience: Of schizophrenia?

RFG: Of John. John's three incoherencies. Do you remember what they are?

Audience: To be sitting between his parents, presenting himself...

RFG: Comfortably, in spite of having accused them of terrible things, that they poison his food.

Audience: He presents himself as rich or grandiose but he looks poor. And the third...

RFG: "I sing like the great singer" and turns out he doesn't. Third?

Audience: This one. Denying sadness...

RFG: Denying his sadness. I see him very sad, and he says he's not sad.

INSIGHT means... an English word that means "understanding of one's own state." He says he doesn't need treatment. How's insight? There's no insight. "I don't need any treatment."

NEUROLOGICAL EXAM: the patient refuses to take neurological exam and refuses to draw his family, two things that would give you lots of information. The patient refuses.

Then comes the DIAGNOSIS IN FIVE AXES. I think the diagnosis in five axes is easy by now:

- Axis 1: Schizophrenia.
- Axis 2: No retardation or personality disorders.
- Axis 3: No diseases, only nasal septum operation.
- Axis 4: How much stress, on a scale from 1 to 5, does this patient have? Five! Just like any schizophrenic or any depressed person without treatment, or anyone with attention deficit. Axis 4, stress: 5.

Audience: Having been in the hospital too?

RFG: If he's been in the hospital, the previous year too, in the two past semesters. Not here.

Audience: Surgery doesn't count?

RFG: Surgery, yes.

Audience: It counts?

RFG: It counts. And even if hadn't had a surgery, he gets 5 points just for schizophrenia.

Audience: He's a cocaine addict, doesn't that go to Axis 1?

RFG: Axis 1: Cocaine abuse, yes. I had forgotten about that one. Exactly. He used cocaine, which is a tremendous stimulant that produces psychosis. But in this case, in spite of cocaine, you can easily diagnose paranoid schizophrenia.

DIAGNOSTIC PLAN. A neurological exam has to be done because he refused to take it. I recommend him to visit the dentist. Generally, schizophrenic patients let themselves go. He's locked in his room all day. I recommend him to visit an ophthalmologist and a nutritionist, because he has mild obesity.

TREATMENT PLAN: diet for obesity, anti-psychotic medication.

The adult patient refuses to sign consent, which is obligatory in the United States –I saw this patient in the USA, in El Centro–, he refused to sign consent for me to give him medication. Can I give a patient medication even if the patient refuses to sign consent? I can, but a physician is in danger of losing his license if that transpires. So it's not easy to practice psychiatry in the United States. The psychiatrist is very limited.

Audience: That is, if he didn't sign consent... not to give it to him, but to prescribe it.

RFG: The patient does not provide the medicine, the pharmacist does that... [*correcting himself*] The *psychiatrist* does not provide the medicine, the pharmacist does that. But the psychiatrist can't prescribe if he lacks signed consent from

the patient, not the progenitors, because he's eighteen years old, an adult already. He would need his parents' signature if he was under eighteen.

Audience: Rubén, does abstinence go into the treatment plan?

RFG: Yes, abstinence from cocaine. Surely I told him that, but I didn't write it down, which is a very important omission you're bringing up.

PROGNOSTIC: bad without medication, good with medication. He can lead an almost normal life, as he is doing now, because in the end he convinced himself he had to do it. There was a crisis, I think it took him two weeks to sign the consent and start the treatment. That was thirty years ago. So he must now be... forty-eight today. This man started to take his medicine with no problems, and one day they give him a Haldol (Haloperidol) with which he was being treated, that was not from the usual lab, but from another lab with another presentation, and he refused to take the medicine again. So these alternatives are seen quite frequently, quite frequently.

Audience: But, were those for pain?

RFG: No, Haldol is used as an anti-psychotic. It's a great anti-psychotic.

Audience: Rubén, we didn't mention what to put in Axis 5.

RFG: In Axis 5 you assess the capacity to function in society, so undoubtedly, I gave him a 35, because he's not hospitalized, and for him to receive support from the State. In the United States, a schizophrenic gets eight hundred dollars per month. I think it's more in Spain. They receive a monthly payment from the State. It is very compassionate that a State helps a patient who can't work.

Prognostic: bad without medication, good with medication. Support psychotherapy for both parents and the patient separately. Help him consent for the necessary medication. Disabled to work on a wage. Less than 45 in Axis 5. If we put

more than 45 in Axis 5, the State won't help him in the US. You have to be careful with everything, with everything.

Audience: You have to find out how it works in Mexico, to adjust yourself, you know.

RFG: Right. I know the laws are different in Mexico. Any question or comment from Argentina?

Audience: There's a question here [*in Buenos Aires*]. Go.

RFG: Go ahead.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Hello Rubén. I wanted to ask you about the assessment of the patient. One of the points was synthetic function. I need you to give an example, because I don't know what the capacity to live *eros* and *thanatos* without producing anxiety is. But if you give me an example to understand it...

RFG: It's what a person called “normal” has, someone who doesn't live with anxiety, who's able to take things lightly, with humor. Someone who looks for the smile of a loved one is using the synthetic integrative function. Even if they're not in Unitary Perception, but those individuals who are calm, who have a good synthetic integrative function, even if they don't live in Unitary Perception.

Am I answering?

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Yes, yes, thank you.

RFG: Questions or comments here?

Remember that these are the details of a patient, for you to see how the chart at the beginning works. At the beginning we have the chart, the skeleton, which we fill with this “flesh,” i.e., the details of each person. When you're starting, it's good to use the skeleton with every patient you see, so you don't miss anything. Later, with practice, you won't need the chart anymore. You'll incorporate it.

So this is the patient's initial assessment, which is actually repeated every time you see the patient. I always tell the story of what happened to me as a psychiatry resident in Pittsburgh University, where I had a very good team of supervisors, among them Dr. Oshino. My first interview with Dr. Oshino: I had just arrived from Argentina, and after seeing my first patient and making my first assessment, it ended up being twenty-four pages long (laughter). Full of myself, I give Dr. Oshino my first assessment. Dr. Oshino looks at it, does this with his hand as if weighing the assessment, and throws it into the garbage bin he had under his desk. Just like the one I have right here. I froze and looked at him with a bit of hostility (laughter), but a very repressed hostility, because he was my supervisor (laughter). I tell him: "Prof. Oshino..."

Audience: "My dear professor... (laughter)."

RFG: ...I went through a lot of anguish and worked really hard in that assessment. I reviewed it many times. I would like to know your opinion." "I can give you my opinion without reading it," he says. "Okay," I tell him, "then give me your opinion." He tells me: "Bring me your assessment when you've brought it down to a maximum of three pages." I tell him: "How can I put all that information in three pages?" He says: "No, what you have done is to put every bit of information under the sun; I'm not interested in that. I'm interested in this patient's information." What Oshino meant, which is very important for this class, is that you have to write down the information pertinent to the case, which shouldn't be more than three pages. Nowadays, my assessments are between one page and one and a half pages long. The more experience you have, the more you synthesize and the more concise written information gets. You don't need much paper to have concise yet complete information about this patient. Because, for instance, you say "aspect," clothing goes in aspect. I must have written... I don't remember, this happened in 1974. Instead of writing "The patient is dressed properly for season, gender and age," I must have written "The patient is wearing a blue denim shirt..." do you understand? So, of course, you use much more paper, and it's completely useless. It's enough to know he's

properly dressed for gender, season and age. There, you only needed three words. You don't have to describe the color of his shoes. Whatever is appropriate and useful for the case, and that, of course, requires experience. When you're starting, your assessments will probably be long, and with practice, they will become shorter, clearer, more complete and coherent with experience. The more you know, the more you read, the better and more concise your assessments will be. Nowadays, I insist, my assessments are no longer than a page.

Ah! And there are clinics in the United States offering me jobs now, and they tell me “four patients per hour.” That's thirty-two patients in an eight-hour work day. So, right from the start, they tell you you're going to work with thirty-two patients each day. Now, you may wonder how you can see a patient in fifteen minutes. But that's what's necessary.

That's why I say, if you want to work in the environment we have... Perhaps not in the CPH, where we're doing things differently, but in any other place, if –God forbid– the CPH disappeared and you have to work in a regular place, they will ask you to assess and see the patient in fifteen minutes. So you have to be clear, concise, concrete, complete and coherent in fifteen minutes. That's why you need lots of practice to get to that point. You're expected to assess the patient in thirty minutes at most, and to avoid spending more than fifteen minutes with a follow-up patient.

I don't know if there is another question or comment in Buenos Aires.

Audience: They say no.

RFG: And here?

Audience: Right now we were talking about information, it does not necessarily have to do with omitting details, according to the case, but, as I understood it, the important thing is to be brief, but that doesn't mean omitting.

RFG: Not omitting.

Audience: Can you repeat?

RFG: You shouldn't omit for the sake of brevity. There are five C's: "CCCCC". Clear, concise, concrete, complete and coherent. So, no omissions. So, everything can be clear, concise and concrete, without omitting anything; it has to be complete and concise. It's not easy, of course. But you, I insist, use the cheat sheet, which is only a page long, and fill it with the patient, asking questions to the patient. You'll get a complete assessment, without omitting anything. To be brief means that to describe, for instance, clothing, it's enough to say "appropriate for season, gender and age." You don't have to describe the color of their shirt or coat, you see? Only what is pertinent and useful. It's not useful to say he's wearing a blue denim shirt. It's useful to say he's properly dressed for the season, which tells you there's no incoherence there.

Audience: Or what song he sang.

RFG: What this patient said is that he sings like Vicente Fernández, who's an icon here in Mexico. When he tells me he sings like Vicente, I ask him to sing, and I see that no, he doesn't sing like Vicente, but he sang a song that would have been relevant in Mexico, because in the United States, nobody knows who Vicente Fernández is, but in Mexico everyone knows him. In Mexico, perhaps I'd have to write down what song he sang, which I think is called "The king." It's very important that "I have no throne or queen, nobody to understand me, but I'm still the king," that means there's a dissociation here, between the concept I have of myself and the way I present myself. "I have nothing:" a poor concept of myself; "I have no throne or queen, nobody to understand me, but I'm still the king:" grandiosity keeps manifesting, and it's very relevant for a patient like this, a schizophrenic.

Audience: If he says he has money, he's rich, and he comes dressed as a poor person, that can be incoherent too. In that case we could maybe say...

RFG: But watch out, because people can say incoherent things just to protect themselves, like a bipolar person who tells you

he's a Purina executive, he's an executive of a large company, but he shows up here dressed as a poor man because he's protecting himself. He's protecting himself from kidnappers, preventing his wife from asking him for too much money.

Audience: Which he won't give her (laughter).

RFG: Exactly.

The significance of each thing depends on the case, even when there is incoherence. But in a schizophrenic you see incoherence all over the place, even in being calmly seated between his two progenitors, whom he accuses of the most terrible things. "My mom poisons my food, but here I am, sitting comfortably beside her."

Any other question or comment?

Audience: Is it important to ask about religion too?

RFG: In this case I didn't, because I always assumed he was a Catholic, but in the United States, it is convenient. For instance, if an African-American patient comes, one of my first questions is: "What is your religion?" They are likely to say: "Islam." There are many African-Americans who converted to Islam, because they feel mistreated by the Christian, enslaved by the Christian, and now they belong to Islam. For instance, an Asian patient, there's many people from Vietnam in this area and in Los Angeles, those who could migrate from Vietnam. "What is your religion?" "*Shinto*," that means they're close to Japan; "Buddhist," that means they're close to India; "*Tao*," Taoist, that means they come from China.

What else does it mean? Nothing, because there is no religious practice nowadays. Generally, religion is not practiced or taken seriously, but it's good to ask, because it gives you an idea of the origin of that family, a bit of what that family is connected to. It can give you an opinion, what kind of values...

For example, *Shinto* (*Shintoism*) has honor as its fundamental value. If you're shamed, you have to commit suicide –*harakiri*. That's one of the aspects of *Shinto*: honor above all. For a

Christian it is, supposedly, love above all, although we have Christian countries invading other countries. And there's a bunch of incoherencies, but it's interesting. I always ask about the patient's religion. If they tell you they're Buddhist, that doesn't mean much either, because there are over five hundred Buddhist sects, but it gives you an idea. If they know what Buddhism is, they're likely to avoid suffering and making others suffer, which is the basis of Buddhism. But it's no guarantee, it's no guarantee.

But it's always good to ask about religion, especially in the United States, where you have people from different races. In Mexico you can almost assume everyone is Catholic, although I'm surprised by the number of Christians who have abandoned Catholicism. Yes, it's surprising, a very large amount. I think the number of people deserting Catholicism is not so high in Argentina.

So, we have seen “the skeleton” of the patient's assessment, filled with “the meat” of a schizophrenic patient I saw thirty years ago, whom I've just seen, and he's doing great, fortunately. Once I had to go to court for him, because he had got in trouble, theft I think.

Audience: In the United States?

RFG: Yes. I had to go to court to tell the judge... –which I did– “I plead clemency, Your Honor (you have to call the judge Your Honor). “Your Honor, I plead clemency for this patient, because he suffers such and such disorder.” They were giving him one year in jail, but they sent him to a psychiatric hospital instead. Thank God I was there, because otherwise he would've had to put up with a year in jail, but he only had to stay four days in the hospital. He was back home in four days. If it wasn't for his psychiatrist, he would have spent a whole year in jail, which would be disastrous for his mental state, completely disastrous, because that guy still depends on his mother. He's lucky to have his mother to remind him of taking the medicine. But if it wasn't for his mother, I bet he wouldn't take it. If his mother died, I hope not, the first thing he will do is to stop taking his medicine and he'll be hospitalized again.

We overextended a bit because we started late. Let's make a fifteen-minute break and come back. See you later.

[Fifteen minute break. The class is resumed reading a fragment of an article by RFG.]

THE COHERENT LANGUAGE OF HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOLOGY IN THE PLANET OF 2003

*Summary of the new psychology and the planetary situation.
August 2003, by RFG*

Interlocutor: You speak about being in the present, living in the present and knowing oneself.

Rubén Feldman González: Judging from the way you express yourself, it's clear you haven't read anything about Unitary Perception, written by me. If you allow me, we can polish the language during our dialogue.

Interlocutor: Sure, with all pleasure and right away.

RFG: There are several ways of being in the present: in Unitary Perception, in fragmentary perception or in the delight of the sacred, although the latter is very rare. One is the way, truth and true life, but you have to discover that for yourself. Nobody can do it for you.

Interlocutor: We have to kill the ego and terminate thought.

RFG: Instead of that, which doesn't mean anything real, let's say we have to see how the ego manifests at each moment, in the form of fear, anger, sadness, jealousy, envy, guilt and desires. If we see these manifestations in Unitary Perception, they won't last. We cannot terminate thought, but we can see it, when it emerges to consciousness as ideas, images, memories, plans... see it in Unitary Perception.

Interlocutor: We can say, then, that I have to exit memory while I feel my breathing.

RFG: If you don't think of breathing, you will breath well. By thinking of breathing you might cause alkalosis.

When we're in Unitary Perception, we see that memory is very incoherent, like thought and the ego. If we see how memory functions, we won't be trapped so much by it, at each moment.

Interlocutor: A peasant in Coyhaique (Chile) might be in Unitary Perception without having studied it and without being aware of it.

RFG: We assume children, peasants, forest rangers and cats are in Unitary Perception. But I don't understand how a person can honestly make such a claim.

UNITARY PERCEPTION IS TO PERCEIVE EVERYTHING PERCEPTIBLE AT THE SAME TIME, RIGHT NOW, WITHOUT WORDS, EITHER THOUGHT OR SPOKEN.

ONLY YOU KNOW IF YOU'RE IN UNITARY PERCEPTION OR NOT. AND I CAN'T BE IN UNITARY PERCEPTION FOR YOU.

Interlocutor: We have to make Precinct C of the mind become conscious.

RFG: 99% of Precinct C is unconscious. First, because we don't want to see. Second, because we don't see well and third, because having ears, we don't listen.

Interlocutor: We should set goals for ourselves, like living in Unitary Perception and living consciously.

RFG: Unitary Perception occurs only right now, therefore it can't be a goal.

LIVING CONSCIOUSLY CAN BE DONE, AS I SAID, IN UNITARY PERCEPTION OR IN FRAGMENTARY PERCEPTION.

Interlocutor: But we need a mental control of the ego, to be able to deny it.

RFG: It would suffice, with a bit of luck, to see the manifestations of the ego, like sadness, for example. IF WE

DENY SADNESS WITHOUT SEEING IT IN UNITARY PERCEPTION, LIKE THOSE WHO LISTEN TO THAT LITTLE MUSIC THEY MAKE TO AWAKEN THE DEAD, SADNESS WOULD BECOME UNCONSCIOUS. UNCONSCIOUS SADNESS MAKES OUR LIFE AN EMOTIONAL MISERY. BY THE WAY, THIS HAPPENS FREQUENTLY TO THOSE WHO DON'T LIVE IN UNITARY PERCEPTION, WHICH IS PRACTICALLY EVERYONE.

Interlocutor: You say that in Unitary Perception we manage to make time become irrelevant.

RFG: I couldn't have said such thing unless I was intoxicated with alcohol, which I wasn't. You have said an incoherent pleonasm. Let's say, instead, that in the present that is lived in Unitary Perception, time is irrelevant, without us making any effort, just as we haven't made an effort for it to be five in the afternoon now. We didn't manage to make it five in the afternoon!

In the complete peaceful attention of Unitary Perception, you don't look for anything. If you want to be here completely, you have nothing to look for. We haven't looked for anything for it to be five in the afternoon, and we can be aware without effort to the flow of life, RIGHT NOW.

Interlocutor: In Unitary Perception, the ears perceive light and the weight of the body at the same time.

RFG: Well, now we've fallen into the magical thought of Harry Potter, just like a British witch would.

But in reality, in Unitary Perception sound, light and gravitation are perceived at the same time. But your ears perceive only sound. Let's not fall into the imaginative fantasy of the ancient metaphysics.

Interlocutor: How do you think Jesus Christ or Jiddu Krishnamurti thought?

RFG: I believe they only thought when rational thought was necessary, and spent the rest of their life in the silent mind, in

Unitary Perception, thus inviting the sacred. It's what I attempt to do constantly.

Interlocutor: Do you think we are in the end of times?

RFG: Time ends right now, when we're truly living in Unitary Perception, in great peace.

THEN THE INTERNAL PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR, WHICH GIVES PLACE TO THE INVENTION OF ENEMIES AND EXTERNAL WAR, ENDS.

Interlocutor: Do you teach Unitary Perception to your loved ones?

RFG: I have done it, sometimes in vain. But I'm in immense peace when I attempt to live in Unitary Perception, right now.

It would be sad if I was the only one living in Unitary Perception, but not sad for me.

Interlocutor: Does positive thinking grow in Unitary Perception?

RFG: When you're in Unitary Perception, you see all that can be seen at the same time. You listen to all the perceptible sound at the same time. If you're doing it now, see how the mind becomes more silent and peaceful.

But in Unitary Perception you don't choose to see and hear only pleasant things.

Just imagine a diabetic person who “thinks positive” and tells himself “I will throw away the insulin that madman of a doctor prescribes me and I will eat as much milk caramel as I want, because milk caramel is good for me.”

Interlocutor: (Laughing) Is Unitary Perception a way of praying?

RFG: In Unitary Perception, the brain is in complete silence, in conscious contact with all the energy arriving at it

simultaneously, in that instant: light, gravitation, sound and cold. That's not prayer as we know it, but it's an effective invitation to the sacred, in a very little-known way.

Interlocutor: So the universe is perceived as an undivided reality.

RFG: The universe is THE UNDIVIDED REALITY. It's not A reality among many. Rubén's mom is not A Ruben's mom.

Interlocutor: You say Unitary Perception is not for everyone.

RFG: I say Unitary Perception is not for an elected few; it's for every human being.

BUT IN THE INTENSIVE WORKSHOP WE'RE SHARING NOW, HERE IN COYHAIQUE, CHILE, WE TEACH HOW MENTAL RETARDATION AND SCHIZOPHRENIA ARE DIAGNOSED, SINCE PEOPLE WITH THOSE DIAGNOSES CANNOT UNDERSTAND WHAT UNITARY PERCEPTION IS AND IS NOT.

But the retarded and schizophrenic are only 4% of all human beings.

We also say people with unipolar or bipolar depression have to start their medical treatment with antidepressants BEFORE attempting to live their whole life in Unitary Perception. David Bohm inherited his mother's depression and took the antidepressant called Sertraline. That allowed him to live in Unitary Perception, without the severe ups and downs and without the complications of a depressed person with no medical treatment.

We recommend to see the patients twelve times (in twelve sessions).

In the first session, one should inquire about suicidal or homicidal ideas, whether the patient is taking prescribed medicines or street drugs, look for symptoms of depression, bipolarity and schizophrenia and whether there are other health problems, disability, grief or mourning.

Unitary Perception has to be taught, which benefits the patient and the therapist simultaneously.

IN SESSION 12, WHICH IS THE LAST, WE RECOMMEND TO MAKE A CONTRACT TO REVIEW THE CASE AFTER SIX MONTHS, ASKING THE PATIENT TO LIVE DAILY IN UNITARY PERCEPTION, UNTIL DEATH.

Interlocutor: Can you summarize Holokinetic Psychology?

RFG: It's necessary that the radical psychological mutation occurs in the human being, which means Precinct C of the mind stops being preponderant, and takes its place only when needed.

Psychological mutation begins with Unitary Perception. The necessary spiritual development of the human being starts with Unitary Perception.

Dr. David Bohm has proven that current Physics no longer needs metaphysics.

However, the new Physics he starts is consistent with the spiritual wisdom of the written history of humanity.

The new revolutionary Physics that David Bohm proposes mathematically since 1986 goes beyond Quantum Mechanics and Einstein's Theory of Relativity, which appeared in the early 20th century.

Many scientists today ignore David Bohm, something that began with Robert Oppenheimer's advice to "ignore Bohm," when Bohm abandoned Project Manhattan, initiated and directed by Robert Oppenheimer, to produce the first "Atomic Bomb," which was later used against Japan twice, in August 1945.

David Bohm said, when he found out what the secret Manhattan Project was all about: "I didn't study Physics to make weapons, but to understand matter and energy."

He quit this project, but his teacher, Robbert Oppenheimer, couldn't forgive him.

We cannot ignore the implications of the Holokinetic Physics of David Bohm in every area of human activity. I had the chance to meet Bohm in 1978. Since I am a psychiatrist, that made the first visible implication of Holokinetic Physics to be seen in the field of Psychology and Psychiatry.

This is called Holokinetic Psychology; its main concept is Unitary Perception.

Before meeting David Bohm in person, I spoke about Nuclear Psychology and Triangular Consciousness (the *perception* that encompasses the *perceptible* and the *perceiver*, at the same time, hence the name “triangular consciousness.”)

I've spoken to professors in Psychology and Psychiatry around the world. Very few of them understand the implications in Psychology of this Revolution in Physics.

Physics was not included in the education of a 20th century psychologist.

We can now speak about Scientific Psychology for the first time.

The Copernican Revolution places the Sun at the center of our planetary system.

This brought about big changes, but the Holokinetic Revolution of David Bohm is much deeper, because it refers to the intimacy of the nature of matter and energy.

Since mind is the universal interface between matter and energy, the nature of Psychology itself changes.

Unitary Perception is the most important fact of the mind. That is the fact we try to attempt to describe.

It's not a new theory. It's much more than that.

Unitary Perception can't be explained with any Psychology from the 20th century.

It can only be explained with Holokinetic Psychology.

The Psychology of the 20th century helps us understand what we now call Precinct C of the mind, but this is only one of the mind's precincts.

Precinct C is conscious and unconscious (mostly unconscious). But we shouldn't confuse the unconscious of Precinct C with the implicit order of mind, matter and energy.

What has happened with prominent psychologists, who have read my books and participated in my Intensive Introductory Workshops to Holokinetic Psychology, is that after hearing “the Mass” of Holokinetic Psychology, they go back to “the Procession” of the therapeutic modalities of the 20th century, which is what they already knew.

It's difficult to hear the Mass and be in the Procession at the same time.

This means they DON'T UNDERSTAND THE FACT of Unitary Perception or the PROFOUND BASES IT HAS IN SCIENCE (Physics, Chemistry, Neurology, Genetics, Sociology, Epistemology, etc.) which explain its enormous importance.

David Bohm has brought a profound revolution in the epistemology of Science, soon followed by the revolution in the meaning of Psychology.

David Bohm did not bring a new way of thinking in Physics.

He brought a new Physics.

We could summarize it as the Physics of Undivided Universal Reality, which is in movement, in flux.

This Physics needs the New Psychology, which is the contribution I have made, thanks to my contacts with Jiddu Krishnamurti and David Bohm for over a decade.

We need to acquire the clarified language of the two orders of the universe: implicit and explicit; the three mental precincts: A, B and C, as well as the four aspects of the explicit order of the universe and of mind: quantum, energetic, molecular and psychosocial.

Known psychotherapies are merely psychosocial.

We have to attempt without effort to live in Precinct B of the Mind (Unitary Perception) but we can't do anything about Precinct A.

Mind is not only the product of the interaction between the organism and the environment, from the fetus until death (what we call Precinct C). Mind is also part of the cosmic Holokinesis (Precinct B).

In Unitary Perception, the observer is part of all the observable, which means that as I listen to all the sound at the same time, I'm seeing without effort all the movements of thought, including that late product of thought known as ego, with its fears, sorrows, angers, hatreds, jealousy, envy and desires. All of this happens in the dualities of contradiction and paradox, as the macro-history of humanity reveals.

I don't speak about anybody's teaching; I speak about Unitary Perception, which is a mental fact of the human being. It's not a theory.

Unitary Perception facilitates enlightenment, but it has to be the constant foundation of our whole daily life, and not just another knowledge or fantasy of the intellect.

(...)

[End of the reading].

RFG: It's a nice dialogue, don't you think? It was in Chile, south of Chile. Coyhaique, a wonderfully beautiful place. It's midwinter in August, lots of snow, but when I went there

during summer, it was all green. A beautiful place. This dialogue took place there, Coyhaique, Chile, the Chilean Patagonia.

After meeting, we took a van from Comodoro Rivadavia to Coyhaique, and I visited the Sarmiento petrified forest. It's a forest that's turned to stone, it's a very interesting area. That's in the far south [of Chile].

This dialogue has many interesting things, especially regarding language, but before commenting it, it would be good to check for questions or comments here.

No questions here. Or in Buenos Aires.

Audience: “No,” they say.

RFG: In this dialogue you can see, as in an “expo,” the first question: “You speak about living the present.” When you start to teach (soon, hopefully) Holokinetic Psychology and Unitary Perception, you'll run into this question: “Are you talking about living the present?” Well, which present? Present A, present B or present C? It's like Jiddu Krishnamurti, when he talks about mind, he uses the word mind, but he doesn't clarify which he is talking about: A, B or C.

It's clear for the informed reader, who already knows that *mind* means thought, *mind* means Unitary Perception and *mind* means the sacred (That) for Krishnamurti. He uses the word mind with the three meanings and only in context does it become clear. We make it clear. Every time we speak about the subject, we start by saying which mind we're talking about. It's important to understand this from the beginning, because otherwise, what happens to Krishnamurti's readers will happen to us: they get completely confused. Careful. Are we talking about living in the present? Yes, but which one? A, B or C?

In the second question, another problem appears: “We must kill the ego.” There are gurus out there saying you have to kill the ego. “Guru” means “spiritual guide.”

Careful, to kill the ego is an impossible thing, completely impossible. Or terminate thought: completely impossible. Thought is the replication of the molecular movement of neurons, which never ends as long as a human being is alive. Thought has a super-production, we should say, by Warner Brothers (laughter), a super-production called "I," called "I" or ego.

Both thought and the ego will be with us until death, they will be with us until death. Now, in Unitary Perception we will have relief from thought and the "I," but we won't kill the "I" or terminate thought; it's about seeing how the "I" manifests and how thought moves, in multiple ways, both subtle and coarse, thought as well as the ego.

But the most common thing about the "I," the first thing we will notice is its fear, its anger, its sadness. The fear that keeps us from saying "I won't kill" when we're sent to fight as soldiers. The fear that keeps us from seeing reality as it is; it's very unpleasant sometimes, so we fall into denial of reality. And the deep sadness in which we are sometimes, not only because we see the state of mankind, but also our own state. We deny that and we don't see. It's not about killing that sadness or terminating sadness, but seeing it in Unitary Perception while we listen to all the sound.

You can't go out of memory, like the man in the dialogue says, by feeling your breathing, which is what gurus say. You won't go out of memory by feeling your breathing. Breathing is a part of the C functioning of the brain. That's why it is repeated, sixteen times a minute, and it'll always be sixteen times a minute unless there is a problem in the lungs or the brain. So, breathing is an unconscious act of Precinct C. It means that, by doing breathing techniques, we will never, ever go out of Precinct C.

The base of holokinetic psychotherapy is to have the patient go from C to B. If it is possible, the therapist should be in B when he starts to teach the patient how to go from C to B. That's the ideal thing: to live Unitary Perception before teaching it.

The interlocutor brings something that seems subtle here, but it's actually rather coarse, and it comes from a fragmentary understanding of Sigmund Freud, of psychoanalysis. "We have to make Precinct C of the mind become conscious," that is, that the unconscious, which is the 99% of C, becomes conscious, which is 1% of C. But as long as we don't want to see things as they are, which is what we do, the unconscious of C will exist.

Another thing the interlocutor brings up, a very common thing, is that "we have to set goals for ourselves." How can you live without goals? When we speak about managing time with Cecilia to make it to the CPH at nine, since the class begins at ten, we have to think about what time we will have dinner and go to bed on Saturday. Not only what time we will get up on Sunday, because we have to come here fully rested; to come here rested is a responsibility, as well as arriving here one hour earlier, why? Because we have to place the tables, set up this whole communication system we have with Ireland and Buenos Aires. We have to be responsible of giving this class a high level, that must be done in Unitary Perception and calmly. You can't do this in a rush, you can't do it "quick and dirty." Do you use that expression here?

Audience: No. But it's a good one.

RFG: Do it well. If you're going to do something, do it well, even if it's just coffee.

So, should we set goals? Well, yes, we have to have dinner early on Saturday and go to bed early, to get up early in order to arrive here one hour in advance, and have everything ready by 10 AM. That's setting goals; in your everyday life, it's important to have an order, related to time to be punctual, and being punctual without rushes so you can be in peace. Not rushing into punctuality, getting anxious and agitated just to be punctual, no, no. It's about being punctual without losing your peace, for which you have to live in peace, move in peace, and have clarity about what our time is and how we use it. All of that is good: setting goals, sure. The rational use of Precinct C.

But in Precinct B, there are no goals, because it's only now. I mean, where do I have to go in order to listen? I can listen anywhere. How much time do I need to listen? None, right now. You can listen right now. What do I have to think of to listen? Nothing, it's only listening. That's why we say Unitary Perception is not a product of thought, and it's based on listening, seeing and feeling the weight at the same time. That's not a product of thought, therefore it's not a technique. Therefore, it's not about setting goals like we do on Saturdays to arrive early to the Sunday class. We have to set a goal of C to get here early, but if we're in Unitary Perception, we can set that goal in great peace, while we use Precinct C rationally, because B encompasses C. It's not the other way around, but B encompasses C.

Another thing the interlocutor says... each question from him is an example of what not to do. "We need a conscious mental control of the ego, to be able to deny it." Conscious control of what, the "I"? That's the same as having conscious control of the unicorn.

Audience: Sure he wasn't a schizophrenic? (laughter)

RFG: No, no, this boy was very interested in everything, but he's using a language he hears in the medium where he moves, which is the language all of you will hear when you start teaching this. This is the language you'll face, which is used in the university, in the Faculty of Psychology.

"We need a conscious mental control of the ego, to be able to deny it." Deny the "I"? No. We're saying see it, see how it manifests. "Conscious mental control." Such a thing is but a fantasy, a part of imaginary life.

"You say in Unitary Perception we manage to make time become irrelevant." We don't make time become irrelevant. Time IS irrelevant and we discover that in Unitary Perception. Not that we managed to make it. That's like saying we managed to make it half past one in the afternoon. It happened while we were in the class, and now I look at the clock and it's half past one. No, we didn't manage to make time become

irrelevant in Unitary Perception, we just DISCOVERED that time is irrelevant.

“And in Unitary Perception, the ears perceive light and the weight of the body at the same time.” Careful, this is an exam question. I think 80% got this one wrong. In the final written exam, 80% of people get this one wrong. I don't know if you, Cecilia, remember the question.

Audience: Can the ear perceive light?

RFG: The question is: can the ear perceive light? 80% answer “yes.”

Audience: “Only in Unitary Perception.”

RFG: “Yes, only in Unitary Perception.” That is, the ear cannot perceive light, not even in Unitary Perception. The ear is made to perceive sound and the eye to perceive light. The ear cannot perceive light or the weight of the body, it just perceives sound. What we say is that at the same time, in Unitary Perception, you perceive sound, light and weight, which are the three energies arriving at the posterior brain. Light, sound and gravitation.

And when he asks how JesuKristos or Jiddu Krishnamurti thought, we enter the realm of philosophy or speculation. Well, my answer was that I sensibly believe they only thought when it was necessary, because if you don't need to think, why will you think? If there is Unitary Perception, we can live in the ecstasy, the beauty, the peace, the joy without cause of Unitary Perception. No problem remains to haunt us: guilt, jealousy, fear, anger, sadness; those shouldn't be there in Unitary Perception, because they don't exist in Unitary Perception.

Then comes another very frequent question: “Do you think we are in the end of times?” We know that when we make the holokinetic exegesis of the Kristian teaching, when JesuKristos says: “The end of time has come,” I find it really, really sensible, because the cross itself tells us that eternity goes across the center of time, which is the horizontal. Eternity

passes through there, or rather, here; eternity is in this moment. Careful with letting it go and not realizing that eternity is in this moment, because there is no other moment for eternity but the present. This means the end of times has come... when? Now! Right now there is no tomorrow or yesterday. What Jesus is saying is almost comically simple and straightforward, but it has been interpreted in a convoluted, absurd way. "The end of times has come means it's all over. Even the politicians' speeches will be over." No.

So, "Do you think we're in the end of times?" Well, yes, according to what JesuKristos said, interpreted sensibly. The future and the past are over when we're here completely in Unitary Perception, but not because the world is going to end.

"Do you teach Unitary Perception to your loved ones?" No one can say I haven't tried, but I have to say I haven't been very lucky. The only one who understood was my father, may he rest in peace, who was making jokes all the time, he was very light. I think that's because he had understood that you have to be here, that there's no other place to live than here. It doesn't matter where you are. So everything becomes light. You could tell he was light, he was joyful for no reason. He was constantly joyful for no reason. May he rest in peace, my father. But I think he's the only one in my family who listened, which is a common thing: people not listening to the teaching of Unitary Perception is not an exception.

"Does positive thinking grow in Unitary Perception?" A very fragmentary question. It means you can interpret it in the best case as "everything is okay in Unitary Perception." We won't say that. That you're in peace doesn't mean that everything will be alright, but you can be in a storm without tormenting yourself.

That's true, we can be in a storm without tormenting ourselves. We can be in the hospital the world has become, the madhouse the world has become, the slaughterhouse the world has become, in peace. That's possible, but not that positive thinking grows. It doesn't mean I'm in the madhouse but I say: "Everything is fine and everyone here thinks in a sensible

way.” No, I'm in the madhouse and it's full of people who cannot think sensibly, that's why they're in the madhouse.

You can be thinking sensibly in the madhouse. Not that positive thinking grows. That positive thinking deal is another part of imaginary life.

He asks if Unitary Perception is a way of praying. I think that, if there is a perfect way of praying, it's Unitary Perception, because it's the direct contact with the sacred. Words take us away from the sacred.

He asks if the universe is perceived as an undivided reality. Well, the universe IS the undivided reality. Who says it isn't the undivided reality? Thought. Thought separates: the Solar System is over here, it's a part of the Milky Way Galaxy, and there's another galaxy over there, etc. But reality is undivided, as proven by the EPR, Bell's Theorem, Bohm's Holokinesis and everything we've seen... the hologram too.

“You say Unitary Perception is not for everyone.” I say it's for 96% of people, so it is for everyone. Not for the retarded child or a schizophrenic, but practically for everyone. In this sense, there are no privileges. But there are people who are mentally ill who will not understand what Unitary Perception is. It's a fact, it's reality. We don't fall into imaginary life when we have to see things as they are.

Then he asks me for a summary of Holokinetic Psychology. I did my best to give a good summary.

You can now see that it's a serious task to deal with people who have a lot of confusion, not only about what the world is, but about the way in which we refer to human life and all the things we know. We use a very fragmentary, very temporal, very hypnotic language. Essentially, an egocentric language, due to the nature of language itself. That's what we have to see, perhaps not fix, in the sense of healing that language and letting another language arise, but at least in the sense of being aware that our language contains all those incoherencies.

Any other question or comment here? Or in Buenos Aires?

Audience: About the four aspects: quantum, molecular, psychosocial, what can you tell me?

RFG: The four aspects. The four aspects are the explanation of reality having only the meter as a point of reference. Actually, the meter is one of the greatest references we have. A physician who doesn't know what a meter is cannot be a physician. "Medic" means "he who measures," "measurer." Medic. He gives you three hundred milligrams of aspirin or eighty-one milligrams of aspirin according to the need. But in the whole reality, if they told you: let's explain the whole universe with the meter, how do we do it? That question is answered with the aspects of the universe. We have the three orders of the mind: A, B, C.

Audience: Precincts.

RFG: I'm sorry, I said "orders". The three Precincts of the mind: A, B, C. We have the two orders of the universe, implicit and explicit, which David Bohm discovers thanks to the hologram. We have the aspects, which are the way of observing the universal reality taking only the meter as a reference.

To what aspect of the universe does this class belong, if we use the meter? We're in Mexicali, in the CPH, which is so-and-so square meters, and we're in one of the classrooms or rooms of the CPH, which is so-and-so meters. There are so-and-so people, so-and-so centimeters from each other, and those people are in a psychosocial interrelationship. Then we may call this aspect the PSYCHOSOCIAL ASPECT. Why? Because you measure it in meters, kilometers, do you understand? Mexico is so-and-so square kilometers.

We have the psychosocial aspect if we use the meter as reference, in what refers to the mental life of human beings. And below that psychosocial aspect, is there another aspect? Yes, one you can measure with micro-microns, of the meter, which is the MOLECULAR ASPECT, which is in each of our cells.

The nucleus is so-and-so micro-millimeters. There are the systems, the cell organs, which are in the nucleus, in the different organs of the cell. That's the molecular aspect.

We have the psychosocial aspect and then, at the level of micro-microns, the molecular aspect, which is where the medication that helps the depressed or the schizophrenic acts. Medications act at the molecular level.

Holokinetic psychotherapy, Unitary Perception, acts at a much deeper level, and benefits the psychosocial aspect too, but from way below, as we will see now.

Known psychotherapies are all within the psychosocial aspect. That is, they bring benefits to the psychosocial aspect only, they don't reach the molecular level like Unitary Perception does, now we will see why.

Below the molecular precinct... sorry, the molecular ASPECT. We have to be careful with the words order, precinct and aspect.

Below the molecular aspect, is there any other aspect? Yes. Measured with the meter, even finer is the ENERGETIC ASPECT. For instance, light, which within the energetic aspect is the most common thing. It's what we're most aware of, light in the energetic aspect, which is electromagnetic energy within a spectrum that ranges from 4000 to 8000 angstroms, which are a millionth of a millimeter –the angstrom. From 4000 to 8000 angstroms we have light. Beyond 8000 angstroms there's infrared rays and below 4000 we have ultraviolet rays. We don't see those, ultraviolet and infrared. They're used therapeutically too.

Besides light, just electromagnetic energy, are there other things? Yes, none of which are visible. Gamma rays aren't visible, they have a much shorter wavelength than light. X-rays aren't visible, wavelength much shorter than light. Hertzian (radio) waves are immense waves that measure up to a hundred meters long, which are not perceptible by the eye, but by the ear.

We have the precinct... sorry, aspect. Careful, an order is a thing, precincts are three: A, B, C and two orders.

Now we're in the third aspect, which is energy. Below the energetic aspect, always using the meter, which is our reference point, we have the QUANTUM ASPECT. The quantum aspect. The quantum paradox: the electron behaves as a particle and as a wave, etc. Bohm has a book about that, it's worth reading. I think it's called *Quantum Mechanics*.

What is below the quantum aspect? Holokinesis! Holokinesis, which is not measurable. It's not measurable. Why is it not measurable? Because the quantum aspect is 10^{-37} millimeters. That is, it's much below the perceptible and even the imaginable. Bohm said: "In the quantum aspect we cannot speak about things as we speak about billiard balls, but rather, we have to speak about everything being inter-penetrated, and that the whole of reality is undivided" and the understanding, the notion of reality as undivided is born, why? Because there is a quantum aspect of reality that unites all that exists. And below that is Holokinesis, which is where Unitary Perception acts, where it acts from, and so it puts the quantum aspect in order, it gets better, and it brings order to the energetic aspect and to the molecular aspect like medication does. I was cured of arthritis thanks to Unitary Perception; Cecilia has been through two cancers already. Luis' allergy was cured in seven days. It means that, from the holokinetic aspect, which is so subtle we can barely measure it... Bohm even said: "The words *subtle* and *simple* cannot be defined." From there, from the holokinetic aspect, the quantum, the energetic, the molecular and the psychosocial aspects get better, something that Gestalt therapy or Psychoanalysis can't do, since they operate on the psychosocial aspect only, they don't reach all the way down there, where things are very subtle and "can't be imagined as if they were billiard balls" –David Bohm says- "but as a flux of inter-penetrated activity." "The atom itself is a cloud," says Bohm.

It's not a billiard ball, the atom itself, at that level... I'm sorry, in that aspect, not level. In that aspect, the atom can be defined better as a cloud than as a billiard ball. It means the sodium

atom, for instance, behaves like a blue cloud in sodium chloride; as a smaller, red cloud in sodium nitrate, etc., and they don't have a permanent existence: that cloud will disappear at some time in the fluctuations of sodium nitrate and sodium chloride.

Do you understand what I'm trying to say? Aspect: always with the meter as measurement, and the reality we're seeing, having the meter as a reference. That's where the word aspect comes from, which we shouldn't confuse with order or with precinct. Precincts: A, B and C; orders; explicit and implicit and the aspects, which depend on the meter.

Any question about all this? Do you understand this in Buenos Aires? Do you all understand this here? Because we'll see therapies in the future that will act, not at the molecular level like antidepressants, but at the energetic level, as we're already doing with infrared and ultraviolet rays; therapies that act at the quantum level, and holokinetic therapies, that will appear perhaps halfway through the 21st century.

Any question or comments in Buenos Aires?

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* I didn't quite understand that about the atom as a cloud that later will... I didn't get that part.

RFG: Bohm tells us... Here we have David Bohm, let's see what he tells us about the atom. Look at how David Bohm describes the atom. I will read him not to betray him.

Audience: Rubén, can you give me five seconds?

RFG: Ah, we'll resume this after we change tapes.

[Technical break.]

We'll see the definition of atom according to Bohm, and why he speaks about the atom as something that looks more like a cloud than a billiard ball. Related to the aspects we've just described. Bohm says:

“The atom is a poorly defined cloud that behaves like a wave, and also behaves like a particle at the same time (a cloud, we can't think of it as if it was a billiard ball) and it's not independent.”

The atom is not independent, it's always in relation to something. In sodium chloride, sodium is in relation to chloride; in sodium nitrate, sodium is in relation to nitrate or rather, to nitric acid. Sodium is in relation to nitric acid to become sodium nitrate. The atom is not independent, we gave two examples.

The atom is not permanent, because its function depends on the context or environment. Once it stops being sodium chloride or sodium nitrate, where does the sodium atom go? We have no evidence of where the sodium atom goes, but Bohm says it's not permanent and it's likely that, in other context, other environment, it'll disappear. It's not separate from its environment, it depends on its context. So, with chloride, it makes sodium chloride. Chloride behaves as an acid, it's an atom that behaves as an acid, it's an anion, and sodium is a cation. In the same way, nitric acid is an anion and sodium is a cation, and they make a salt. But it means none of them, anions and cations, are independent of their context, so they are CONTEXT-DEPENDENT.

I don't know if this atom issue is clearer now. I hope it's clarified, at least in how Bohm defines the atom as a cloud. We shouldn't think of it as a billiard ball, but rather as a cloud.

Is this answered?

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* Yes, yes, perfect. We're talking about the measurable aspect here. So holokinesis is from the measurable aspect.

RFG: Holokinesis can't be measured, it can't be measured, which doesn't mean it's not a scientific fact. I mean, you can't measure Unitary Perception, but since it is consensual –because if I teach it to you, you'll get the same as me– for that reason it is scientific, not because you can measure it. Measuring

something does not make it scientific. It needs to be consensual, i.e., that if I teach Unitary Perception to you, you live the same thing I live: the same peace, the same energy, the same joy for no reason.

Even in the Gospel there is a parable, the parable of the vineyard, which I had never understood. The vineyard's owner hires workers at noon to harvest the grapes; at three in the afternoon, he hires more workers, and then more workers at five; at six o'clock, when the sun sets, he gathers them all and pays the same to everyone. So those who started at noon, who had worked for six hours, complain: "You're paying those who worked for an hour the same you paid me, who worked six hours." I used to say "That's so unfair of the vineyard owner, I can't believe this is in a sacred book like the Gospel," but it's a parable about what we're saying. If I teach Unitary Perception to a person, that person will be in the same peace I am, even if I discovered Unitary Perception, thank God, at age thirty-four. When I teach it to Chuy, who's twenty years old, he will feel the same peace I have felt in the last thirty-five years. Does that mean the salary is the same for me and for him? Of course, the salary is the peace of Unitary Perception. That's the parable of the vineyard owner, that's the meaning: that if I teach this to a fourteen-year-old, as we're trying to do now, if he understands it, his salary will be the same as mine, even if I've been attempting Unitary Perception for thirty-five years: peace, joy for no reason, energy. That's the parable of the vineyard owner: we all get the same salary, no matter at which time we arrived to start the job. No matter what time we arrived at Unitary Perception, the salary will be peace, joy for nothing and energy. Is this understood?

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Yes, thanks.

RFG: If there was a question or comment...

So, we're talking about something scientific, because it's consensual, because the peace that someone who's in Unitary Perception feels can be transmitted at any moment, and that person will live the same that this other person, who has lived perhaps for years in Unitary Perception, is feeling.

That's why we say: there are no hierarchies. Hierarchies are a deep corruption, especially in the spiritual field. Thirty-grades, cardinals, popes, lamas. All those things [hierarchy] are a disgraceful corruption of spiritual life. There is no hierarchy in spiritual life. What does exist is what JesuKristos said: in spiritual life there is communion, which has nothing to do with hierarchies. There is fraternity in communion, which has nothing to do with hierarchies. Hierarchy is a distortion based on the desire for power and control over people, but it has nothing to do with spiritual life. We see that at every step in the Gospel, as we can see in the parable of the vineyard, which is very clear, and as we see at every step through the Gospel, they talk about communion, not hierarchies.

It's two [in the afternoon] already, we started a bit late. I don't know if you have questions or comments, either here or in Buenos Aires.

Audience: So we can say: the four aspects of the implicit order...

RFG: Explicit. Four aspects of the explicit order, precisely because it is measurable. In the implicit order there is no measure. In the implicit order there is the one energy. Remember when I moved my arm? The less distance the movement covers, the more energy it implies. The less distance the movement covers, the more energy. When movement is from here to here, all the energy is there.

Anything else?

Audience: No, I just had the idea that five aspects were used. Now there were four, but I don't remember...

RFG: Someone made a diagram in which mind was included as an aspect, but, what is the mistake? The mistake is that the universe is formed by mind, matter and energy, and mind, matter and energy have an explicit and an implicit order. It means you can't place mind as an aspect, but the same aspect exist in the explicit order in any of the three components of the universe: matter, mind and energy. Mind is not an aspect, but

one of the parts of the universe. In the explicit order of matter-mind-energy (there is also an implicit order in the whole universe of mind-matter-energy) but in the explicit order of mind you have the aspects, just like in matter and just like in energy.

Mind is not an aspect. You can't measure it with the meter like you measure aspects. But there is a diagram out there that has to be corrected, we have to take out mind as an aspect.

Audience: Not the psychosocial, but the mind –or the psychosocial?

RFG: Mind was [in that diagram] as an aspect, just like psychosocial, molecular and energetic. Mind is not an aspect.

Audience: I don't know if those in Argentina heard that holokinetic is not an aspect of the explicit order. There are four aspects of the explicit order and the implicit order has no aspects.

RFG: There are no aspects in the implicit order; it is immeasurable and indefinable. It is only inferable. We know it exists, because intelligence screams at us it does, and because there is evidence: EPR, hologram, Bell's mathematical Theorem, etc. Bohm's Holokinesis. But it's only inferable, not measurable.

In the implicit order there is energy as a single thing, and in the explicit order, the many forms of energy exist. We know them: electromagnetism, gravitation, nuclear force, weak force, sound, etc.

Any other question or comment?

I insist, why do we talk about aspects? What do we need to relate the meter with reality for? Because of the therapies that will appear and those who already exist. Holokinetic therapy, holokinetic psychotherapy, is a new therapy that acts in the most subtle aspect. That's why it brings benefit to all the aspects: quantum, energetic, molecular and psychosocial. I believe that's the reason I was cured of arthritis, and the reason

Cecilia is still alive after two cancers; and there are many more cases, of course. There are many, many examples of how the new therapies can work. How many therapies will appear in the future, besides holokinetic psychotherapy? Many, many.

Audience: No other in psychology, I guess.

RFG: No other in psychology, sure. But, can you imagine something being applied in medicine at the quantum level? How it could benefit all the aspects; or having a technology appear that, as Bohm said, allows us to “plug into” the implicit order. Then we could not only travel to the stars, because that would be endless energy, but, how could that be applied to medicine? We don't have the slightest idea. When I asked these questions to Bohm, he would answer: “We don't have the slightest idea,” as the honest person he was.

We're actually talking about the unimaginable. A humanity that, if it survives, takes Unitary Perception seriously, will encounter a delicious way of life.

Audience: There's a question from Argentina.

RFG: Go ahead.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] I got confused a bit. The aspects of the explicit order are: psychosocial, molecular, energetic, quantum. Holokinesis is not measurable, but inferable, and it's of the implicit order. It is not the fifth aspect, or is it?

RFG: Don't forget the definition of holokinesis: the movement from here to here between the implicit order and the explicit order of all the matter, mind and energy in the universe. So it exists in the whole universe, right here, in your body and in mine –Holokinesis. I insist: movement from here to here between the two orders of everything there is in the universe: matter, mind and energy. I don't know if that makes it clearer.

Audience: Yes. So it has an explicit aspect and an implicit aspect.

RFG: Order, not aspect.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires, corrects self*] Yes, the implicit order.

RFG: Holokinesis “moves,” let's put it this way –or doesn't move, as you prefer (laughter), between... Actually, it moves, because it is a form of movement. It is the paradox of movement, which is movement –Bohm said– from here to here between the two orders: explicit and implicit. We repeat again that the word *between* comes from our conception of distance, space and time before Bohm. But it is kind of difficult to understand “between” when we're speaking about an implicit order that occupies the same place as the explicit order. Both orders occupy the same space, therefore using *between* is an idiomatic defect that we inherited from Fragmentary Perception, prior to Bohm. Do you follow?

Audience: Yes, yes.

RFG: As long as we see all these things, there is no problem. The problem is when they go unnoticed and become hypnosis, and this stays only in Precinct C.

Audience: [*another student from Buenos Aires*] Rubén, a question: when you say Unitary Perception is contact with Holokinesis, conscious contact with Holokinesis, we're not saying, as far as I understand, that the movement between the implicit and explicit orders is becoming conscious for us, but that we're being aware of energy, of the unity of energy.

RFG: Exactly, exactly.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] So when we say the implicit order is only inferable, I think the word “only” brings me doubts, in the sense of it being only inferable from Precinct C. It can become conscious in Precinct B; it's only inferable from Precinct C.

RFG: Right, very well said, very well said. It's only inferable from Precinct C and it can be verified in Precinct B.

Audience: Lived.

RFG: It is lived in Precinct B when energy grows, because you're in contact with Holokinesis, in conscious contact. In Unitary Perception you live (experience) what you can only infer from Precinct C. That's very good, very good.

Any other comment or question...

Audience: I don't know if you'll speak about holonomy later.

RFG: I don't think it's worth it, because those are things Pribram went into because of the question he was asked, but with what we already know about the hologram is enough for Holokinetic Psychology.

Audience: But there is an oral question: what is holonomy?

RFG: Come again?

Audience: But there is a question in the oral exam: what is holonomy?

RFG: Yes, it's something Karl Pribram invented as the law behind something that is the implicit order and Holokinesis. A law that would be derived from Holokinesis. So the brain can also be seen from holonomy, that memory is in every part of the universe –sorry. Well, some people say that too, but no, I meant something else: that memory is in every part of the brain. Holonomically, we can see memory that way, but not neurologically, because neurologically, the brain is already divided in parts, like the visual area, Broca's area, the motor area, the auditory area, etc. The brain has its areas, which Broca described very well. It's the known neurological way of studying the brain.

When Karl Pribram coins the word *holonomy*, he's not trying to invalidate Broca, who classified the brain in its functional parts, especially the cortex, not the inner part. Broca classifies the cortex functionally, but not the inner part.

And what Pribram says is that with holonomy, we'll be able to talk about the brain in a way that's closer to Holokinesis.

Audience: Holographically.

RFG: In a holographic way. He said "holographic" at the beginning. Then he called it holonomic. He has a series of things that seem to be inexorably connected to philosophy, when he wasn't trying to make philosophy. When he says "holonomy," when he says "nomy," law, he's in danger of being seen as a philosopher, which wasn't Karl Pribram's intention.

I told Karl Pribram: "Will you keep working in the US Navy forever?" He tells me: "No. Once I discover the invisible man, I'm leaving" (laughter). He wasn't kidding, he wasn't kidding. You know well there was the Philadelphia experiment, Tesla was going into that field, trying to make the invisible ship... invisible to radars? No! They intended to make it invisible to the eye. That's why they were playing with magnetic fields, like Tesla was. Pribram wasn't just being funny. He was making a joke, but I knew well it was no joke, that he was continuing Tesla's attempts of the Philadelphia experiment.

Audience: In *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, Bohm retakes holonomy a bit. Because he talks about it.

RFG: No, the thing is that Bohm explains all of this. Bohm is the one who can gather Pribram's holonomy, explain the Philadelphia experiment and explain Tesla with only Holokinesis, without resorting to further interpretative fragmentations in science. Holokinesis is enough to explain all those phenomena. That's what's great about Bohm, and sadly there is a great resistance to seeing it. It's no surprise, because we know well what happened to Galileo, Copernicus and Ptolemy: the history of science is populated with horrors like what is going on with Bohm. Ignoring Bohm. That trend of ignoring Bohm won't last much. It cannot last.

Okay, this is the end of Class 7. We'll meet again within three Sundays, because I'm supposed to be in Barcelona the next two

Sundays, to give a workshop there. Thank you very much, and see you in three Sundays. Good luck.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Rubén, excuse me. I didn't know you were finishing, but I wanted to make a last comment then. When you say Unitary Perception is contact with Holokinesis, perhaps it would be more precise to say "with the implicit order," i.e., with the explicit order too, and also the implicit order. Or is that distinction unnecessary?

RFG: It's unnecessary, because Holokinesis is precisely the movement between both. I insist, if we contemplate the word *between* and put it in its place, then we have to say it is the contact with Holokinesis, which includes both orders.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Good, perfect. Thank you.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Have a good trip.

RFG: Thank you! Greetings to everybody there. A big hug.

Audience: [From Buenos Aires] Thanks for everything, a hug.

RFG: On the contrary! A hug to you all.

TOPICS - CLASS 8

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 8 (465)
- REVIEW OF THE EXAMEN ON HOLOKINESIS (465)
- REVIEW OF THE EXAMAN ON DIAGNOSIS (468)
- PRESENTATION ON A DIALOGUE MEETING(475)
- READING: DIALOGUE ON CONSCIOUSNESS (476)
- CLARIFICATIONS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT: DIALOGUE ON CONSCIOUSNESS (486)
- INTELLIGENCE AND LOVE IN PRECINCT C AND IN PRECINCT B (488)
- INVITATION TO FRATERNAL, EXPLORATORY DIALOGUE (492)
- HISTORIC TRAGEDY OF THE WORD *MIND* (494)
- CLARIFYING THE MEANING OF FREE WILL (501)
- HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY (504)
- DIAGNOSTICS THAT DO NOT BENEFIT FROM UNITARY PERCEPTION (504)
- WHAT DOES SLEEPING WELL MEAN? (504)
- HORIZONTAL CONFLICT, TECHNIQUES AND KNOWN PSYCHOTHERAPIES (505)
- THE OBJECTIVE OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY (506)
- HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY: COMPLETE UNDERSTANDIGN OF TIME (506)
- SOME CONCEPTS OF THE OLD PARADIGM IN PSYCHOLOGY (512)
- QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTES -CLASS 8 (513)
- PROGNOSIS IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY (515)

- MAIN FEATURES OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY (516)
- FIRST ROLE REVERSAL (THERAPIST-PATIENT) -CLASS 8 (517)
- FEEDBACK ON THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL -CLASS 8 (518)
- SECOND PART OF THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL (THERAPIST-PATIENT) CLASS 8 (526)
- FEEDBACK (SECOND PART OF THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL) -CLASS 8 (528)
- HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY SESSION: LAST COMMENTS (531)
- QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (534)

CLASS 8

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, September 26th, 2010.

RFG: Good day! September 26. Two Sundays have passed, during which I was in Barcelona, in a very international workshop. There was people from Portugal, France and people who had come from all Spain, and even from Argentina. I, of course, went there from Mexico. A good workshop.

And now, we're going to go over all we have seen through the exams, starting with the one on Holokinesis, which was the last one. Eduardo, does the hologram employ light or laser?

Audience: Laser.

RFG: Laser. The hologram uses laser. Eduardo: what is Holokinesis?

Audience: It's the undivided energy from which the other energies are born, and it's only inferable.

RFG: Hmm, yes, you're defining the implicit order. What about Holokinesis, Bohm's mathematical formulation; what is it that Bohm formulates when he calls that thing Holokinesis? What is he referring to?

Audience: The total movement between the implicit order and the explicit order.

RFG: Right, which is in the whole universe! And what fundamental feature does that movement have, for the first time in history, in the histories of both science and mankind? What kind of movement is that?

Audience: From here to here.

RFG: From here to here! Holokinesis is the movement from here to here between the explicit order and the implicit order, in the whole universe. Mathematically demonstrated by David Bohm. Without which we can't continue studying Psychology, as it was done in the 20th century; we have to do it with Holokinetic Psychology. The first scientific paradigm in Psychology.

The EPR. What does the EPR show, Eduardo?

Audience: That two electrons maintain a relationship without time and space being relevant.

RFG: Exactly, so, what does that prove about reality?

Audience: Well, that time and space are an illusion, that they are products of thought.

RFG: Perhaps not space, but time is. Time is a product of thought. Space isn't, but time is a product of thought. Now the EPR manifests that reality is undivided. That's what it manifests, that there is a single undivided reality! Human thought divides it.

Well, let's take Yolanda. Unitary Perception: a) is unconscious contact with Holokinesis; b) is Holokinesis emerging to holographic memory, c) is contact with "A," or d) is conscious contact with Holokinesis.

Audience: Conscious contact with Holokinesis.

RFG: Right, it's the last one. Unitary Perception is conscious contact with Holokinesis. That's why the organism is so energized with Unitary Perception, in a short time. Yolanda: what is the hologram? Is it the memory across the whole brain, or is it a photographic technique, or both?

Audience: The photographic technique.

RFG: It's a photographic technique (laughter). Watch out, because many get it wrong and include the hologram as memory in the whole brain. No! Karl Pribram used the

hologram to talk about the brain functioning, so he said the brain had a holonomic functioning, but the hologram is a photographic technique.

Javier, if I am driving at 160km/hour, is that movement from here to here, is it a Ferrari I'm talking about (laughter), or is it from here to there?

Audience: Movement from here to there.

RFG: Right. Now, that also implies that we can't talk about velocity when we're talking about Holokinesis, because Holokinesis is movement from here to here, where the concept of velocity does not belong. Very important.

The hologram was proposed by: David Bohm, Albert Einstein, Leith & Upatnieks or Dennis Gabor?

Audience: Dennis Gabor.

RFG: Dennis Gabor, Hungarian Nobel Physics Prize, who didn't have the elements to prove it because he was poor, but it was demonstrated later by those who did have the elements, at the University of Michigan –Leith & Upatnieks-, but based on Dennis Gabor.

The lens and the scales, Javier: do both show correspondences as in Precinct C of the brain, or are they outdated instruments? I mean the lens and the weighing scales.

Audience: They show correspondences.

RFG: Right, the lens and the scales reflect how Precinct C works, by establishing correspondences, comparisons, just like Precinct C does. So, the instrument, a product of the human mind, works just like the human mind works.

Javier, the Cartesian coordinates: a) Express time; b) Do not consider Holokinesis; c) Are the only way of proving something in science.

Audience: They do not consider Holokinesis.

RFG: Cartesian coordinates do not consider Holokinesis, that's right. Now, some believe that using the Cartesian coordinates is the only way you can scientifically prove something, but actually, every time something is proven in a consensual way, we're talking about something scientific. Therefore, if I teach Unitary Perception to someone, and that someone replicates it in the same way and gets the same benefits: deep peace, joy for nothing and energy, then that fact, Unitary Perception, is scientific. It is scientific! As much as $2+2$ being 4.

Very well, and that's the exam on Holokinesis.

Before that we also had the exam on diagnosis, to go over that subject again. And I would like to start this with Yolanda. How do depressed people present themselves?

Audience: With lack of sleep...

RFG: Right...

Audience: ...and without energy.

RFG: Very good. Insomnia and fatigue.

Yolanda, the most common diagnosis in psychiatry and psychology is... ?

Audience: Abandonment of the treatment.

RFG: Very good! The patient abandons the treatment, either because they lack the money, because they're anti-medic, like our whole society, or because they forgot the prescription. No! It's because the physician didn't take the time to persuade them to take the medication they need, that's why they don't continue the treatment. They're not convinced. And it's the most common diagnosis in psychiatry and psychology: abandonment of the necessary treatment. That happens in schizophrenia and depression especially, and with any other diagnosis.

Yolanda; a three-month old baby in his cradle, near a functioning TV: a) Is an example of hidden child abuse; or b) is an example of a sensible children care.

Audience: a) (laughter)

RFG: Of course. And if those parents are smoking, is that hidden child abuse too?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Of course, because they're making the child smoke, second-hand smoking, right? Which happens when a smoker is near a non-smoker. And many babies are born to smoking parents, and that is abuse too. Abuse is punished by law, but these hidden kinds of abuse are seen like normal things, sadly.

Yolanda, the depressed patient stopped taking his antidepressants; what do you do?

Audience: Tell him to go see his doctor.

RFG: Right, the doctor who prescribed it. Very good.

Natzio, what does Bernheim's (Sigmund Freud's friend) experience prove? What does Bernheim's experience prove?

Audience: That thought is hypnotic.

RFG: That thought is hypnotic, that's it, that's what it proves.

What theory does the DSM, the Diagnostic Manual has?

Audience: It's a-theoretical.

RFG: Very good! It has no theory. Many answered "psychoanalytic," or "behaviorist," but no, the manual has no theory.

Javier, what is axis 4 of diagnosis for?

Audience: Measuring stress.

RFG: To measure stress. Do you remember the scale?

Audience: 1 to 5.

RFG: 1 to 5, that's right, very good.

In which axis, Karina, are schizophrenia and depression located?

Audience: Axis 1.

RFG: Very good. Do you remember, Karina, what the negative symptoms [signs] of schizophrenia are?

Audience: The negative symptoms [signs] are: abulia, "alogia" and flat affect. Sorry, I mean abulia, *alogia* and flat affect.

RFG: Right. Abulia, alogia and flat affect. That's what I heard, wasn't it?

Audience: Yes, I think I missed a vowel...

RFG: Ah, right. Abulia, alogia and flat affect, that's it. Abulia: little will; alogia: too few words; and flat affect: they can talk about the most tragic things as if they were talking about having a cup of hot cocoa.

Blanca, if there was a divorce 6 months ago, where do you place that divorce in the written assessment?

Audience: In personal details, personal history, family history.

RFG: Very good...

Audience: And in diagnostic axis 4.

RFG: What do you put in axis 4?

Audience: Five.

RFG: Five! Very good, Blanca.

Yolanda, a 16 year old boy gets caught stealing, what is the incompatible diagnosis? Schizophrenia, depression or antisocial personality?

Audience: Antisocial personality.

RFG: Right, if that's all you know, that is the incompatible diagnosis, due to his age. Because you cannot diagnose personalities before age 18.

Do you remember any of the words which are no longer used in the Diagnostic Manual? Two or three words...

Audience: Organic...

RFG: Very good.

Audience: Uh...

RFG: Psychogenic.

Audience: Psychogenic and... psychopath?

RFG: Psychopath, sociopath, because now it's called *antisocial personality*, right, and the word neurosis, which was a very important word for Freud. All that is to make the manual a-theoretical. Well...

Audience: Psychosomatic too...

RFG: Psychosomatic, yes, many words that were lost... And simply because psychosomatic meant that a person that was often angry would get liver cancer, which was never proven. Those were interesting ideas that turned out to be false. That's why they took out psychosomatic. The psychosomatic movement was started by Flanders Dunbar.

A 45 year old woman says she attempted suicide at 19. In what part of the initial assessment is this placed: details, presented problem, history, diagnosis or treatment plan?

Audience: History and personal details.

RFG: Personal details wouldn't be completely wrong...

Audience: But in history, because it happened a long time ago...

RFG: ...but especially in history, yes, very good. Especially in history, because she's 45 and this happened when she was 19. And does that affect axis 4?

Audience: Well, no, because that was in the past.

RFG: How far back in the past?

Audience: Twelve months.

RFG: Twelve months! Only what happened in the last twelve months applies to axis 4, which is stress. That was a long time ago; therefore it goes unnoticed in the clinical history.

Audience: Even the man's grief, I mean mourning...

RFG: Mourning lasts four years in men, yes...

Audience: But, I mean, even those twelve months, do they apply for men? Those twelve months...

RFG: Yes, even though it's not correct, because a man's mourning is much longer, at least four times longer than a woman's mourning.

If I ask someone about their energy, what am I looking for?

Audience: Depression.

RFG: Depression, of course!

What case does not benefit from Unitary Perception? 1) Depression without treatment (antidepressant medications); 2) Sexual obsession; 3) Chronic anxiety or 4) Mourning over a divorce?

Audience: The first one.

RFG: The first one! Depression without treatment does not benefit from Unitary Perception.

The treatment of a drug addict, Javier, begins with: a) Unitary Perception; b) ceasing the use of illegal drugs; c) a proper diet.

Audience: Ceasing the use of illegal drugs.

RFG: Ceasing the use of illegal drugs, that's the treatment for both drug addicts and alcoholics. That's right.

A depressed person presents what problems?

Audience: Tiredness, insomnia and lack of energy.

RFG: That's right. What if he was bipolar?

Audience: Have you ever spent more than 48 hours without sleep?

RFG: That's right, "have you ever spent more than 48 hours without sleep?"

Well, we seem to have assimilated the fundamental knowledge of the first part of this Course. We'll finish this with Javier again. In Holokinetic Psychotherapy, Javier, is it necessary to: a) have the patients go from Precinct C to B; b) reveal their unconscious memories (as in psychoanalysis); c) make them think positive (as in neurolinguistics) or d) talk to the empty chair (as in gestalt)?

Audience: To have them go from Precinct C to Precinct B.

RFG: That's right. Is that easy?

Audience: No.

RFG: It's not easy. I think the most difficult thing for a person who's going to read the written work will be to understand what Precinct B is, and its differences with Precinct C. That's the most difficult part. In my experience, I have seen that the most difficult thing is to understand what Precinct B is.

The patient says, Karina: "I smoke marijuana, I drink a six-pack of beers a day and use amphetamines almost daily." Where in the assessment does that go?

Audience: In the patient's history, treatment plan and diagnosis.

RFG: In the diagnosis, the diagnostic axes, right, or five-axis diagnosis. Very good.

Blanca, the patient stopped taking their medication, what do you recommend?

Audience: To return to the doctor who prescribed his medications.

RFG: That's right, Blanca.

Yolanda, a schizophrenic: a) benefits from Unitary Perception; b) needs anti-psychotic medication or c) is the product of a dysfunctional family.

Audience: Needs anti-psychotic medication.

RFG: That's it, they need anti-psychotic medication.

It's not convenient to start Psychotherapy: a) if the patient claims not to need it; b) if the patient is a Psychologist; c) if the patient isn't sleeping well; d) if the patient is taking medications.

Audience: If the patient is not sleeping well.

RFG: Very good, because the psychiatrist who is treating a depressed person needs to know, after the treatment begins, when the patient has started to sleep properly, to return to Holokinetic Therapy.

A lady of age 25 is saying that her neighbor's big dog is going to eat her, and that she sees human faces in the leaves of trees. The therapist should: a) quickly introduce Unitary Perception; b) have this lady hospitalized; c) send her to a psychiatrist; d) recommend St. John's Wart.

Audience: c) Send him to the psychiatrist.

RFG: Right. Someone who starts to talk in a strange, bizarre or absurd way needs to see a psychiatrist.

How long should each session be?

Audience: Forty-five minutes

RFG: Forty-five minutes! Why? The therapist has to be ready if he will see several patients; you can't make the next patient wait, because in those 45 minutes the session should be over, he has five minutes to take down some notes and 10 minutes to rest, to be able to attend the next patient at his full capacities. That is, in a professional way.

Can you hear this in Buenos Aires and Ireland?

Audience: Yes, perfectly.

RFG: Well, any question or comment in Buenos Aires?

Audience: No.

RFG: All right. I think we have the base now. If we know these things we've asked about, we have a good base to continue.

What we'll do now is a representation of what a meeting is. Local meetings take place in many parts of the world: Mexicali, Buenos Aires, Barcelona, Mexico City, and many other places where weekly meetings are organized... for what? To see what Unitary Perception is and it isn't. Now we will represent those meetings. We will read a paragraph and then have a dialogue about that paragraph. So, just like we do in a meeting, something about Unitary Perception is read, from the forty or more books that exist, and then we move on to dialogue. A fraternal dialogue, without authority or hierarchy.

But we shouldn't take more than half an hour, which is what we recommend for a meeting. Don't let a reading last for more than half an hour. We should add that we're about to read about consciousness (I hope you can hear this), which hasn't been defined yet, because a physician will consider consciousness as that which a patient in coma is lacking, while a patient with delirium barely has consciousness, and anyone who can answer questions normally has a normal consciousness. So the medical definition of consciousness is too precarious to be accepted universally as a definition of consciousness.

[Reading begins]

DIALOGUE ABOUT CONSCIOUSNESS:

Interlocutor : You say the brain can operate at 100% of its capacity, but most human beings don't achieve that before their death.

Rubén Feldman-González (RFG): I say it calmly. We're no longer in the year 1500, when people who got enlightened were burnt.

Interlocutor: What is your consciousness like?

RFG: My consciousness is human consciousness.

You can't define the word "consciousness" because the intelligence that understands it is that intelligence which is also Unitary Perception, which, in turn, is "to be aware of every perceptible thing that is happening at the same time, without effort, haste or expectation."

Observation encompasses all the observable in Unitary Perception. The observable includes the observer.

Interlocutor: Is there another consciousness and another intelligence?

RFG: What I say throughout my whole written work is that perception can be fragmentary (the one we know) or unitary (the unknown), which is true, non-imaginary life.

Unitary Perception is the intelligence of Functional Brain Precinct "B".

The intelligence of Functional Brain Precinct "C" is that which the Wechsler Revised Test measures, and that which can "read between B and C".

Once I discovered Precinct B, I knew when to use memory, thought, imagination and self from Precinct C, and when to be in the deep and immediate energetic peace of Precinct B.

Interlocutor: Can you live without consciousness, that is, without realizing you exist?

RFG: When the human being sleeps in the sleep stage NREM-4, he has no known consciousness (memory, thought, imagination, self or dreams).

A comatose human being has no consciousness of functional precincts B or C either.

Upon waking up from coma or sleep, he enters C. He could wake directly into B, as I do (or, as it happens to me), after many years of attempting to live in Precinct B (Unitary Perception).

But learning to live the true, non-imaginary life of Unitary Perception is a matter of minutes, if there is no selfish interference of fears or personal desires.

Without a doubt, after I teach this experience, I emphatically recommend the complete study of Unitary Perception and Holokinetic Psychology.

The subtleties of Unitary Perception are many and very deep, that's why I recommend the complete reading of the Work written by me about it.

Interlocutor: Why isn't the word "consciousness" defined?

RFG: Because even the measurable intelligence, say, with an IQ of 120 or more in the Wechsler-Revised Test, KNOWS that Precinct C IS NOT all there is in the human mind.

The unconscious only exists in Precinct C.

But Precinct "B" is purely conscious.

Interlocutor: If you say mind is Universal and therefore is in the whole Universe, like Matter and Energy, how is it possible to go beyond the Universal Mind?

RFG: You go beyond the known human mind (Precinct C) and discover universal mind.

The first and last step is Unitary Perception (something that the mutant Jiddu Krishnamurti – JK-2- called “meditation” –a word he made sure to eliminate on September 1st, 1985, in Brockwood Park).

It was JK-2 who asked me to use “Unitary Perception” to speak about what he called “meditation.”

Mental Precinct C is of cyclical nature, while B is a-cyclical in nature, but Precinct A is of an unknown nature.

A good brain functions with ABC.

But 99% of human beings function only in mental Precinct C.

Interlocutor: What is Precinct A?

RFG: You cannot explain it with words, symbols and numbers.

I’m beginning to write about this by redefining words such as “enlightenment,” “sanctification” and “transcendence.”

We need to have fraternal dialogues about this, without mystifying it, without taking it to organizations, without it being something esoteric, mysterious, gradual, philosophical or metaphysical.

Interlocutor: Talk to us about the mind-brain relationship.

RFG: In my dialogues with JK-2 (Jiddu Krishnamurti) he went as far as to say the brain was created by God, by creation. But mind IS that creation.

The brain does not produce mind. Mind functions in the brain.

The brain does not produce sodium. Sodium acts in the brain, in each neuron.

Let's say light is perceived by the eye and consciousness is perceived by the brain.

I'm trying to be clear, concise, concrete and simple.

What can be said with ten words does not need a hundred.

Interlocutor: Socrates says man knows less than he believes.

RFG: Undoubtedly. And several centuries later, Saint Paul adds that the Second Awakening (to Unitary Perception) is better than believing.

First you wake up from sleep into wakefulness, and then, the Second Awakening may take place, from wakefulness to Unitary Perception.

Interlocutor: It seems that religion has something to do with your description of consciousness.

RFG: But it has to do with original religion, not with the five thousand organized Christianities.

We have separated daily life from the religion of JesuKristos.

We have separated life into separate, hermetic, water-proof compartments.

That has been done by the fragmentary perception of thought (Precinct C).

There are five thousand Christianities out there, claiming to understand JesuKristos.

But misery and wars continue, even among Christians.

There are five hundred Buddhisms, but they don't help us understand consciousness.

Let's not confuse JesuKristos (JK-1) with the five thousand Christianities.

Let's not confuse our Scientific Psychology with the 34 Psychologies in fashion.

The terrible thing is not what we don't know about the mind. The terrible thing is what is known, but wrong.

Interlocutor: Physics studies matter and energy, but it doesn't understand consciousness.

RFG: Current Physics is satisfied with only accurate statistical predictions.

That's not studying matter or energy.

What we know about matter and energy is still in the intelligence of Precinct C, which cannot comprehend consciousness directly, as Precinct B does.

This comprehension is very real, but it's not verbal, symbolic or numeric in its nature.

There is no explicable relationship between the mind and the brain, unless we understand Holokinesis, by physicist David Bohm, author of "Wholeness and the Implicate Order."

We can start by saying the mind is the interface between matter and energy, and then redefine the word mind as I do throughout my whole written work.

This doesn't mean there is something better than science in Precinct C.

Mind is universal, as matter and energy are.

They do not need the human brain.

This can be understood with a metaphor: a ghost does not need a human brain, except for the brain of those who perceive it.

The human being realizes that time is irrelevant (besides being absolute and relative) when entering Unitary Perception, which is functional Precinct B, which has its own intelligence. It (B) is an a-cyclical intelligence, not directed towards any goal. This intelligence does not need effort, haste or expectation.

I'm not talking about emotional intelligence, which is also of Precinct C.

When we live in Unitary Perception (non-imaginary life) we understand that universal mind does not need human consciousness. If the human being continues to live its daily life separated from the universal mind, its disappearance as a species may also happen soon.

The striated muscle, which allows us to hunt and escape for survival, can also play football and dance salsa, just to spend time or for entertainment.

The "C" intelligence that plans the collective hunt and escape for survival, has also built mathematics.

$2+2=4$

But that intelligence has built 34 psychologies.

Recurring again to an explanatory metaphor, in those psychologies it has been said that $2+2=5$ and that $2+2=3$, and nobody has protested but me and the Professors of Holokinetic Psychology of the International Academy of Sciences.

Just like the eye doesn't hear and ears don't see, Precinct C cannot do what Precinct B does.

Consciousness is understood completely when B encompasses C and the brain functions with B and C at the same time.

Interlocutor: Consciousness does not come from language or culture. Where does it come from?

RFG: It comes from life. Living beings (all of them) are conscious. It's a biological thing. This is not understood in C. It's understood directly and non-verbally in B.

But less than 1 per thousand of humanity lives in B.

Interlocutor: Is it so difficult to live in Precinct B?

RFG: What makes it difficult is our terror of changing, of abandoning our daily horror.

We're afraid of losing our physical security, which is a security that is imagined by Precinct C, and not even millionaires have it.

Out of that illusory safety we make the most horrible concessions. We even become voluntary slaves of consumption and debt.

Only in Unitary Perception do we start to live in fruitful, energetic peace, which is the basis for the original Kristian communion.

Without Unitary Perception, the human being is very incomplete. His life is envy, fear, anger, sadness, gossip and profound mediocrity.

Interlocutor: What place does God have in consciousness?

RFG: The place we give him.

For now, his place is only in our language and our imagination. We live an imaginary life; it's not the true life.

You know that the word "God" is not the God of Creation.

You know that the word "water" won't quench your thirst.

Interlocutor: And the same thing happens with the word "consciousness."

RFG: The same thing. We live without total consciousness, we only live with a partial or fragmentary consciousness.

Interlocutor: Can we say consciousness exists in space and in time?

RFG: We can, but it doesn't mean anything. That is a philosophical, high-sounding phrase that may bedazzle a metaphysicist or a philosopher, but to me, that phrase doesn't mean a thing. I hope you're not offended by my frankness.

(Pause)

Let me clarify that, please. Consciousness exists in time in Precinct C, but it doesn't exist like that in Precinct B.

Consciousness exists without time (100% here) in Precinct B.

Unitary Perception (B) encompasses memory (C), but it is free from memory.

So consciousness is free from time in Precinct B.

If you have seen documentary movies on the lives of insects and plants, you know that a great deal of consciousness fits in, for example, the tiny head of an ant.

If many of them gather with the same expectation, the same effort and the same urgency, they can concentrate to eat a human being in the time it takes you to eat a full dinner in a good restaurant (no dessert, to make it less expensive).

I have seen this in documentaries about marabunta ants and army ants.

I only hope not to run into them, or have them move to my neighborhood.

But there already are many human beings with very similar and homicidal efforts, urgencies and expectations that carry the names of nationalism, racism or organized religious fervor, which go so far as suicidal homicide.

So you need space to park your car, but you don't need space to park consciousness.

The brain, in space, does not produce something non-spatial (consciousness).

Consciousness exists in the implicit order of the universe and it becomes explicit in all the universe, in all the forms of life and even in matter itself, and in energy, from the implicit order.

David Bohm made me see this in holographic clarity in over a decade of dialogue.

Now I feel tempted to ask you to read my whole written work, but I won't.

You will do it if you understand the importance of what I say.

Interlocutor: Was consciousness born with the Big Bang (BB)?

RFG: That's an interesting theory.

I prefer to live here and now in the Great Peaceful Silence (GPS). You can only find that in Precinct B, which is Unitary Perception.

When I walk at night in the Valley of Death, where I live, and I look at the sky, I don't hear any explosion; I hear the living silence of the desert and I see the heavenly luminaries in great peace.

It doesn't seem very compassionate that consciousness has no home and it goes around homeless.

That consciousness is all there is. It is the very home of everything.

Precinct C (imaginary thought) wants to find a home for it, because it doesn't understand that consciousness can't have a home.

You have to read “The Group Mind” by David Bohm, or his great book “Wholeness and the Implicate Order” to understand this a bit more.

Group mind is not Precinct B.

Consciousness is in the whole universe, just like matter and energy, in the electron of the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen experiment (designed by Bohm) and in the matrimony of sodium and chloride, the matrimony that flavors our mashed potatoes.

Interlocutor: How is consciousness related to free will?

RFG: Well, if you ask a good astrologer that question, he will tell you that in no way, and that free will is an invention of human thought to give the ego illusory importance and gratification.

Interlocutor: So there is no free will?

RFG: Free will exists only in Precinct A.

Jeff Dahmer, the homosexual serial killer who murdered tens of young black men, said –shortly before a black young man crushed his head with gym weights, in the state prison where he spent his days and nights- that he NEVER WANTED to be a homosexual or a serial killer.

It seems Jeff Dahmer wasn't exerting his free will.

If you decided to stop eating, your free will would last for about 60 days only.

Our inventions of thought (including mathematics) obviously don't explain us everything about mind, consciousness, matter and energy (all of which are universal).

Nevertheless, Unitary Perception (B) can change your life for good, if you were one of those extremely few people who take this seriously and don't mix it with anything known.

[Reading ends].

Audience: That was fast! I thought it was longer. That's it, it's over.

RFG: Exactly twenty minutes, which means that, of our hour and a half (ninety minutes) we have seventy minutes for dialogue, as it should be in a meeting.

Audience: It's true, it was only eight pages...

RFG: ...and it seems tremendously long because we're afraid of reading [*voices overlap*] ...but you can read this in twenty minutes.

Audience: Could you repeat that about the consciousness of physicians?

RFG: Yes, and several other things that I have written down here... So you see that in twenty minutes we have read this, and we still have seventy minutes. Which is what a good meeting is, I insist, a meeting of fraternal exploration, with no hierarchies, no authority. Let only intelligence and communion operate. Then we can discover anything. And especially, what consciousness is, because consciousness has no definition. Why doesn't it have a definition? Because in medicine, *consciousness* means, for instance (it seems I've said it but it wasn't heard) that a patient in coma has no consciousness, therefore in the chart of a comatose patient, you write "patient without consciousness," which is true, and then comes a patient in delirium, that is, a patient with partial consciousness, and lastly, the funny thing about the word consciousness is that any sick person has consciousness as long as he or she can answer a question. Now, even though there are patients with consciousness who can't answer because of aphasia or agnosia, in general, for example, a depressed, schizophrenic or retarded patient, or someone with attention deficit, have consciousness. Why? Because they can answer questions. It means the word consciousness within medicine has low aspirations. What do I mean with this? That the word is limited to the capacity of being awake and able to answer to a question, right or wrong.

So we cannot base ourselves in that medical definition of consciousness, because it is a precarious definition. So, do we have a definition of consciousness that's not precarious? We don't have it! Except for the etymological meaning, which is "to have awareness of everything together". Unitary Perception! Awareness of everything together. This means that in the (Latin) origin of the word, consciousness means Unitary Perception. So originally, the word consciousness has nothing to do with the way in which we use it today. A patient in coma: no consciousness; delirium: partial consciousness; retarded, schizophrenic, depressed: a perfect consciousness, because they can answer (laughter). Well, excuse me! Like comedian Steve Martin says. Excuse me, says Steve Martin, that's not a good definition of consciousness; it's a precarious definition. So, why can't consciousness be defined? Because of what I have just said. And, are there three consciousnesses?

Audience: It's the best thing to do, make it equal to the ABC model, right?

RFG: Of course! That's why Holokinetic Psychology is the Psychology of the 21st century, and the only scientific Psychology. Because it's the only Psychology that can have three definitions of the word consciousness, since we've discovered that the brain works in three completely different ways. So they tell us: "Ah, you're talking about living in the present." Wait a second, excuse me! Excuse me, what present are you talking about? Are you talking about the A present, the B present or the C present? Which means, which consciousness are you talking about? A, B or C?

So, consciousness of A: much has been written, and I believe we can still say very little from the scientific viewpoint. Although we dared to start writing about this, we can say little about consciousness in Precinct A from the scientific viewpoint. It is fascinating, very interesting, without a doubt. But, also without a doubt, it's very far from language, therefore it is difficult to define consciousness in mental Precinct A. But, what can we say about consciousness in mental Precinct B? We can say that in that consciousness, time does not exist, because time has not become relevant to consciousness. Time exists

now in the clock, absolute time, but it hasn't become relevant, it hasn't re-elevated to consciousness yet, it hasn't re-elevated to consciousness yet, therefore consciousness in Precinct B is timeless, apparently. David Bohm said it better: the time of consciousness, in Precinct B, i.e., in Unitary Perception, is irrelevant. It has not elevated itself to consciousness. And lastly, what is consciousness in Precinct C like? If we say it's a disaster, that's an understatement, and not a good definition either. What is consciousness in Precinct C like? Time-bound, in absolute time, very simple. That's the better definition we have in Holokinetic Psychology. Consciousness in Precinct C is time-bound.

Very well, Karina, what is intelligence in Precinct C like?

Audience: It's... measured with the person's intellectual quotient.

RFG: Louder please?

Audience: It's measured... in mental Precinct C, the person's intellectual quotient can be assessed.

RFG: Very good. And what would intelligence, Blanca, be like in Precinct B?

Audience: Well, it's true intelligence.

RFG: And what is its most visible, obvious function?

Audience: Well-being...

RFG: Yes... anyone else remembers?

Audience: In mental Precinct B, intelligence is defined by what is functional and non-functional thought, for instance...

RFG: Very good, in a few words, intelligence in Precinct B is the capacity to discern when to think and when not. Simple! When to think and when not. How much time of thinking do we need in a day? Very little.

Describe the intelligence of C and of B. That's what we've done. And, what is love like, Yolanda, in C or in B? Can love be defined differently in C and in B, if we dare to define love? Let's define love. We'll dare to define love, what is it like in B and what is it like in C?

Audience: In C it is all the known, that love is probably the only thing we know, it's not true...

RFG: And what is it based on, when you say "I love you, dear" and he says "I love you, dear"?

Audience: On an image of the person, in the idea.

RFG: Right, and also on an exchange: I give you and you give me.

Audience: On a reflex...

RFG: Well, some have defined it like that, Pavlov among them. A reflex.

If we look at the nervous system as a group of reflexes, well, they're all reflexes, but that's not enough to explain the intimacies of love, that definition about it being a reflex. But in Holokinetic Psychology, we see it more clearly: in Precinct C, love is "I give you and you give me." That is, "I'm your wife and I give you this and that, but on my birthday, you forget it and you don't bring me any candy or chocolate."

So, we generally call that give-you-give-me deal "love". Now, in general, in the societies we know, the man provides and the woman provides what she can provide, but that is also an outdated definition, it's a Victorian, Freudian definition. Nowadays, with the complete disaster of society, it's very difficult for love to fit into that definition. But the love of B is different, the love of B is when you diminish the suffering of those around you, when you try to reduce the suffering of mankind; that's the love of B. Of course, we're simplifying.

The brain is created, it's part of creation; sodium, blood, energy, mind. And, what is mind? Is it something the brain produces, Eduardo? Is mind produced by the brain?

Audience: No, no.

RFG: No! Sodium is not produced by the brain, although it works in the brain and the brain needs sodium. But the brain does not produce sodium, and neither does it produce mind. And there is still an ongoing controversy about what is knowing versus what is believing. Two things that are part of consciousness: knowing and believing. But the apostle Paul, in chapter 13 of his letter to the Romans, already said that waking up is more important than believing. Waking up is more important than believing! He's talking about consciousness, in a 60 A.D. fashion. He didn't have the elements, the knowledge of energy, matter and mind we have today. But he's saying, in a very simple and very clear way, that waking up is more important than believing. Romans, chapter 13.

Now, if light is perceived by the eye, and sound is perceived by the ear, how is consciousness perceived? Light by the eye, sound by the ear, and where is consciousness perceived? It seems to be in the brain. Even if we have awareness of our hand, it's a form of consciousness that occurs in the brain. If we lost the part of the brain that represents the hand, we wouldn't have awareness of the hand. If it was true that ghosts exist, what brain is needed for a ghost to be seen? It's the brain of the person seeing the ghost, not the brain of the ghost. And those who know about ghosts have written that ghosts want to be seen. Now, if the ghost wants to be seen, it needs a brain that sees it, therefore the consciousness of the ghost is the consciousness of the brain of the observer of the ghost. Now, a ghost is supposed to be someone who lost their train and never got to know Unitary Perception, never lived a good life, so he or she died and continued as a ghost, instead of returning to the creation where they came from.

So, Yolanda, does the mind need the brain?

Audience: No.

RFG: No. In the brain there is mind, but mind does not need the brain. We see the mind in the ant, we see the mind in the flower and the wasp, in how they interact for the wasp to help the orchid reproduce. So the mind is much more than the brain.

Matter and energy: do they need the brain, Eduardo?

Audience: No.

RFG: No. But there is matter and energy in the brain. Does consciousness need space, Javier?

Audience: No, consciousness is in space.

RFG: Exactly. But just as it is in a virus, in an ant, in us, it is also in the electron –David Bohm said–, consciousness is in the electron; the electron plays, communicates and reproduces. It means the electron itself has consciousness, according to David Bohm. Consciousness is also in the molecule, undoubtedly.

Audience: How does it reproduce?

RFG: Electrons split.

Then, another question related to consciousness: is group mind in C or in B?

Audience: In C.

RFG: Group mind is in C. Group mind is not B; it's C.

Audience: Are you talking about mind and consciousness almost as if they were the same thing?

RFG: I'm trying to see what the differences could be.

Audience: Aha.

RFG: Right, and the difficulty of defining consciousness... because originally, consciousness means Unitary Perception, to be aware of everything together, at the same time. But that's not how the word is used, that's not how doctors use it in the emergency room. So we're seeing that, and we're seeing why it

is difficult to define consciousness, and what relationships it can have with the mind, since so far, Holokinetic Psychology is the only Psychology that has placed consciousness in its place. Now, group mind is in C, it's not in B. Therefore group mind is a secondary topic. The important thing in Holokinetic Psychology is to understand Precinct B. And to know we're prisoners of Precinct C in a hypnosis that goes from birth to death. If we know that, we're on the right track.

Now, how do you define free will? Yolanda, do you dare to define free will? I mean, how much free will did the mayor of Cork have, who starved to death in Ireland?

Audience: It's an illusion, right?

RFG: He had, I don't know if sixty-nine days of free will, and he died, he starved to death. And where is free will, if it does exist? Where is it? It seems to me that it could be in Precinct A. Therefore it's something rather indefinable, outside of words. But it's not in Precinct C and it does not seem to be in Precinct B. Only that in Precinct B there is a feeling of freedom, peace, energy and joy for no cause, which feels like free will. It resembles free will in that you feel free. Now, feeling free is not the same as the concept of free will.

Well, and with all these bases, we can start a dialogue, supposing we're in a meeting, like the ones we have here in the first Saturday of each month, with free entrance for all Mexicali, and without hierarchies, without authority, simply a dialogue in communion to explore the truth of life, and the truths of life and the lies of life, together, with no hierarchy, no authority, in fraternal communion. So we have the basis for a dialogue with this, especially if we have read some of the written work about Unitary Perception and Holokinetic Psychology. If that's the case, we will have a deeper dialogue, a dialogue that can be more consensual, not only deeper but also more consensual, because we're all speaking a language that will not cause confusion, a language that can be the starting point for a new discovery. So now we open a dialogue. We invite the friends in Buenos Aires, I don't know if you want to start in Buenos Aires with questions and comments.

Audience: Yes, I wanted to say that, well, it seems that in general, the word consciousness is understood in psychology as a synonym of thinking. I'm conscious of something when I think about it, otherwise I'm not conscious. We could say that in Holokinetic Psychology, or rather in Precinct B, consciousness is related to the English word "aware". "To be aware". [*N.T. the Spanish noun "consciencia" translates both "awareness" and "consciousness". The Spanish adjective "consciente" translates both "aware" and "conscious"*]

RFG: Exactly, or at least there is the consciousness of thinking, which is C consciousness, and also B consciousness.

Audience: Which would be to perceive everything perceptible, that is...

RFG: Of course.

Audience: ...the best way of translating "to be aware" is to be feeling the weight, i.e., it's Unitary Perception, being in contact with energy...

RFG: Which may or may not have language, which is not only thinking.

Audience: Yes, exactly, now the human being has the capacity, that is, the senses to be in contact with reality, or rather in contact with energy, in order to be aware, he has the senses. Now, a rock does not have senses, or a plant does not listen, but we could say there is consciousness there by explaining a bit the parallelism you were making between consciousness and mind, right? In a rock, or in a plant, in a flower, consciousness is related with the very structure of the matter composing it, I mean, in humans it is related to the form we have; the ear, the eye, whereas a flower has no ears, no eyes, but you can say it has another form of consciousness determined by what I said before, its material structure. That's what comes to my head, I don't know if...

RFG: But what you're saying is what Bohm says when he speaks about the consciousness of the electron, that the electron

has consciousness, it has mind. And what you're saying is very interesting, when you say that when we say "I am aware" is actually when we're thinking. Because all of Psychology from year zero till today has been the study of thought and memory, and at best, the study of the ego, which starts mainly with the book *The Ego and the Id*, by Sigmund Freud, published in 1905, which is still unknown to some people in 2010.

Audience: Yes, what Freud describes is very little, in the sense that you attempt Unitary Perception, C becomes unconscious and changes occur which you might notice later maybe, right? I mean, a conflict returns and you say: "Oh well I'm a bit less anxious," so the consciousness of thought is very limited and it's not even related to what happens in the consciousness of Precinct C, if we interpret the word "conscious" as "aware vs. unaware" in this case. Consciousness, from the viewpoint of psychology, applies only to the emergence of, say, the contents of memory to consciousness; whereas in Unitary Perception, changes in consciousness occur without my thinking about them, i.e., I don't notice them, but they occur. So consciousness of Precinct B goes much beyond thought, and it produces a mutation in Precinct C, many times without Precinct C even being aware of that.

RFG: Exactly, and the great tragedy is that, for instance, a JK, when he speaks about mind, is speaking about A, B or C. Can you hear this clearly?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: There's kind of an echo here. Well, so JK, when he speaks about mind, is talking about A, B or C, and we have to look at the context to know which of the three minds he's talking about; I think it's easier to begin speaking about the mind saying we're talking about Precinct C, or Precinct B. The tragedy is that humanity has made the word mind a synonym of thinking of memorizing, then that's a psychological tragedy, a historical tragedy of mankind, that mind means thinking and memorizing. When Holokinetic Psychology comes around with Unitary Perception, we start to shout from the housetops and we say in Universities: the mind is also Unitary Perception; the

mind is more than memory, thought and 'I'. And that phrase only brings a great deal of conflict before it is digested. Why? Because we're bringing the understanding of a new fact, because Precinct B is a recent discovery of brain functioning. So, let's say it again: the tragedy is that when we say consciousness, we're generally referring to what we think, say or memorize, and that there is no association of the word consciousness to Unitary Perception. Then, we have more problems to define consciousness. And I believe, then, that a good start to define consciousness is what we said at the beginning, that there are three consciousnesses in mind, that of A, that of B and that of C, and they are completely different, and they have completely different laws. Any other question in Buenos Aires?

Audience: What comes to mind now is what Ana, a participant in yesterday's meeting here at Alba's, was saying, that she felt a kind of vertigo, she attempted Unitary Perception and she was scared of not knowing how she would act, feeling a sort of uncertainty. So, there's also a kind of fear of losing C consciousness, right? And it's curious because if we understand consciousness as Precinct B, that fear does not exist...

RFG: Right, or that anger or sadness.

Audience: Yes, and I told her that consciousness does not end, which is what came to my mind, that if you attempted Unitary Perception... Then she asked me: what do you mean by consciousness? And it's curious that this subject came up.

RFG: Now, let me ask you Gabriel, did Ana go out of Precinct C?

Audience: Well, she was told that we should pay attention to where the question comes from, where fear comes from, the fear of what's going to happen, or not knowing how I will react, so I think there was not awareness of that. There was simply fear, so I don't really know if she got out of C or not. I think an attempt was made and it was a very nice attempt...

RFG: But judging from what you're saying, by your words, I have the certainty that she did not leave Precinct C. Because when you leave C and enter B, fear lasts, I think, not more than a fraction of a second, two seconds if we're exaggerating. But fear cannot last in Precinct B, and neither can sadness or anger. That is, when Aeromexico steals from me, I feel anger, but that anger lasted for two seconds. That is, in Precinct B, anger lasts for two seconds at most. And I bade them farewell saying "thanks for nothing" in an elegant way (laughter). If I had followed my impulses from Precinct C, that would have been a scandal, as it generally is. Tremendous scandals happen in airlines when people are told that their plane won't take off, that they have to wait six hours, so people go crazy at the airport, I have seen that. So in Precinct B, fear has little duration, I'm talking about less than two seconds, the same is true for anger and sadness. If there is a feeling of uncertainty, that person you mentioned never left Precinct C. That's why I say, the most difficult thing on Earth is, sadly, to know exactly what Precinct B is. That's why I say that without reading the written work about Precinct B, you cannot comprehend Precinct B, which is something too subtle, more subtle than we think, and it's not enough to know a definition and say "Unitary Perception is to perceive everything perceptible at the same time," we might add "without effort," of course, since you don't need effort to listen, and "without expectation," which comes from Precinct C, from memory, but if we simply say "Unitary Perception is to perceive everything perceptible at the same time," we've already said a very useful definition of Unitary Perception. Nevertheless, from all the people who know this definition by heart, there is a very small fraction of people who really understood what Unitary Perception is. From your description, Ana has obviously not left Precinct C. Sadly, those who don't know Precinct B will not make the least movement, the least attempt to see what Precinct B is, to try to be and live in Precinct B. He who has lived it cannot leave it, but those who haven't lived it, like the case you described, are very likely to forget about Unitary Perception soon.

Audience: With peace as something secondary...

RFG: “I don’t even know what peace is.” So, once I said “What will Unitary Perception give me? Peace!” And this lady says “And what else?”

Audience: “Is that all?”

RFG: “Is that all?” I tell her “Well, you’re asking that because you don’t know what peace is.” So, that’s the problem, the tragedy is that we stay in Precinct C, in uncertainty, and in fears, anger, sadness, never a moment of the true peace of Unitary Perception, which saves you from what? From human condition. It’s no guarantee of entering paradise, but that moment of Precinct B saves you from the human condition, which is fear, anger and sadness, which is uncertainty. I don’t know if there are any more questions or comments in Buenos Aires.

Audience: It seems not.

RFG: What about here, in Mexicali? Questions or comments?

Audience: We haven’t mentioned the use of English, as in “to be conscious” and “consciousness”.

RFG: Oh! That complicates the whole thing. We didn’t deal with that here, but in English, you have “consciousness” and “conscience”. “Consciousness” has to do with awareness, but “conscience” means moral awareness, it means the person is capable of regretting an error, something that a person with antisocial personality lacks, for example. So consciousness (awareness) is very different from conscience (moral). It’s easy to make that mistake when you start speaking English.

Any comment here? We still have twenty minutes. In an hour and a half of dialogue you can read an eight-page article and discuss it with a great depth, and with a great tranquility, when we still have twenty-five minutes for a dialogue session. It means that ninety minutes of dialogue seems little, but if done right, it allows many people to intervene in a sensible, fraternal way, and the time we have for dialogue is more than it seems.

Anything else about conscience, about knowing good and evil, which is what the English word conscience implies?

Audience: But who discerns what is good or evil?

RFG: Well, JesuKristos said “don’t call me good, because only God knows what is good.”

Audience: I think the good ones are those who don’t hurt, and evil is to cause harm, simple as that...

RFG: Of course! To cause suffering is evil, and to diminish suffering is what we can do, it’s good. Now, evil and good, right? “Don’t call me good,” JesuKristos said. And what does JK2 say? “There’s no rose without thorns.” Of course, the most beautiful thing can carry with it something that may hurt you.

Audience: JK2 also says, in the 12th video with Anderson, that the essence to be in Unitary Perception is innocence, and that innocence is not being hurt, and that being hurt is the condition of all human beings since they are children.

RFG: Or the egocentricity looking for profit.

Audience: Yes, which is a way of doing damage, the pursuit of profit is a way of putting you over there, to put myself over here, that over there, “well, this is better for me,” but what I want to emphasize is the need for innocence, which is coincident with what love is, in the sense that we talked about love in C and in B before. Love is innocent, if it’s not innocent, then it’s not love...

RFG: Well, it’s the love of C that trades, right?

Audience: Well, it’s a word with an L, an O, a V and an E, but it has no real meaning...

RFG: But it’s the meaning people give to it.

Audience: True love is when you give without expecting something in return.

RFG: Of course.

Audience: Love in B.

RFG: And that's the innocent one, but people in general, 99% of the population, not to say 100, when you say "love," that means "you give me and I give you."

Audience: And it's something that can only exist in human relationships.

RFG: Ah, right.

Audience: If they are in fact relationships... and this reminds me a lot of what JesuKristos says when they ask him who would enter the Kingdom of Heaven first, and he says: "Those who are like children." So, what does he mean with being children? With innocence, an innocence that is only pure, it's the purity of B.

RFG: In theology, they talk about Adam's innocence, and the second innocence, which Jesus brings. Adam had the innocence that made him fall, and JesuKristos brings that second innocence, which is not that of the poet Machado about not believing in anything, but that second innocence brought by JesuKristos is that of the person who knows what suffering is, and who enters that second innocence, transcending suffering and knowing what it is, trying to get people around them to suffer less...

Audience: Compassion...

RFG: Of course, which is compassion. So, in theology, Kristos would be the second innocence and Adam the first.

Audience: And also the fact that the innocent mind, or the innocent being, is still the ideal of what we suppose can manifest in the individual, but there's all that baggage which impedes that manifestation, which is what Krishnamurti points out constantly too, and well, the written work, right? Seeing that Precinct C, which is the only thing we know, and all its manifestations where we include love and we put the religious

life, etc., and which keeps us in the illusion that it's only that and nothing more.

But if we do know that something else might manifest, for example, what we say about the innocent mind, then, for something new to be really discovered for the first time, first we have to see what is preventing it. And that is the Unitary Perception of seeing what really is there, and not an ideal of what could that be. In that paradox is the possibility. The paradox of not ceasing to see what is.

RFG: Yes, and JK says you can feel hurt, but you have to see that that *feeling hurt* is a product of your ego, a product of your memory, then the solution you have is what he called meditation, a word he renounces to later, and we call it Unitary Perception, to see the wound in such a way that it's not a ghost in our life, it's not something that haunts us and destroys the relationships we have.

Audience: And that is coherent with not condemning or justifying.

RFG: Right, it implies not justifying or condemning.

Audience: There's a difficult thing to understand in Krishnamurti. He says that without understanding the wound, there cannot be innocence, and then he says understanding is seeing. But... understanding is seeing, yeah, it's a revelation, and there's another great video of him, when he was 70, at the end of a talk a man tells him: "I'm sorry, but if I look at that tree like you say, without the observer, that tree will not disappear. So, if I look at fear without the observer, why would fear disappear? And Krishnamurti kind of shrieks at him and tells him: "You don't want to get rid of fear!" It means that fear, the wound, more specifically the wound –because he says it's the last and main impediment to see there is no innocence, and we should see that lack of innocence which is the wound, so the wound itself is innocence, I mean, seeing the wound...

RFG: It's not separate.

Audience: Right...

Audience: Of course, this is difficult to... that's why he says "look at fear" with love, or why don't we look at something like hatred, and he says it with an expression of delight in his face, as if hatred was a wonderful thing...

RFG: It's true! He means not condemning what one is...

Audience: Truth sets us free, that's also implied...

RFG: Yes, and that also reminds me that I am what I am, which is the name of God. So, if I love God, I love "I am what I am." It's a Christian play on words, which is very wise. If I love God then I also love myself, and what do God and I have in common? That I am what I am, and if I don't love that, I will never be able to see the wound, or see how I make people suffer unknowingly, or knowingly, which is worse, etc. So, all this has a tremendous importance, and it's related to consciousness...

Audience: And to perceptual honesty!

RFG: And to perceptual honesty, i.e., seeing things as they are. Seeing things as they are, without transforming them. Seeing without distorting them, without distorting what you see, I mean, this is a piece of paper, it's not an elephant even if they tell you it is. It's a piece of paper: perceptual honesty.

We still have ten minutes. Just look at what 90 minutes mean for a dialogue. There's time for a lot of things. I wanted to do this as a sort of demonstration of what a dialogue between friends, a fraternal, exploratory dialogue of ninety minutes is, and you see there's enough time to say lots of things, and delve into human life a great deal, especially into our suffering and the end of suffering.

Audience: I remember a very good dialogue in the Zoe forum about free will; to say "free will" is to give thought the capacity of decision.

Audience: The ridiculous capacity...

Audience: The ridiculous capacity of decision, and that it would be more acceptable or convenient to talk about a relative autonomy, that a function of the cup is being a cup, and one is one. And one functions in Holokinesis, without the need of ego, without the need of saying “I have free will.”

RFG: Exactly.

Audience: The importance of free will comes because the important thing in our life are events, that is, whether I succeed or fail. So when the focus, when the relevant thing is no longer success or failure, the relevant thing is now what is happening now, which has nothing to do with success or failure; it's made of sound and light, of weight and sorrow, then that has nothing to do with success and failure. That is what there is. So when the focus is there, where is free will with sound, light, weight and sorrow? Where is free will, and what importance does it have?

RFG: None.

Audience: And it's so accurate that you say you believe free will is in Precinct A, I also believe it wouldn't be so off to say Precinct A is free will.

RFG: You feel like saying it, because it's precisely that place, I mean, that space of mental functioning which is completely far from language.

Audience: But there it becomes a dream.

RFG: Well, a dream would be still part of Precinct C. Precinct A is outside language, we cannot talk about it.

Audience: Did he say it can become a dream?

Audience: Yes, that if we start to define it, it becomes a dream.

RFG: Right, you mean if we define Precinct A, right? Of course. But I'm under the impression that if free will existed, it would be in Precinct A, and that's something you cannot talk about, because we're seeing that in Unitary Perception... who

cares about free will? If you're here completely, who cares? I mean, let's say a good astrologer tells you: "So, today Saturn is in the 4th degree of Libra, and that will have the following consequences: one, two, three, four, five." Okay, so how do I get rid of that influence from Saturn, according to the astrologer? In Unitary Perception, if you're completely here, who cares? Observing with no words. Yes, every time I try to observe without words I feel love, and I see that clearly. That also confirms the beauty of the teaching, that seeing without words is the beginning of true life. It's not what we've been taught. To look at each other without words, without condemnation, without justification.

Audience: That is, without Cecilia and without Rubén, without...

RFG: If we look at each other without words, then there can be a relationship. Otherwise, we'll have nothing but wounds and suffering.

Okay, now we're reaching the end of the first part of class 9.

Audience: It's 8, right?

RFG: It's 8. So we'll continue with Psychotherapy, which is what several people told me they're waiting for. How you go from C to B in Holokinetic Psychotherapy, and we'll do some exercises. We'll start simply with what we have, and take it from there. When giving a seminar, the part I like the most is when we invert roles and have a student teach me Unitary Perception, and many problems come up –since you're reading and have attended half of this course, I don't know if we will get so many problems with language, but when a student tries to teach Unitary Perception to the person giving the five-hour seminar, many problems come up. To go from C to B, then we see the difficulties of language and that's very amusing (laughter), very amusing because we all laugh, but also...

Audience: ...we learn.

RFG: We all learn, that's the most important thing, we all learn the appropriate language, the language that won't cause confusion. So, if there is a last question or comment...

Audience: After the break?

Audience: There was a last question from Buenos Aires pending a while ago...

RFG: Yes? Go ahead. If there's a question please...

Audience: Yes, but it's already answered.

RFG: Good, then we'll meet in fifteen minutes, is that alright? Fifteen minutes. See you.

[15 minute break]

RFG: Hello, we begin the second part of this class, and we'll start talking about Psychotherapy. About how we –for instance, in the office- go from Precinct C, which is memory, thought, egocentricity, to Precinct B, which is Unitary Perception. There are some things we have to know before that attempt of going from C to B; we have to discard four diagnoses that don't benefit from Holokinetic Psychotherapy. Which are them? Depression, schizophrenia, attention deficit and mental retardation. We already know how that discarding is done because we've seen it. And a depressed patient, either uni or bipolar, who begins to take his medication, as he should, for the rest of his life, will benefit from Psychotherapy only after he starts sleeping properly. What is to sleep properly? To sleep nine hours straight. If an individual, male, after age 40, wakes up more than once to urinate, we should suspect he might have a prostate problem. Dilated prostate, right? So, what is good sleeping? And what do you ask about sleep? First: how many hours do you sleep every 24 hours? It's surprising to hear people tell me four, five hours, when the normal sleep time for a human being is nine hours, after age twelve, and twelve hours per night up to age twelve. So, how many hours do you sleep? First sleep question. So we're seeing the things we need to know before starting psychotherapy. If the person has one of

the four diagnoses that don't benefit from psychotherapy, and what it is to sleep well. And what should you ask about sleep? How many hours do you sleep? Do you sleep them all straight, or do you wake up a lot? And when you wake up, how long does it take you to fall asleep again? If they say more than five minutes, you should consider depression. You should consider depression! And to discard bipolarity, you have to ask: "Have you ever spent more than 48 hours without sleeping?" That's a very good question.

We've spoken about gurus and breathing. A guru has his business card, which is the breathing technique, and we've seen that breathing techniques are nothing but an entertainment that could even be dangerous. We've spoken about horizontal conflict. What is horizontal conflict? It is the belief that we're separated from everything. In Gestalt there is a motto that says you make do as you can and so will I. That is, they're mottoes compatible with a society like the one we've built, a society lacking in compassion. And horizontal conflict is the essence of Precinct C, to believe I am separated from everything I see. We've also said the "I" doesn't breathe, it doesn't sleep, it doesn't grow, it doesn't see and neither does it look. That happens only in language, but let's not believe that the "I" breathes. The human body breathes, through the lungs. That's not something a little guy called "I" does. It's not that. There are words that must be seen with distrust: "I achieve, I control, I inhibit, I facilitate." Those are the words they use in the known psychotherapies.

Audience: I rule.

RFG: I rule.

Audience: We already know (laughter).

RFG: He stole my joke (laughter) He's faster than me (laughter).

There are phrases that people say without much thinking: I achieve, I manage, I control, I inhibit, I facilitate. So, we're not talking about defensive psychotherapy, but of Holokinetic

Psychotherapy, which is Unitary Perception. The goal of Holokinetic Psychotherapy, as we said is to go from C to B. How do we go from C to B? Well, there is one thing that we mustn't do, the first of all: we have been told we should take the best part of each thing. Well, as far as psychology is concerned, there is a psychology up to David Bohm and another one that begins after David Bohm. The problem is that after David Bohm, we have a complete understanding of time, which did not exist before David Bohm. So we can't take the best parts of the psychotherapies previous to David Bohm to put them into Holokinetic Psychotherapy. It's about NOT mixing Holokinetic Psychotherapy with all the prior therapies, and this is difficult to understand if you don't understand what David Bohm did. What did David Bohm do? He gave us Holokinesis, which is the way of completing the understanding of time, and without that, you can't understand why we say Holokinetic Psychotherapy cannot be mixed with any of the previous therapies. Freud said we have little mental soldiers that we are born with, he called it psychic energy or libido, which are our soldiers, the army of Precinct C, say, the energetic army of Precinct C, if we translate that into Holokinetic Psychology. And what Freud said is that every time we have a problem, we go back to past moments from our personal history, to look for those soldiers that died in our life each time we had hardships or moments of great stress. That's why, for instance, we play the guitar, which he called an adaptive regression, because we go back there to look for soldiers, back in our history, to escape from that feeling of helplessness that any hardship can produce in us today. So Freud talks about regression. Freud talks about projection and denial, which are the most frequent defenses. Why? Because projection is to attribute hate to a person I hate, but that I don't want to see that I hate, so I say "she hates me," because I don't see that I hate her. That's called projection, according to Freud. And denial is "no, I don't feel any hate," despite I feel it. And these defenses are frequent. Why? Because they are primitive, they're the first defenses to appear in Precinct C. Then we have problems like inventing enemies, that's called paranoia, which is the consequence –Freud said– of an ineffective denial, an unsuccessful denial. For instance, positive thinking is a form of

denial. “Everything is fine as it is.” Excuse me! Excuse me, Steve Martin says, I don’t think everything is fine as it is. Or, for instance, “The Titanic is unsinkable,” as they said in all the newspapers of that time, in 1913, that the Titanic could not sink. That’s why the sailors were knee-deep in water and they asked each other: “Should we wake the captain up?” (laughter).

Because the newspapers said: “The great, unsinkable Titanic sets off”. That’s how it was presented in the newspapers, and the sailors were hypnotized by that idea, and even knee-deep in water they asked each other if they should wake up the captain. When the water level rose a bit more, and maybe other organs got wet (laughter) they started calling the captain (laughter). And what was going on there, according to Freud, who was still alive? That they didn’t see the water was reaching their knees, because they were hypnotized (in my language, not in Freud’s), conditioned by the newspapers, because they said it was unsinkable. And then there are other important words, we’ve seen projection, denial (Freud’s words), regression (going back to look for soldiers), positive thinking, which is something new –bah, it is born in the Nazi Germany, neuro-linguistics. And positive thinking is just a denial that has no effect. No matter how much you say everything is fine, that won’t change things, or that the Titanic is unsinkable, no! It sinks, it sinks. And if I have positive thinking and I don’t go for the lifeboats, well, 748 of 1500 people died. Everyone would have died if they didn’t untie the few lifeboats the ship had. Of course, most of the dead were poor people, those traveling in third class. So saying that everything was fine would have been terrible in the Titanic. Or today, when we have many reasons to think mankind might end: ecological reasons, atomic, epidemic reasons, etc. We can’t say that all is fine, which is the great positive thinking that [president] Fox has sold to Mexico: “Yes we can! We have to think positive!” That’s not enough! We’re in a situation, not only Mexico, but the whole mankind, which is terminal, therefore we need much more than positive thinking, and if possible, less positive thinking and more adequate action, which comes from Unitary Perception.

What did Freud say? Conditioned by the news, they didn't see the water up to their knees. Two other important words in psychotherapy are: transference and counter-transference, which we have seen, do you remember? Transference: what the patient feels for the therapist -I love him, I hate him, and everything in between. And that may also happen to the therapist, but in that case it's called counter-transference -I love her, I hate her. It happens in any relationship. Any comment?

Another word from Freud, important because it's a defense, is the word rationalization. That is, let's say tuberculosis is caused by Koch's bacillus. "Ah, now I understand tuberculosis." Excuse me! Excuse me, Steve Martin says, it's not like that. Excuse me (laughter). Rationalization and saying Tuberculosis is caused by Koch's bacillus does not make me understand Tuberculosis, because 98% of human beings have Koch's bacillus, but not Tuberculosis, so this means: careful with interpreting causes! Which is what is done in psychoanalysis, for example. An interpretation is done. Ah, okay, but how will I interpret? Like I interpreted Tuberculosis, saying there is only one cause, and that there are no economic causes, no fall of immunity due to stress, etc., etc.? Then Janov comes along, trying to simplify psychology and he says it's enough if the patient cries *mama* out loud to end the conflict.

Audience: (laughter) The primal scream.

RFG: That was called Janov's primal scream. How did Janov's primal scream end? Just imagine what a group therapy session was; he worked with groups, so "your turn Mr. Omar, your turn, Mrs. Karina, now scream at the top of your lungs: maaaaaaa!" (laughter) A bit later everyone was crying (laughter) and why did Janov's primal scream end? Because one of the patients screamed *mama* and died of a heart attack (laughter).

It's what we say, that when we say *mama*, the whole META process (thought) is acting: memory, image, visceral reaction and all the emotional reactions.

So, of course, that heart couldn't withstand it (laughter). The first time he screamed mama, tears came out, the second time he started weeping, and when he screamed mama for the third time, he died of a heart attack (laughter). All of us who say "there is only one mother, and she had to end up with me" can understand this problem (laughter).

Of course I'm kidding, but many things have been done with psychotherapy that are even shameful, not to say criminal. They have turned entertainment and torture into something they call psychotherapy. And we're trying not to turn psychotherapy into entertainment or torture. Let it be the discovery of the only brain movement, the only ONE, where there is no conflict.

Audience: And the only therapy without past.

RFG: And the only therapy without past, because conflict is in the past. I think you made that poster which read "Get rid of the past," right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Great poster, by the way, to promote the free public seminar of the CPH's third anniversary, which is tomorrow, September 27, but since tomorrow is a Monday, we'll do the free seminar on Saturday 2.

And well, there are other therapists who are a little more compassionate and simply tell their patients to describe their mom (laughter).

Audience: Quite compassionate (laughter).

RFG: So, "describe your mom" reminds me of a beautiful JK anecdote, from his great friend, Pupul -although she wasn't a great friend of him yet: JK leaves the United States, after the Second World War, he goes to India, he stayed there for about two years, I think, and there he meets those great friends who went to see him die in the United States. Pupul Jayakar, who was probably his most important biographer, perhaps the most faithful one, whom I had the pleasure, the privilege of

knowing, goes to Krishnamurti –this is in “Commentaries on living,” Pupul’s name is not there, but you’ll recognize this if you read Jiddu Krishnamurti’s book “Commentaries on Living.” Pupul goes to see Krishnamurti and tells him:

—I want to talk to my husband, and I know you can make me talk to my husband.

—Where is your husband?

—He’s dead, but I know you have the capacity, the *rishi*, the power to communicate with my husband. Of putting me in contact with my husband. Can you or can you not do it? —She was a very “yes or no” person. A very energetic woman, professor of compared religions in the University of Rajpur, and adviser of Indira Gandhi, who was a prime minister of India, and was murdered –Indira Gandhi- by her own bodyguards. And Pupul was in that environment, say, in the Indian elite, and she tells JK she wants to speak to her husband. So JK tells her:

—I can make you talk to your husband, but you have to tell me which husband you want to talk to.

—I’ve only had one husband. —So Krishnamurti tells her:

—No, what I mean is: what husband do you want to talk to? The young man you met at the university, with whom you daydreamed of eagles? Or that thirty-year-old man who had problems to pay his mortgage? Or with the forty-year-old man who had prostate problems, etc.? With which one of them do you want to talk? —And Pupul tells him:

—You’ve said it all! Thank you very much.

And they became friends until death, of course. Pupul came from India to say goodbye to JK, who died in February 1986. Pupul was present, next to Krishnamurti.

So, saying “describe mom” is the same as telling JK “make me talk to my dead husband.” Is there hatred between the progenitor and the son? Well, anyone who tells me they never

hated their mother is a liar, because you can't tell me the first person who ever told me "don't do that!" didn't make me angry. Don't pee on your pants, don't poop your pants, don't climb on the table, don't meet with those friends I don't like, and don't climb to the rooftop with Paredes (a boy called Paredes), I don't want you walking on the rooftops with Paredes, and I still dream of Paredes (laughter). Whenever I have a problem, I dream of Paredes (laughter). Well, little things. "I don't want you climbing to the roof with Paredes," and my glory was to climb to the roof with Paredes, who, by the way, is currently a physician in Santa Fe, Argentina. Is there hatred between progenitor and son? Should that be seen in psychotherapy? Is there hatred between spouses? Ah, this question is never asked, especially when the wife is present (laughter).

Audience: And when she makes the rules.

RFG: You had to denounce that! (laughter) You're supposed to keep quiet about those things (laughter).

Audience: They're already well-known (laughter).

RFG: Everybody knows (laughter).

Audience: Especially married people (laughter).

RFG: So, is there hate between the spouses? Of course there is, every now and then. Now, why? Does the hatred between spouses start in the honeymoon? Because of a little frustration of something one expects from the other, and that other person does not fulfill. In their silver-anniversary of the wedding, the husband tells the wife: "Oh darling, silver anniversary at last," and she says: "Yeah, but you didn't open the car door for me on our honeymoon." And do false expectations exist? In any relationship, are there transferences or displacements? Of course there are. And Freud, who was a great observer, was wrong in saying that psychoanalysis would bring the end of conflict. He himself, honestly, made sure to say it, that psychoanalysis was not effective as a therapy, but it was useful for the study of the mind. And we add, for the study of Precinct

C of the mind. Sigmund Freud is very important. Is hatred conscious, or can it be unconscious sometimes? I asked JK this question, and JK told me: “The hatred you might feel for someone is unconscious as long as you don’t want to see it.” Beautiful! And hatred, of course, is made conscious in Unitary Perception. Anger, sadness, fear, become conscious in Unitary Perception, when you start to attempt it, and some people get scared because they think Unitary Perception is that. No! The truth sets us free, and Unitary Perception shows you, right from the start, the truth about what you are, of “I am what I am.” Unitary Perception shows you the truth of “I am what I am” right from the start. And if we don’t get afraid, we can come to a very beautiful life.

Audience: Or it can come to us...

RFG: Or, that beautiful life can come to us, which is an even better way of saying it.

And *reaction formation*. Another term from Sigmund Freud to refer to a very subtle defense, in which, for instance, the mother engulfs or overprotects the child she hates, to avoid seeing that hatred, which causes the mother embarrassment, guilt or anxiety. Ah, then I overprotect him: “Don’t play football because you’ll break a leg, don’t go skiing because you’ll lose a knee.” In one word, I overprotect him, and that is reaction formation. I protect him because I’m reacting to my hatred. All of these subtleties are important before going into psychotherapy. To see your own envy. What does Freud’s Oedipus complex mean? You can read that in any of Freud’s books, especially in “The Ego and the Id,” published in 1905. Is it true that in puberty the organism starts to produce hormones that didn’t exist before, coming from the gonads – testicles and ovaries- and that they produce a series of unbalances and confusions at the intellectual or mental level? Of course it is true. And is it true that the twelve-year-old boy falls in love with a fifteen-year-old girl and fails to realize that girl is going out with a twenty-five-year old man? Well, he fails to see that because he’s invaded by pubescent hormones. Freud describes puberty as a purgatory period in which there are regressions, perceptual and emotional instability, a more

difficult intimacy with parents only, and the sublimation of that energy, called libido, through painting, for instance, or through any other way. Just like people smoke cigars or cigarettes instead of killing themselves, because wanting to commit suicide is not conscious, so they do a small thing, like smoking, which is a sort of slow suicide. I “dance” Tai Chi so the Japanese invaders don’t realize I’m training to fight back, I mean, an American soldier said that. Passive Aggressive. What is that? I say yes, but it’s no. Double-bind is a very subtle word that refers to a fact like this: for instance, the mother tells her son: “Okay sweetie, go to the cinema, I’ll just stay here alone and miserable.” (laughter) So, if the boy goes to the cinema, he will feel bad, and if he stays, he will feel bad. That’s called double-bind, i.e., whatever you do, you will feel bad with what I tell you.

Audience: Double shock.

RFG: Double shock. You’ll feel bad whether you go or not (laughter). That’s why some people say: “There’s only one mother, and she had to end up with me.” (laughter) Yes, I saw that in an Italian movie and wrote it down: “*andate che io rimango sola come una cagna.*” I was surprised by the word *cagna*, from can, (dog). “You go to the movies, and I’ll stay here, alone like a dog.”

And we’ve all seen this in one way or another, right? I’m summarizing, we’ve all seen this. Any questions?

Audience: When we say Holokinetic Psychotherapy is the only therapy without past, but the conflict is here...

RFG: Right.

Audience: But the conflict is the past, that is, the horizontal conflict is the observer and the opposite from the observer, and the observer is the past, so it’s not a therapy that obeys in the same way we were saying earlier that, when B encompasses C, memory is seen, but not obeyed. Not exactly like that, but...

RFG: Right, conflict is the past, so what we actually have to do, to put it simply, is...

Audience: Just a minute to regain connection.

RFG: Alright.

[A break is made to fix connection issues.]

RFG: So, we've seen all this, I repeat it because we'll start these role reversal exercises, and it's important to know all this.

Why do I deny? It's to return to conflict, which is fear-anger-sadness, which I love because it is familiar, it's what I know, and I'm afraid of what I don't know, what we were saying a moment ago, of a girl who complained about her uncertainty when attempting Unitary Perception. That's because she never entered Precinct B. Her fear kept her inside Precinct C.

Audience: There's a question here, from Argentina.

RFG: Yes, go ahead.

Audience: Hello Rubén. We were saying here, regarding Psychotherapy, since we're all learning here, we maybe lack the smart questions to do it, so it would be nice to hear the smart questions for us to learn how you communicate with a patient...

RFG: No, no, we'll get to that soon, but I'm just saying there are very basic things that we've been over already, and I'm just repeating them so you don't forget. We're getting there.

Shall we move on, or is there anything else?

Audience: No, no, let's move on.

RFG: Dreams, Freud himself said it, oniric dreams, which are 95% of dreams, are there to maintain sleep, to keep us asleep. But other dreams exist, which we will see later, which are archetypal and projective, very rare dreams. The most common dreams are the oniric dreams, which are produced to keep you

asleep. For instance, if you're sleeping and you hear, say, a bell ring, you incorporate the sound into the dream in order to continue sleeping.

Prognostic.

—Doctor, will I get rid of this problem?

—Yes, if you make Unitary Perception your whole life and not just another knowledge.

—Doctor, will I achieve Unitary Perception little by little with lots of effort?

—No!

I'm repeating this, because these are questions you hear right away.

—Doctor, will I get rid of this problem?

—Yes, if you make Unitary Perception your whole life and not just another knowledge.

That is, if you don't take it to Precinct C and nothing else. Another very common question is "Will I achieve Unitary Perception little by little with lots of effort?" No! Because you don't need effort at all. What effort do you need to listen? None.

In Unitary Perception, the professor is who does psychotherapy in class, and the therapist, who does the psychotherapy, benefits as much as the patient. He doesn't feel exhausted at the end of the therapy, as it happens with other therapies, why? Because the peace and the energy don't come gradually. They come suddenly, and the patient's improvement is not gradual, it's also sudden. And we have several therapists here who tell me the patient's improvement is immediate. Cecilia and those who are doing therapy here say yes. Imaginary life ends right now, not gradually. Communion is without past. To go to Precinct B is real communion. When the therapist and the patient go together to Precinct B, there is real communion,

which is not the communion of the choir, where everyone is singing the same song at the same time, and they get a feeling of communion, but since it is formulated and planned, it's not communion. For it to be communion, it has to be spontaneous, not planned, not formulated. It has to be doing the same thing at the same time, but with no plan, no formula, as it happens in the choir or in a parade, where all the soldiers are marching at the same pace. But that is not communion, why? Because it's planned and formulated, just like the choir. And interpretation disappears, the therapist does not interpret; he or she tries to see, together with the patient, the problem the patient brings. I always give the example of Galileo, who, in 1632 was still teaching Ptolemy. Galileo, who was an expert in Copernicus. Copernicus had died in the year 1543, that means a hundred years of dread of the truth had gone by. A hundred years of dread of dying like Giordano Bruno, in 1600. Galileo was perhaps twenty years old when Bruno died, burnt completely in the Vatican, so Galileo was afraid of sharing Bruno's fortune. He does not teach Copernicus, whom he was an expert on, but Ptolemy, from 145 AD. Those were 100 years of dread of the truth. But interpreting is not the same as seeing together in Unitary Perception. And another thing we recommend doing is a twelve session pact, so the patient can see repeatedly what is to enter B and to leave C. And what it is to live like that, when you tell the patient: okay, the session ends here, don't forget to live like this until the next time we meet, next week, at the same hour, next Wednesday, at six in the afternoon, we meet again and until then, for the following seven days, live like this, just like we're living now –which introduces the individual importance.

Very well, so, when we make a role reversal, the students become therapists and the professor becomes a patient. I recommend you to read: "Dialogue on religion and Satan; Kosmon, that cold winter of the naked man"; "Silence, space and Ego"; "Introduction to Unitary Perception at the University of Guadalajara", which you should have read by now, read it again; "The mind is more than memory", don't forget to read that one; "Unitary Perception" and the identity of the universe, page 180 of "Lo Profundo de la Mente"; "Talking about the I"

from page 207; “The I does not exist in the Now” from page 369 of the same book; “The words ‘God’ and ‘I’” [page 375]; and the last page of “Lo Profundo de la Mente”: Being one with energy, [page 466]. All that will help you understand what happens in the passage from C to B.

Let’s start with someone who doesn’t know much. You, Eduardo, have never been in a workshop, right?

Audience: No.

RFG: So it’s convenient that you try to lead me into Unitary Perception now. I’m your patient and we have exactly 45 minutes. Why am I inviting Eduardo? Because Eduardo is one of the few people here who haven’t attended a workshop or seminar already.

Audience: One second please.

RFG: Let me know when we can start.

Audience: Go on, it’s recording.

RFG: Okay. Eduardo, you’re the therapist, I’m Ruben, the patient. I’m terribly sad and I came here looking for help. Let’s start.

Audience (T) *[in the role of holokinetic therapist]: I would start by asking what your level of energy is and how you sleep.*

RFG (P) *[in the role of patient]: Good energy, good sleep...*

T: Then, I would give you an introduction of what Unitary Perception is, which is no more and no less than being here totally. I would try to teach you to be in contact with your senses. *Do you feel right now the weight of your body on the chair, either in relaxation or stress in your muscles? Do you listen to my voice while you listen to everything that’s in the room? Without labeling those things, without naming them.*

P: *Aha.*

T: *Are you (I don't know if this is the right word) aware of your visual field?*

P: *Yes, I see you.*

T: *Without losing the capacity to perceive through your other senses.*

P: *You mean, that I should see you?*

T: *Yes.*

RFG: Let's stop here. What could be the mistake here?

Audience: Well, first I always like to ask patients if they have slept well the night before, or the two previous nights, and then if they feel comfortable, if they feel right.

RFG: Comfortable in the chair.

Audience: Comfortable in the chair.

RFG: Before saying, like Eduardo, feel the weight...

Audience: Yes, and then "at the same time" is missing too...

RFG: At the same time, to listen and see at the same time. Anything else? When he says: "Look at the visual field." I say: "I'm seeing you."

Audience: See all the visual field.

RFG: He should have corrected me: "It's not only to see me, but to see the whole visual field." He should have corrected me there. Has anyone seen anything else?

Audience: The attempt is not mutual. He's the one inducing the attempt to the patient, but it's not a mutual act. So it doesn't happen in therapist and patient at the same time, and the language is not in accordance with that. "Are you...", right? It's an attempt of Unitary Perception here by both. So, language has to correspond to "We are seeing..."

Audience: We're attempting...

Audience: Therapy is an attempt by both, so...

Audience: Fortunately, both reap the benefits, right? Then...

RFG: Ah, of course.

Audience: ...then, if the therapist is making an invitation to Unitary Perception but he's not attempting it, he's missing out on the whole therapy, so why wouldn't the therapist attempt Unitary Perception, right?

RFG: Right, careful with rushing into telling the patient without being in Unitary Perception yourself.

Audience: And then, generally, if a patient goes to the office is because they have a problem. So, if that problem comes up, let him listen, let him see it at the same time.

RFG: Was there any mistake there? Because he asked about energy and sleep.

Audience: Only.

Audience: He forgot the reason for the consultation.

RFG: But, did he miss any other question in order to detect problems that won't benefit from Unitary Perception?

Audience: Have you spent more than 48 hours without sleep?

RFG: That's one. Any other? What else did he forget to ask to know if I could benefit or not?

Audience: Hallucinations, to discard schizophrenia...

RFG: How would you ask that, to any person? You don't know if the patient has hallucinations, how would you ask that?

Audience: No, I really don't know.

Audience: Do you hear voices?

RFG: Do you hear voices?

Audience: So you just ask them directly?

RFG: “Do you hear voices?” It’s like: “Have you thought about committing suicide?” It’s very important to ask the question directly. “Have you ever thought about killing yourself?” “Have you ever heard voices from people who weren’t there?” So, you’re looking for hallucinations, the most common of them are auditory. And generally, they’re insulting. So, how do you manage to discard schizophrenia? You have to discard depression, schizophrenia and retardation, to see if this man, Ruben, will benefit or not from what you have, which is Unitary Perception.

Audience: What would the transition be? Because I don’t know that, it’s a question. The patient says “I came here because I’m very sad,” and I ask him about the visual field. How do you make a transition from what he comes from and what the therapist is talking about? I mean, well...

RFG: That makes some people angry. “What does my sadness have to do with listening?”

Audience: How do you go from what they came to tell you to whether they feel comfortable in the chair, right?

RFG: Yes, that’s very important too.

Audience: Ruben, for the audience in Argentina...

RFG: Ah, yes, what we’re saying... you say it.

Audience: Yes, the question is... how do you make a transition between the problem and how the senses are involved, right? How we perceive...

Audience: ...between the problem that the patient brings and the beginning of the attempt of Unitary Perception, to avoid a rejection. “Well, you’re very sad but, I don’t know, please now pay attention to what we will do,” something like that, right?

Audience: You can ask them where the sadness comes from, so you take them to see that sadness...

Audience: Well, I think so... in fact, the patient comes for a reason, sadness, fear, anger, so, we will begin, we won't stop listening; and listening and seeing at the same time we will, I don't know, see the reason for your consultation, but without ceasing to listen and without ceasing to see.

RFG: "For the moment, we won't deal with your sadness, for the moment we will listen to all the sound." In a way, you're introducing them, without causing a reaction, because they'll want to talk about their sadness and you tell them to listen! "I want to talk!"

Audience: Page 310 of *The Psychology of the 21st Century* has something very important about psychotherapy. It's a dialogue between therapist and patient where the patient brings a problem, sadness over divorce, and the therapist tells him: "what we're going to do is to get in contact with your problem without naming it, because your problem is that you call that recurring movement sadness," then perhaps a good introduction is to say "we're going to get directly in contact with your problem." Then, he feels safe that we will deal with what he's bringing, but "please, pay careful attention."

RFG: For Buenos Aires, so you can hear this, we're insisting on the relationship between what the therapist is saying, "listen, feel, see at the same time" and what the patient is saying, "I'm sad," and many times there is a conflict in the patient, because he or she feels betrayed. "What? I come here with my sadness and this guy (therapist Eduardo) tells me to listen to the sound?" Do you see? There's a kind of phasing out there, apparently, that the patient fails to understand, and it should be clarified in the way they're presenting here, or in the way that you come up with [as a Holokinetic therapist].

Audience: What I see is that, to avoid causing that resistance, I first have the patient notice how they are involved in a cyclicality of which they cannot go out, and which they're not aware of. So I point it out for them and: "Exactly! I don't want to think

about that anymore, and I keep thinking.” “No matter how hard I try to stop thinking, the past brings it up and it comes back.” So I make a short explanation of how the META process works and once they realize it –because no one [no patient] knows how it works, none of them realize it’s a unitary movement, but they think that with effort, with will, with insistence, with thought or by evading thought...

RFG: You’re saying the META process is a single thing...

Audience: Aha.

RFG: ...and that it’s also cyclical, repetitive, etc.

Audience: That’s very important, because the patient, when he realizes that he wasn’t even aware of...

Audience: Or resists it...

Audience: Because at most, what the patient can say is they evade, right? Thinking about something else. So I also make them notice that: “At night, when you go to bed, when you lie down, all those thoughts you evaded during the day come back...” “Oh yes, exactly, at night I’m there again...”

RFG: “And that’s why I can’t sleep...”

Audience: “And that’s why I can’t sleep”, so, what happens? Since we’re now realizing thought is not the solution, neither is effort or all the rest, then listen to me, even if it sounds too simple, let’s attempt Holokinetic Psychotherapy, and we’ll see...” And the patients go with it, they listen to what you’re saying.

RFG: What Cecilia is saying...

Audience: “Sit comfortably in the chair, let’s start seeing...”

RFG: That is, to clarify what the META process is, for the patient to understand what it is, its laws...

Audience: But in a very concise way!

RFG: In a very concise way, but also its laws: that it's cyclical, repetitive, dual, etc. For someone who is not very learned, explain what "dual" means...

Audience: I use those words, and yes, some of them ask me what they mean, and you explain them and they say: "Oh, yes, exactly!" They feel really identified with that.

RFG: Of course, and that alone is therapeutic already.

Audience: And that builds the patients' trust towards you, because they say "she understood me perfectly."

RFG: Of course, "I'm not crazy, right?" I mean, she's describing how my mind works because she knows how the mind works.

Audience: Unitary Perception in therapy is a discovery for them, even if it was a little taste, because they have never perceived...

RFG: And it's likely that one or two sessions go by without them perceiving it, because some patients are very stubborn in clinging to C, they love pain because that's what they know...

Audience: Because they "already know," or they say they're already listening or seeing...

RFG: Ah, right, or they think about listening without listening. All that is possible.

Audience: That's why it's dangerous to tell them to be aware the brain is already perceiving, because then... "what for?"

RFG: Of course, "well, I'm already perceiving, listening..." and it's not true! They're maybe thinking about listening but not actually listening. These are the subtleties you will find, right? And we'll continue to see them in the Course, and you have to read them in the written work too, so you, as a future therapist, assimilate them, otherwise you'll forget about all this. So, we said we still had to discard those, say, diseases that prevent the patient from benefiting from Unitary Perception.

You discarded depression right away, then skipped to the attempt of Unitary Perception, but you forgot to discard retardation and schizophrenia. How would do it—so far you're doing fine with schizophrenia-, what else would you ask the patient to detect schizophrenia or retardation?

Audience: Perhaps I'd ask about his relationship with people, or rather how they describe their relationship... [*to see if there is*] flat affect.

RFG: How they describe their relationships, sometimes it's enough with asking them to talk a little about themselves. Not "tell me about your past," but "tell me about yourself," and incoherence will appear: they don't finish their sentences, they roll back then move forward again, and they've spoken for a while and you have no idea what he's talked about. Then you wonder "is this person schizophrenic?" So you ask them: "Do you hear voices?" "Well, every now and then..." Dun-dun-dun (laughter) "What voices?" "I hear a voice that says things I can't even repeat." "What do the voices tell you?" "No... they're insulting things." So you think: "I'll better not make this patient waste time or money, I'll send him to the psychiatrist." But supposing he's not schizophrenic, not depressed, how do you find out if he's retarded?

Audience: I'd start to pay attention to his reflexes, the capacity for attention he has...

RFG: That would apply for attention deficit, but how do you know if he's retarded? Some questions tell you easily. For example, have him interpret a proverb. "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones," that's an English proverb. What does it mean? And he tells you: "They shouldn't, because they could break the glasses!" What did the patient do? He understood in a very concrete, very basic way, which makes you wonder: "is this man retarded?" Because that proverb means much more, much more. Or, for instance "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink." How do you interpret that? So if they tell you: "Well, if the horse doesn't want to, he won't drink." Those are the things a retarded person will say. On the other hand, a learned person

will tell you “Well, what can we do about Obama?” They made a quantum leap from the proverb to reality, and you’ll find out if it’s a good leap. “Why do you bring up Obama?” “Because he’s promised things he’s not doing...” Know what I’m saying? That person makes comparisons with the proverb, which means a high-level of abstraction. Whereas the retarded person tells you everything concretely: “Well, if the horse doesn’t want to, he won’t drink.” That sounds like retardation. You can order a Wechsler-Revised III to know if he’s retarded or not, because you could be wasting your time and the patient’s money because he will not benefit from Unitary Perception. He will never understand it. And there are other ways, but especially the test. And before sending him to the test, which is not cheap, first you test him with proverbs, or “Tell me what’s the greatest problem of mankind right now.” And if he says: “My house is full of cockroaches,” you know that’s a very dim-witted patient. Is he retarded? Wechsler Test. “What is the greatest problem of mankind today?” “Well, I have a nephew in Iraq.” Yes, that’s a great problem, but that is *his* problem.

Audience: Besides, in the interview he must have said a lot already, right?

RFG: Of course, it’s not a problem of mankind, it’s a personal problem. That is, in a few words, you manage to see if you should send it to discard retardation or not, with proverbs, trying to see how he understands things. What is mankind’s greatest problem? That’s a good way to start.

Audience: Psychotherapy is like... to help, right? It’s to help...

RFG: Of course, *therapis* in Greek means servant. Therapist means servant. Which is almost the same as slave, i.e., a slave that helps to reduce suffering.

Audience: Well, that’s not so clear for most people.

RFG: No, that’s why the act of therapy is to clarify, right from the start, everything. Okay, so you see me and I tell you I’m hearing voices. What do you tell me?

Audience: That you probably need a psychiatrist and medication.

Audience: But don't say "probably".

RFG: Drop the "probably". "You need to see the psychiatrist." Don't start therapy without being in contact with a psychiatrist. If you're in the CPH, there's no problem because we're working as a team, but if you're alone in an office, first make a pact with a psychiatrist so you can send him these patients, because otherwise you're framing yourself for failure, because these patients will speak badly about you when they see no progress.

Very well, so I don't have any of those things: schizophrenia, retardation or depression. And now let's go back to the attempt, you want me to go into B. We try again. Actually, it has to be attempted several times during a session, for the patient to go deeper and deeper into peace. "Let's make a second attempt, Mr. Rubén, what do you think, are you comfortable? Are you listening?" Listening to what? "Are you listening to me, to that car?", etc.

Student: *[in the role of holokinetic therapist] (T): ...to all your ear can perceive in this moment, without classifying the sounds, be aware of the energy the ear can perceive, at the same time you see your whole visual field.*

RFG: *[in the role of patient] (P): Exactly, at the same time you see... But, I hear something like a car out there, but then I forget about the other sounds, and I see you, but when I'm looking at you, I'm no longer listening, I can't do it at the same time...*

T: *I'd point out that you're fragmenting things, the mere fact of concentrating starts to separate the senses and that...*

P: *So you're telling me not to concentrate...*

T: *Right, no effort is needed.*

P: *So I listen to you, I look at you, and then I hear the car.*

T: *It has to be done all at the same instant, right now. Right now.*

P: *And is that possible?*

T: *That's right, it's completely perceptible... all those different forms of energy are right here, but you're dividing them, so I'll ask you to attempt to listen to everything at the same time again, and to see your whole visual field, while you're aware of the gravity, right now, in this room, with you.*

RFG: Okay, let's hear the criticism now. Javier, would you have done something different?

Audience: Well, just now, in the example of language, which is very hard to clarify when you're just starting.

RFG: Yes, this is Eduardo's first time.

Audience: When he talked about the sound, the detail [he missed] was that sound is perceived at the same time by the brain. And well, right now, I figure that, since we know each other... it's not the same when it's a completely new person, but let's remember the mutual attempt, I mean, that the attempt is mutual, and that we should make it clear we're attempting together, for example: "Can we be aware of the sound...?"

RFG: Eduardo doesn't seem to understand you. How would you explain that to him? You're not understanding...

Audience: No, it's clear.

RFG: Ah, I'm sorry.

Audience: Emphasizing that it's a mutual thing, between you, the patient and the therapist.

RFG: Right. Anything to add?

Audience: Perhaps at the beginning, when you asked if he slept well, I'd also ask what sleeping well means to the patient. How many hours is "sleeping well" for you?

RFG: *[in the role of patient]* Four! (laughter)

Audience: Because our culture emphasizes that four or five hours is enough to sleep well. So, maybe we should delve a bit into these questions.

RFG: Yes, don't assume the patient has understood you, and don't take what the patient told you as the ultimate truth. The patient is also confused...

Audience: Check if he's being honest.

RFG: Right, check, and especially if he's being clear, if he knows what he's saying...

Audience: Perhaps he says "yeah, I sleep nine hours" and he's sleeping four, to avoid getting sent to a psychiatrist...

RFG: Or he tells you he's not hearing voices but he is. What do you say?

Audience: Usually, the more honest they are in their answers, the best you can help them, and obviously you tell them: "The more honest your answers are, the more we will make of our time."

RFG: Did you get that, Eduardo? He didn't hear it. "And the more honest you are..."

Audience: That's what I tell patients the first time I see them.

RFG: You tell me: "The more honest you are with me, Mr. Rubén, the better our therapy. Don't hide anything from me, say things exactly as they are, don't distort them."

Audience: And also, patients relax when I have to ask tough questions, like if they hear voices, or about suicide-homicide, etc., I tell them: "these are just routine questions, but it's important that I ask them, and please be honest in your answers..." so they don't feel like "what's the deal with these questions?"

RFG: These are routine questions, and here they come:

Audience: I tell them that, and they relax a bit.

RFG: Suicide, homicide, etc.

Audience: In short, it's about placing yourself at the same level, not creating that sense of hierarchy, that I am...

Audience: ...because there's no difference in Holokinetic Therapy. The therapist is patient and the patient is a therapist.

RFG: Of course!

Audience: And the dynamic we will have here, I think –well, I don't know, I suggest we assume, for instance, that we already know all the questions on diagnosis and that we've discarded a problem, and let's focus in Holokinetic Therapy, which is the point of interest now. I say we shouldn't waste much time in making the diagnosis, let's assume the diagnoses are already discarded.

Audience: Here.

Audience: Here. And let's go into Holokinetic Therapy right away, as if any psychiatric problem was discarded already. And regarding what happened here with him, I think the thought factor is important, because that's the main problem the patient doesn't know how to see, because the emerging contents are what bombards his consciousness the most, and when there is a more concrete problem, then that is what consumes him the most...

RFG: And in practice, what are you recommending to Eduardo?

Audience: That he never explored the way in which thought is seen together with the fact of Unitary Perception. That is, to listen to the sound and all the rest... but "How do I see this constant noise called thought? And that's really important, maybe one of the most important things a patient has to learn.

RFG: And the patient is very unlikely to tell you “How do I see this constant noise...?”

Audience: No, he’s not aware, actually...

RFG: He doesn’t even know.

Audience: ...when you explore a bit, you realize he’s thinking, not perceiving, he’s thinking about perceiving but...

RFG: He thinks about listening but doesn’t listen, what we were just saying.

Audience: And then, when you’ve explained everything... the attempt... always –I say this from experience, they usually ask me how they are going to be in their daily life without thought, because they don’t know the difference between memory and thought, and it doesn’t seem so, but it’s very common.

RFG: Very common. Yes, these are all subtleties that we have to see in the mutual movement. Any other thing you want to add?

RFG: *[in the role of holokinetic therapist] (T):* So, to wrap things up, since we have seven minutes left, it would be something like this, like saying: “*Are you comfortable?*” Now you’re the patient... “*Are you comfortable, Eduardo?*”

Audience: *[in the role of patient]* Yes, yes, I’m fine here.

T: *There’s no position, no padmasana, no special position, you just sit for comfort, and if after a minute sitting like that you’re uncomfortable, you change position to be comfortable again. Simple as that! There’s not a position. Second: “Are we listening to all the sound? There are sounds out there in the streets, but we don’t name them, and there is silence between the sounds; we’re listening to sound, silence, everything at the same time, while we feel the weight of our body on the chair. So, sound, weight, at the same time. And at the same time we see the whole visual field, I’m looking at the card holder there, but at the same time I’m seeing all that can be seen. Not seeing everything, but seeing all that can be seen. So: seeing,*

listening, feeling the weight, at the same time. Not thinking about listening, but listening! And feel how the body is calm while one is listening to all that can be heard, at the same time. The body starts to take a calm of its own. Do you feel that calm? Honestly.

P: *Immediately.*

RFG: Immediately! So that's how the therapeutic act begins, after we've discarded the diagnoses that don't benefit: depression, bipolarity, schizophrenia, retardation, attention deficit. All of that discarded –which we just did! And I have to check if you're really feeling calm, and I have to ask you. When I feel –because I'm with you, it's mutual, I'm listening with you; I ask you to listen while I listen, it's mutual, so I listen to all the sound at the same time and that makes me feel calm. Do you feel that calm? And you said: immediately. So far so good. Now, the patient might tell you: “No, I don't feel calm, I feel very tense.” “Don't worry, this is not easy, it seems easy but it isn't. But we'll try again.” And again, another attempt. And the question we also have to ask, if the patient just won't enter B, is: “How many hours do you sleep? And how many hours do you work?” Like this guy in Saltillo told me, a physical education teacher, who had seven jobs! Seven jobs a day: he went to sleep at eleven or midnight, after having spent his whole day working, since seven in the morning. He just couldn't enter B. You have to ask if there is stress. If there is a lot of stress, stress makes entering Unitary Perception difficult, or else, what does it do? It makes Unitary Perception feel as palpitations, tingling, headache, somnolence. So, if they report any of those things:

— “What you're feeling is not because of Unitary Perception, but because of the stress you've brought on yourself, working in excess and sleeping little, and not having enough rest.” “Do you take a day every week to rest?”

— “No, on Sundays I sell hot dogs, because I make use of my Sundays to gain a few extra bucks.” —He has not a single day of rest, that's why it's difficult for him to enter Unitary Perception.

— “And how much do you sleep?” — “Four hours.”

You already have the answer to why he won't enter, just won't enter. How do you heal that? More rest, less work. And that's not easy in some cases.

Audience: Or in most cases.

RFG: Yes, in most cases there is this situation...

Audience: But what if they tell you they don't see the relationship with their problem?

RFG: That stress won't let you enter Unitary Perception.

Audience: No, but I mean, what relationship does Unitary Perception have with his problem. You have to make him understand...

RFG: That's at the beginning.

Audience: Can you repeat that?

RFG: It's what Cecilia, or someone else said, that first you have to make the connection between the patient's problem and what we want to teach them, which is Unitary Perception. And sometimes, not to say always, the patient fails to see the relationship. “But I am sad and you're talking to me about listening. What does that have to do with it? You're defrauding me.”

Audience: Perhaps what's missing from this class is –suppose I'm a classic therapist- so the connection between a patient who comes with a serious relationship problem, sunken in the sadness he carries, since I identify that conflict in the past, how does Holokinetic Psychology –what nature of conflict does it define so we can treat it in the present, in the now, that is, the leap from a classic therapist who says: “Well, this man is in serious mourning because someone has died, and that happened in the past, so I should talk about that mourning.” How do you make the leap from that to the fact that what he has is a conflict

which is right here, now, with which he can get in contact here? That leap...

RFG: Yes, that's what we said at the beginning, to clarify the connection between the problem the patient brings and what you will give him, which is Unitary Perception, something that many times the patient doesn't understand. That's what we said at the beginning, but not with much clarity or depth. We'll have to review this in the rest of the Course, so no doubts remain, so we can see the therapeutic act from fact to fact, to go through the whole thing until we get it right.

And well, I think that's all for today, unless there are questions and answers.

Audience: I remembered something. As you age, you lose the S4 sleep stage, right? But, do you also spend less hours in bed?

RFG: Well, that's what they tell us. I've spoken to William Dement, who's an expert in sleep, and he told me: "old people need to sleep as much as any adult person, that is, eight to nine hours." If they sleep less, that's because they're thinking about dying in their sleep too much (laughter). Yes, fear! That is, they go to bed in fear that they will die, because there's a prayer in the USA that goes (this was in the USA, William Dement, San Francisco): "If I die before I wake...", that's how the prayer starts, and all the children say it, but when they're old, "If I die before I wake..." Now they're hypnotized with that (laughter), so they go to sleep with that fear. "I'm 69 already, so now, If I die before I wake, well..." So, careful, ask this too: "do you go to bed with fear of dying?" All you can know about the patient regarding sleep is little. Because sleep is one of the bases of health, or rather, not only one of the bases, but one of the signs that let us know how the patient's health is. Better sleep means better health. So, explore sleep, all the questions you'll ask are little. How much time? Do you wake up a lot? Is it hard for you to go back to sleep? Have you ever spent more than 48 hours without sleeping? To men of age forty or more: Do you wake up to urinate more than once? If they say: "Yes, I get up four times to urinate," they're likely to have prostate hypertrophy. "Go see a urologist." Many

questions about sleep have to be asked. These are the most common, but the more you know about sleep, the better. Any question or comment?

Audience: No questions in Buenos Aires, they say.

RFG: Okay, so we finish and see you next Sunday...

Audience: Eduardo has a question.

Audience: Do you talk about Precinct A with patients?

RFG: In special cases, yes, because not everyone is interested. But when they're interested, yes, we have moments for Precinct A. A patient told me recently, right here:

—Doctor, before leaving, I would like to pray with you.

I tell her:

—Well, but, I'm a difficult person; you have to explain to me what praying means, because JesuKristos says: Our father who are in Heaven, etc., but after he's done teaching his friends how to pray, he says: "But remember God knows what you need before you even open your mouth." So that means we don't need it. Now, is that what you're talking about?

—Well, everyone can pray as they please... —Ah, that's even worse (laughter). Romanticism creeping into religion: do it anyway you want (laughter). It's not "Our Father who are in Heaven..." it's whatever you feel like (laughter).

Audience: Whatever needs you have...

RFG: Right, "Dear God, please send me a fridge soon because my milk is going off" (laughter). Yes, so, "what is praying for you?" Then, a conversation took place which the patient didn't like much, but I was talking about Precinct A, and showing the patient we cannot deprecate Precinct A. There's a line in the New Testament which says your blasphemy against anything will be forgiven, except for blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. I take that very seriously. I ask her:

—What is praying? Don't come to me insulting the sacred, or taking the sacred as if it was a football game. No, not with me. Tell me what praying is. I'll tell you what praying is, I understand praying as when JesuKristos tells us, after giving us the Lord's Prayer, which is the only prayer there is, not your prayer or mine, but that one: Thy will be done and not mine, and then he says, after giving us the Lord's Prayer, that Gods knows what we need before we even open our mouth. Ah, what does it mean? That we're free from praying or not praying, so I propose to you that we become free to pray or not pray. If you want to pray, pray, and I'm free to do whatever I want, while you pray.

—Oh, fine. (she didn't like it).

—But you can pray if you want—, I tell her.

—Well, no, I wanted to pray with you.

—We'll continue talking about that (this was at the end of the session), we'll continue talking about that next time.

But in the following sessions, the subject didn't return, because she realized I was dead serious, dead serious about the problem of Precinct A. That there will not be blasphemy against the Holy Spirit here, we will not take it as a joke; it's something too serious, it's not a formula. I transmitted all that to the patient in that dialogue, and she was no fool, so she understood.

A patient, when I was going through my divorce, comes and tells me: "You're getting divorced, and that means you have a very hard heart" (laughter)... that's what JesuKristos says, that divorce is for the hard-hearted. So she, this patient tells me: "You have a hard heart, because I know you're getting divorced." I tell her: "Yes." And she says: "And I want you to tell me if you really are a Christian, because otherwise, I can't come to see you." And I tell her: "Look, if I was a homosexual, I wouldn't tell you, and if I was a Christian, I wouldn't tell you either (laughter), because that's between me and God. And I won't turn that into blasphemy, or into a football game, or into

a boxing match. To me, it's the most sacred thing there is, to know if I'm Christian or not. To know if I'm Christian is the most sacred thing there is to me! But I won't tell you." And she didn't return, I lost her as a patient. But if she had understood, she would have come back. But, you Cecilia know this, I don't take the sacred as a joke. Do you get that word? [*Explains Spanish expression*]

Audience: No.

RFG: As a laughing matter. It's not a joke for me. So I answer this patient, but I answer in the most truthful way that can possibly come from Ruben, right? As it should be for every one of us. To truly answer to the patient, what you really feel...

Audience: And assuming the consequences, right? Because that's the question, that sometimes you make concessions so as to avoid the consequences.

RFG: Right, concessions. But well, if you make concessions about the Holy Spirit –it's written! I don't remember if Jesus said it (or who,) but I think it's been said: "You'll be forgiven for anything but blasphemy against the Holy Spirit". Oh dear, as Bob Hope, another comedian, says: "I do benefits for all religions - I'd hate to blow the hereafter on a technicality." (laughter)

We're done for today, see you next Sunday at ten.

TOPICS - CLASS 9

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 9 (538)
- REVIEW OF BASIC NOTIONS OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY (538)
- FIRST ROLE REVERSAL AND FEEDBACK - CLASS 9 (542)
- READING: : EDUCATION AND VIOLENCE (BOOK: “COMPLETE INCARNATION”) (545)
- CLARIFICATIONS AND COMMENTS OF THE READING: EDUCATION AND VIOLENCE (548)
- THE “I” WANTS TO CONTINUE AND PERPETUATE ITSELF IN CONFLICT (555)
- FEEDBACK ON THE PRESENTIAL COURSE FROM STUDENTS (556)
- SECOND ROLE REVERSAL AND FEEDBACK (557)
- THIRD ROLE REVERSAL AND FEEDBACK (566)
- ACTION VS. ACTIVITY (585)
- COMMUNION IN JOY AND SADNESS (588)
- BEING A MIRROR OF EACH OTHER (589)

CLASS 9

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, October 3rd, 2010.

RFG: Good morning. We are gathered here again for the Sunday Presential Course, always trying to transmit Unitary Perception as the solution to the growing division of humanity, which seems to be convenient for many traders of war and misery.

Today we will continue with how to pass from C to B. That is the whole meaning of the course: how to go from C to B, which we were talking about at the end of the previous class.

But before moving on to that, I would like to know if you read what you received to read and if there are any questions about the readings, before moving on to psychotherapy. Are there any questions about the readings you received... and did not read? No, no (laughter).

Is there no question, no comment? Well, next time read the homework, because otherwise the Course gets inevitably fragmented. It is very important that you read the texts you are given.

Let's go over some basic things about [Holokinetic] Psychotherapy. You already know that it is about being comfortable, the psychotherapist has to be comfortable, in Unitary Perception, without any formulated position, but the position that gives comfort. We know that the therapist benefits as much as the patient, because the therapist has to be in Unitary Perception before beginning the psychotherapeutic act.

Let us remember that the peace and energy of Unitary Perception do not come gradually; they arrive right now, at the moment Unitary Perception begins. That the improvement is not gradual; it is immediate, because peace is immediate when

one attempts Unitary Perception. The imaginary life ends in Unitary Perception and the true, non-imaginary life begins. Remember that communion is without the past, communion is without the past, and it is valuable to the individual and to society. Societies that live in the past are the most warlike. We have the case of the Middle East: the Arabs are tied to one tradition, the Jews to another tradition, and war does not cease among them. Why? Because they are tied to their past, to their traditions. It seems unthinkable that they can say: “First we are human beings and then we are Jews”, “first we are human beings and then we are Arabs”. It seems unthinkable that this would happen, unless they took Unitary Perception seriously.

And we have said that going from C to B is not the communion of a choir or a parade, which has been formulated. Both the choir and the parade have been formulated. The communion that happens when you go from C to B, i.e., from the M.E.T.A. process to Unitary Perception, is unformulated, spontaneous.

Another thing that is not done in Holokinetic Therapy is interpreting. What we do is to see together in Unitary Perception. We spoke here before beginning the class about the need to see together, first of all, our conflict. Our conflict.

Because I cannot speak about love if I do not see my hatred, I cannot speak of courage if I do not see my fear, I cannot speak of generosity if I do not see my greed. I cannot talk about anything, right? I cannot speak of peace if I am full of rage, I cannot speak of joy if my sadness is consuming me. Then, first we have to look at fear, anger and sadness, and our own violence.

And that can be done in Holokinetic Psychotherapy. The same thing can happen: that the patient comes to psychotherapy for relief and returns to the life of Precinct C the rest of the time. It is necessary to alert the patient that his life has to continue in Unitary Perception, because that is the true life, the non-imaginary life. That is, we are talking about an individual responsibility in the patient, and in each one of us, to take living in Unitary Perception seriously, and also to teach it when

we can teach it, when we have incorporated the polished language.

What we are going to do now is a role reversal, where the student is the psychotherapist. I thought Yolanda could be the psychotherapist, what for? So that we can see together, in a critical way, how to improve the therapeutic act, provided it had to be improved. Do you dare?

Well, then we will do what is called role reversal, which is a very entertaining exercise, especially because we can all laugh at the student ... No! (laughs). It is very entertaining because we can see the difficulties in going from C to B in the therapeutic act.

And today we are not going to deal with basic things, I hope that Yolanda gets into Unitary Perception before she starts, that she is comfortable in the chair, I don't know if she needs more space...

Audience: No, it's fine.

RFG: Everything that implies checking whether the patient is not depressed, is not schizophrenic, has no attention deficit and is not retarded, we will leave that for later, when we dive into the complete session, which also involves the medical history. We'll leave that for later, now we will see nothing more than the act of going from C to B. It is assumed that Yolanda has already taken Unitary Perception seriously, has made herself comfortable, has already asked about schizophrenia, about retardation, about attention deficit and about depression, and that there is nothing of that in the patient, played now by Ruben.

I already told Yolanda that maybe I will play devil's advocate a bit, which means what? It means that maybe, if the opportunity comes, I will do things that patients do to resist the passing from C to B, which is something common to all of us. In all of us there is the great enemy named Ruben and named Yolanda. The great enemy of Ruben, who is Ruben, and the great enemy

of Yolanda, who is Yolanda, which is Precinct C, which does not want to pass to B.

Well, let's do this exercise and then the criticisms that will come from the other participants of the course.

Student (T): *[In the role of holokinetic therapist]:* We've already discarded everything, right? [psychiatric problems]. Then I think it would start with "Let's see, I'd like to hear what brings you here."

RFG (P): *[In the role of patient]* What happens is that I have been fired from work in a way that...

T: *Do you feel comfortable in the chair? Are you comfortable?*

P: *Yes, thank you. I've been fired from work after twenty years of service, I feel so betrayed by the company and here I am. I cannot get out of this and I thought maybe with help I can get out.*

T: *How well did you rest last night?*

P: *Not very well: startled sleep, nightmares. I dreamed that I was leaving my job and I could not remember my home address, and I did not have a cell phone. I talked to a policeman, asked the policeman what he could do, since I did not remember my home address, and he told me he was going to take me to the police station, then I woke up.*

T: *Has this been recurring?*

P: *This is the second time I have this dream.*

T: *Then you have not rested well.*

P: *You can say I didn't, not completely. When I woke up, I wanted to continue sleeping.*

T: *The energy has been low.*

P: *A bit, yes, of course, compared to what I was in the company. I was... I was supposed to be an important figure in the company, until they said "bye-bye baby" to me.*

T: *Are we listening to what you say?*

P: *Hmm?*

T: *Are we listening to what you say?*

P: *What I say...?*

T: *You.*

P: *You mean, if I'm listening?*

T: *Yes.*

P: *Yes, yes. I feel really betrayed, really betrayed.*

Student: Here I stopped because... if I notice that you are telling me about low energy [*asks RFG*]: is there a depression? But we discarded it and...

RFG: Yes, because this is what happens in a stressful situation. Depression is already ruled out, everything, but in a stressful situation all this can happen: nightmares, startled sleep.

Student: So, would it be convenient to send him to a psychiatrist for him to...?

RFG: No, because we have already ruled that out. So now you can allow yourself to attempt Unitary Perception.

Student: Then I keep checking if you are comfortable. Although there was low energy, you are prepared to attempt Unitary Perception.

RFG: Yes!

[Recording stops and resumes with another subject, after the role reversal].

RFG: So: to live without acceleration. How do I speak? Do I speak fast? I mean Ruben. Do I speak fast? As everyone does, because everyone is accelerated, since society is accelerated, because that suits the people who are ruling the world, those from Sector 1.

Audience: They are also accelerated.

RFG: They live with much tranquility (laughs); they are the ones who do not hurry, in the false security that wealth gives.

Then we see that we are accelerated, that society is accelerated and that it is absurd to live fast. How do I speak? Do I speak fast? How are my movements? Are my movements violent? How do I open the car door? How do I close it? Etc., etc. That is, the little things, how do we do them? Do we do them with acceleration, in a hurry? Seeing that, seeing that, seeing that.

Then when the patient arrives, you are already living that life. The more you live the life of Unitary Perception, the more honest your therapeutic act will be. You will be at peace, you will not be accelerated.

**This class had technical problems. We offer an apology.*

Eventually, when we do a one on one between patient and patient... Yes, it is very important not to use the word *visualize*. That is repeated a lot here. The word *achieve*, the word *visualize* are all ways with which society hypnotizes us, that is, we hypnotize each other to live the imaginary life. It is not the true life of Unitary Perception, but the imaginary life of Precinct C: memory, thought, egocentricity. To *visualize* is used a lot in the so-called psychotherapies, thirty-two previous psychotherapies. It's not about visualizing.

Thank you Yolanda. *[Addressing the student who completes the therapeutic exercise.]*

What I see, with much regret, is that you are given study material for...

Audience: Homework.

RFG: Homework, and of course, to have a dialogue emerge from there through questions and comments, something which has not happened, i.e., you have not read and dialogue has not occurred; that is what happens with the *Zoe* forum; there are books and the *Zoe* forum is not used because no one reads them, no one comments them, no one asks questions. There are greetings, congratulations, announcements of seminars, all very valuable, but there is nothing of that for which the *Zoe* forum was created, which is the dialogue to see what Unitary Perception is and what it is not, as it has now been done here in this therapeutic act; here there was dialogue. Curiously, in the *Zoe* forum this kind of dialogue, this kind of level of dialogue, does not exist. Why? Because people do not read, which is a disgrace.

So what will we do? We have to do something that has not been done at home. We will do the reading here. It seems that Cecilia, who has that northern Mexican voice, has disappeared. In northern Mexico they speak in a way, in a loud voice, because originally the houses were very far apart and they talked to each other with shouts. Like: “HOW WAS THE MILK YOU TOOK FROM YOUR COW THIS MORNING?” You know what I mean? And the other answered, three hundred meters away: “IT WAS GOOD MILK!” And so on. “HOW MANY EGGS DID THE HENS LAY?” “THERE WERE FOURTEEN EGGS OR SO!” “AH, NOW WE’RE TALKING” (laughter). There are areas like this with that tone of voice, that volume of voice, exactly what we need for this task of reading.

Cecilia, do you dare to read a paragraph? Because they have not read the readings at home. They have not read.

Audience: They didn’t read?

RFG: They did not read, so there was no dialogue or commentary, which is what I say, I repeat for Cecilia, does not happen in the *Zoe* forum either: people do not read, comment or ask questions.

Do you want to read it? Will you read it from there?

Homework was not done at home, so we will do it in class.

[Reading a fragment of the book "Complete Incarnation"]

EDUCATION AND VIOLENCE

The cultured intellectual mistakenly believes that understanding comes from accumulating knowledge or from following spiritual, metaphysical or scientific hierarchs.

The ignorant person is he who does not live in B, even though he might have a cultured intellect.

The ignorant person does not understand the cycles or the extreme dualities of C: Dependence/independence, kindness/violence, lies/sincerity, intelligence/suicidal egocentric stupidity etc.

The cumulative learning of C, without the non-cumulative learning of B, brings misery and interminable wars. It brings an Empire.

Good education frees us from seeking security in profit, prestige, power, or pleasure.

Good education (in ABC), frees us from conflict (fear, anger, sadness, jealousy and obsessive desires).

It also makes us understand that it is not necessary to produce conflict in others. That it is not necessary to kill, or to suffer, or to cause suffering.

Love and peace have to be above egocentric advantages.

Education is to learn in Unitary Perception, perceiving all of the perceptible at the same time in a constant way, but it is also to unlearn useless knowledge.

In this way the human potential of each individual is completely developed, and even enlightenment is possible.

The culture that exalts egocentricity hypnotizes us to believe that there will be transformation at some future time, using techniques or methods of introspection, self-analysis, mental control, positive thinking, analysis of the family of origin, etc.

We seek to transform what is occurring into something that is not occurring.

But the transformation only occurs when we perceive all of the perceptible at the same time without escaping from here.

The I does not get better.

It terminates or not, facultatively, from instant to instant.

We do not see the anger and the violence, here, while they are occurring (not before or after).

In the imaginary and egocentric life that they have taught us to live, we do not see the anger, the violence; we only imagine their causes. We say that our spouse has disillusioned us, that she is a jealous person, or menopausal, resentful, vengeful, persecutory, desiring to hurt and to cause suffering.

We say that the invasion of Iraq, the growing misery and slavery, the mosquitoes and the interminable war for the last five thousand years make us angry.

And the violent anger returns several times a day, producing despair and isolating loneliness.

We distract ourselves from seeing here, in Unitary Perception, what is here, what one is being here.

We justify ourselves thinking that we are violent because of the inexorable animal and cultural conditioning. We say that the anger has genetic or epigenetic, psychosocial or molecular causes.

With all this we do not see the anger when it is occurring here.

And if we do not see it, it does not end.

To forgive distracts us from seeing the anger here, in Unitary Perception.

Forgiveness is not a voluntary act, but it blossoms spontaneously with love, when anger ceases in Unitary Perception.

It is necessary to see the anger while we listen to all of the sounds at the same time.

The anger against the suicidal and the homicidal person makes me as brutal and as animalistic as that suicidal-homicidal person.

The conditioning of the Christian culture does not prevent the Catholic Christians from killing the Protestant Christians and vice-versa in Ireland.

The conditioning of memory, in precinct C, is not as important and energetic as the exquisite sensitivity of precinct B, which is only here.

On saying that violence is inevitable, I am justifying escape from here, with the egocentric imagination.

With imaginary life, I delay the true life of Unitary Perception.

We justify the wars and we support them, because they allow us to continue in the egocentric violence of seeking gain at all cost.

With imaginary future security, we sacrifice the true security of now.

Jiddu Krishnamurti told me: "Attempt without effort to live with death in futureless silence".

[Repeats] Attempt without effort to live with death in futureless silence.

He was telling me to be here one hundred per cent.

If there is violence, one sees the violence in Unitary Perception. The violence is seen while all of the sounds are listened to at the same time.

In that way, violence cannot last, as the human divisions that one maintains by oneself and in oneself do last.

It is necessary to see our violence in Unitary Perception, without imaginary escapes.

The way out is not to escape.

The way out is Unitary Perception.

[End of reading]

RFG: If you want to comment on this article, I recommend that you read Chapter 6 of the book...

Audience: *Freedom from the known.*

RFG: *Freedom from the known*, thank you. Chapter 6 of the book... *Libérese del pasado* in Spanish –*Freedom from the known*. It is a compilation of JK [Jiddu Krishnamurti] they made in England. Chapter 6 of *Freedom from the known* is about violence. It is worth reading; it is related to what we have just read. That violence is in us and, of course, we do not realize it. It is what we said before, related to the accelerated way in which we live, we speak, we move, how we arrive at the last moment to events and there is not a single moment of peace or a single moment for peace. I believe that there must be moments of peace between events in our life. Moments of peace.

For that, I insist, we need to have a schedule with times, to know if we are busy, at what time we will do one thing and at what time we will do another, to be able to arrive punctually, to be able to arrive with much spare time, being in peace for what we have to do, especially in therapy.

In a word: to give ourselves time. To give ourselves time means to give ourselves peace in Unitary Perception, to do everything we have to do: live, eat, talk, work, all life in Unitary Perception; don't let it be just one more thing.

I don't know if there are questions or comments about what we have read.

Ignorant is not the one who does not know math or geography, but the one who does not know Unitary Perception.

I wish we can have a dialogue in these twenty-five minutes that we have, about this: our violence, our acceleration, which we have seen in the therapeutic act that we played, to understand more what it is. I think we all learned a lot thanks to Yolanda [*the student*].

What kind of dialogue can there be in twenty-five minutes about all this? Our violence, our acceleration. Our life.

Audience: I believe that the simple fact that we don't know peace makes life so fast.

RFG: What you are saying is that, since we don't know peace, that's what makes life so fast, so fast.

Audience: I'm just surprised by the reading. This article was taken from the book *Freedom from the known*, right?

RFG: It's actually from another author [*laughter, because the author is RFG himself*], but what we're saying is...

Audience: Ah, I got confused.

RFG: But it is not Chapter 6 of JK.

Audience: Ah, well, what I mean is this: it's surprising to me how this article refers to education, how sometimes, in the mental Precinct C, they inculcate education in us as a cumulative learning, of knowledge. But true education, true learning does not exist. It really is learning history,

mathematics, but, where is the true education, the true learning, which is the mental Precinct B?

RFG: Of course. At Brockwood Park we once had a dialogue... The Brockwood Park School, which JK founded near London, England. There was a dialogue about education, about education, just what you say. What is the difference between a teacher who teaches mathematics without Unitary Perception and a teacher who teaches mathematics in Unitary Perception? They are two different teachers.

Audience: Of course, including that we are always students, we are always beginners here. That is the constant attempt of Unitary Perception; it makes us beginners. We are not accumulating knowledge to get to know Unitary Perception, but we are or are not [in Unitary Perception]; for example right now, the time I've known you for, the short or long time, doesn't make me know more or less than other colleagues or friends, there is no knowledge here...

RFG: Cumulative. In Unitary Perception knowledge is not cumulative, which means that we are all novices, we are all beginners, as Karina says. Then the one who arrives at twelve to five is in Unitary Perception, and the one who arrives at two in the afternoon is also in Unitary Perception. And we are all beginners.

Audience: A comment about violence. Violence seems to be a form of escape. Thus, it is a form of flight from one's own conflict or suffering. Then the conflict is avoided because there is a conditioning that suffering is something repugnant, something to flee from, and violence in the other is that I cannot see your suffering, I cannot see your conflict because you remind me of mine, then I do not see you and I order you and I point you out and I try to get something from you, or get away from you. That is the violence towards the other, which is a form of flight from seeing the suffering of the other, and that violence is a way of escape from one's own suffering, and the worst conditioning is that one rejects one's own suffering and that of others. To look at it, because that is what generates violence, and I believe that if there is love, it is by the person

who, having seeing suffering in himself, can see the suffering of the other, then when seeing the suffering of the other, you no longer reject it and I think that is an aspect of the conflict that is so difficult, which is that I cannot really see it because I have been taught to hate, because I have been taught to fear my own suffering, the conflict itself, to reject it in myself and in others, and that is the wood that feeds violence on the earth, and nobody tells you that.

RFG: Yes. Well, another important thing. Yesterday we were watching with Cecilia... We ate dinner late and we were watching the biography of Obama, Barack Obama. Then one says, “Yes, this man who talked so much about change and who said that he was going to end the war in Iraq and that he had to get the troops out of Afghanistan has done nothing of the sort. He is a tremendously violent man.”

The question is not whether Obama is very violent or not, if Obama went back on his promises to end wars. The question is: how much of Obama is in me? How much of Obama is *in me*? When I say I'm going to end a conflict, a problem, a war, and I do not finish it, I do not finish it. When I say that I will live in peace but I stay mad at that friend who once insulted me, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

How much of Adolf Hitler is in me? Those people who are regarded as so violent –and they were– how much of that violent person is in me? Do you remember that cop who beat a black man, an African American, in the United States? Everyone was horrified because it had been filmed by an amateur who had the camera in hand at the time and filmed an African American being beaten by the police. There was news all over the world. Well, we were at a seminar somewhere in the world, I do not remember where, and they asked me, “What do you think about the Los Angeles police?” I say, “No. What we have to ask ourselves is how much of the Los Angeles police is *in ourselves*.” In ourselves.

How much of that violence is in ourselves? Do not believe that there is no racism in us, that there is no violence. See how far... “How many black friends do you have?” Here in Mexico there are no African Americans, no problem. But in America: “How many African-American friends do you have?” “Well, none because I do not live in that neighborhood”, etcetera. Or “none” because one is a bit racist too, etcetera, etcetera. To see all the problems of mankind. Are they in me?

Someone [*Publius Terentius Afer*] said: “Nothing human is alien to me”. If I am within the human condition, I am supposed to suffer from all the problems that human beings suffer; I am not a special thing. We are special, we are unique, because I am Rubén and you are Javier. We are very unique, it is true. We do not have the same fingerprints, the same blood group, and so on. We are unique but we are also *one*. Then we have to see the human condition in us completely, with what we like and what we don’t like. How much of that person I don’t like is in me? Not only to get along with that person, not only to get along better with that person, but sincerely, to see what is in me of that person I don’t like. Then start the change that humanity needs with oneself.

Audience: “*I am the world and the world is me*”. “*I am the world and the world is me*”. [Krishnamurti, Second Public Dialogue in Madras, December 1973].

RFG: Yes. “*I am the world and the world is me.*” What a good phrase. “*I am the world and the world is me.*” I am humanity and humanity is me. Yes.

So it's surprising that there are such violent attitudes toward people we do not like because of their skin color or the way they lead their lives, which does not really bother us; the way a person lives his life does not affect us, I don’t know why we have to be so angry when a person lives life as he wants to live it, without hurting anyone. Let him live his life as he wants to live, as long as he does nothing bad, no harm to anyone.

We still have ten minutes, if anyone wants...

Audience: It reminded me of a phrase by Michael Jackson in a song [*Man in the mirror*], that if you want to change the world, first begin with the man in the mirror, i.e., with yourself. If you want to change the world, first start with the man in the mirror, the one in the mirror.

RFG: If you want to change the world, quoting a Michael Jackson song, start with the man in the mirror, who is you, i.e. oneself. Of course.

Audience: That would then be the phrase that, since yesterday I bring and that I found very beautiful, by Krishnamurti... that we must live in peace, with death...

Audience: To live with death in futureless silence.

Audience: It means being there to be able to see that the rage against the other is *my* rage, it is *my* fear. What is in me becomes explicit.

RFG: Right. How do I contribute to the continuation of war and misery in humanity? Is the desire for easy profit, as it now exists increasingly, in me? Is easy money, one of the great corruptions of mankind, in me?

And so on. Is there violence in me? Are anger, sadness, and fear in me? The fear of talking, the fear of living, the fear of dying, does it exist in me? And why? Not so much “why”, but seeing it, seeing it the moment it appears.

Audience: And we do not see it because we are not at peace, because we have that illusory belief that we are at peace, that we do know peace.

RFG: Exactly.

Audience: And we say, “No, I’m not afraid to die,” because we do not see it.

RFG: Of course, of course.

Audience: What happens is ... Krishnamurti, I remember once, I think it was in a video, I heard something surprising: [*The quotation is not textual*] “Why don’t we see, for example, hatred?” But he said it with great affection, and it is true, in the sense that the rejection of violence is a dangerous thing, because it is that rejection that prevents seeing it. That is, there is something very delicate. If you are at peace, violence hurts. It is a fact. But if you reject violence, then you are preventing yourself from seeing it.

Then one thing is to be sensitive to the wound of violence and another is to keep your eyes open during the surgery, that is, if the surgeon closes his eyes, the patient is lost. Then when there is blood, when there is violence in one and even in others, in order to look at it, you must not reject it. And this I think is a mistake that is made very often, it is: “I want to see, but I don’t like it”, then you cannot see.

RFG: You can’t see.

“Love each other”. Yes, and in what way do we hate each other? First we have to see that (laughs). We have to see that.

I believe that love begins, as JK says, by seeing hatred. Let’s say, a Northern Irishman who bears his orange color to differentiate himself from the Catholic, and who has killed Catholics, etc., and he calls himself a Christian. Like the Catholic in Southern Ireland, who has killed Protestants, and they are both Christians! I wonder how such a thing is possible. The two are Christians, the two of them say, “Love one another,” but it turns out that they kill each other, why? Because they have not seen hatred, they have not seen hatred, without which... Without seeing hatred, love is not possible, not even among Christians, as it is in Ireland and as it has

happened in Europe in the last five thousand years. At least in the last two thousand years of Christianity, the Christian countries of Europe have been constantly fighting each other. They were all Christians but they killed each other. They had not seen hatred before seeing love.

So, I don't know if there are any more comments.

Audience: A comment. It is about the self, how it wants to have continuity.

RFG: How the self wants to continue.

Audience: It wants to continue. Its need to continue becomes manifest as hate, as sadness, that wants to continue. But it is clear that it is...

RFG: In other words, two enemy countries: country A and country B, let's not give names. And all the people of country A teach their children to hate the people of country B. To their children, who know nothing at all. They are already teaching them to hate country B. What is continuing there? The ego of the one who teaches his son hatred. That's what you're saying. Desire to continue.

Audience: Yes, because in its manifold manifestations, the ego wants to continue, even with the emotions that are characteristic of the past, of what has happened, of personality...

RFG: "If you are from country A, then you have to hate those people born in country B, who are our neighbors." And the people of country B are doing the same, and so hatred continues. In Ireland they have been fighting for six hundred years. Six hundred years of Christians fighting against Christians, Catholics against Protestants. Six hundred years, since the time of Saint Patrick, who sent a letter to the King of England and the Pope, saying: "Look at what is happening here, the tremendous abuse of the English to the local

Irishmen.” St. Patrick himself wrote a letter to the Pope, which was completely ignored. And that was six hundred years ago, and things continue –I think they do– pretty much the same. That mutual hatred.

And I wonder, is it hypnosis or is it not?

We are all hypnotized, we are all hypnotized. There could be no war if soldiers were not hypnotized, unless the entire population was hypnotized into accepting war.

Audience: There are professions, such as that of a soldier, where that man, if he wants to see his hatred for it to end, will have to leave his job. And not just a soldier; anyone in a company, one of the systems... Competition is a form of hatred, and the more competitive a person is, the higher level of hatred, that's clear. And when you manifest a low level of hatred, you are considered disabled.

(Laughter)

RFG: Big truth, big truth. The competitive person is a person with a lot of hatred, and if you have little competition it is because you have a low level of hatred, says Natzio. I think that's a big truth.

We can make a break, and we'll be back in about fifteen or twenty minutes. What do you think?

Audience: Very well.

[Fifteen-minute break.]

RFG: Well, we continue with the second part of the class. We have asked our friend in Ireland whether he has criticism of the course or the teacher, he says he does not. From Buenos Aires we are told that they can't hear other participants, and that this can be a problem –it certainly is. We will do our best to repeat what the participants say so they can also be heard in Buenos Aires.

And here in Mexicali, if any of you have opinions to improve the course or to improve what I am doing as a teacher, I beg you to do so. I have it written in this class because that question was made in the same class of the first Course, from which we learned a lot to improve this one. If you have an idea how to improve this one, I beg you to say it now.

Javier? *[Addressing the audience]* Do you think we're doing well? Good pace, not too fast, is it understood well? Is it clear?

Audience: Yes, I think we're doing well.

RFG: Eduardo? Are we doing well...

[Addresses another member of the audience]

Audience: Not enough jokes (long laughter).

RFG: Very good. I think there have been jokes (laughs).

Perfect. Let's do another role reversal exercise.

Chuy? *[Addresses a young member of the audience]* Do you want to participate? We all learn.

Audience: Me?

RFG: Yes, please.

Well, then Chuy is going to be the therapist here. And we also assume that he has already ruled out depression, mental retardation, attention deficit, schizophrenia, things that we will see later, how they are discarded, what questions to ask, and we will see it in greater depth, why questions are asked, and so on. Now we are going to see nothing more than the therapeutic act, performed by people who are “just beginning to begin”, to put it some way, so as to learn from the mistakes the therapist might make [during the therapeutic act].

Like we did with Yolanda, now we do it with Chuy.

Then go ahead, and thanks for participating.

Student (T): *[In the role of therapist]. I'd like to know what brings you here.*

RFG (P): *[In the role of patient] Well. I have started a relationship with a woman and I am married, and that has me very worried... as I don't know what I have to do, whether to leave my wife or leave my lover or stay with both. I don't know what to do.*

T: *Why don't we start seeing this concern that you have in a mutual way, and at the same time we attempt Unitary Perception –which is the therapy that we manage here in this office? Please be attentive to what I am going to say and attempt constantly what I am indicating.*

P: *Yeah.*

T: *We start by feeling the weight of our body on the chair, the gravity, the weight of our legs, arms, taking a comfortable position in our chair so that it does not get difficult for us.*

P: *Yes, I noticed I was not comfortable when you started talking about weight and changed my position.*

T: *So, we are feeling the weight of our body.*

(Short pause).

At the same time, listen to all the sounds around us, without naming them. Be aware of all the sound around us, at the same time that we feel the weight of our body.

(Short pause).

We'll attempt, at the same time, to feel the weight of our body and hear every sound around us; we try to see everything visual within one hundred and eighty degrees, without naming what we are seeing. At the same time that we hear everything around us, we feel the weight of our body.

(Short pause).

[Role reversal stops].

RFG: Teachers... *[Asking for feedback of the therapeutic act].*

Audience: A bit rushed. It should be more paused.

RFG: You're going a bit too fast, it has to be slower.

Audience: More paused, and asking the patient how he feels.

RFG: Ask the patient how he feels.

Teachers...

Cecilia, tell me.

Audience: Well, of course *around* is a word that has to be excluded from the vocabulary, because it invites you to separate yourself from perception ... and from what you are perceiving.

RFG: Because, where is the sound heard?

Audience: It is heard from the brain, the sound is in the brain, and when we say “around”, we create an effort in the person to try to get the perception to be brought in from outside, when it is, actually, from the inside.

RFG: For Buenos Aires, Cecilia is saying that the word *around* is not appropriate, because the sound is heard in the brain.

Audience: And it is a fragmentary perception.

RFG: By saying “around,” there is the separation, the horizontal conflict, which is the self that believes itself separated from everything it observes. The word *around*, Cecilia tells us, should therefore never be used.

Audience: However, I want to congratulate him, because I think that is the only thing I can point out to him of everything he has said so far. Because he spoke of “at the same time”. The pause was good for me, it did not seem accelerated to me; the pauses were good for me.

RFG: He was not too fast for you.

Audience: I saw him very well paused, even giving space for the patient to enter. Then I congratulate him, and the only thing I can point out is that we should not mention the word *around* him.

RFG: Not mentioning the word *around*, like, for example, the previous participant mentioned the word *achieve*, and from that we have learned too, and it seems that he learned very well, not to accelerate too much.

Alright, then we go on.

Student (T): *[In the role of Therapist] Well, then, are we attempting?*

How do you feel with the constant attempt?

RFG (P): *[In the role of patient] I feel calmer, calmer. I still have that dilemma, doubt, what to do, and whether it is true that you can love two people or if it is a fairy tale... That's the drama I am going through, but at this moment, after you invited me to listen, I feel calmer.*

T: *Let's see that concern. Those thoughts that come to your head, we are seeing them, listening to them as another sound. At the same time that we feel the weight of our body, we hear all sound and see everything there is.*

(Short pause).

Are you attempting it?

P: *Yes, actually, what you are saying has brought me calm, yes. And I have forgotten the problem that I mentioned for this moment, as if it didn't exist. It exists, but I feel as if it didn't exist.*

Now, don't you think it's dangerous that I don't remember the problem I actually have? Now that I'm with you I forget, but

I'm sure that problem will come back as soon as I walk out that door.

T: *Unitary Perception has to be a constant attempt. As that attempt is made, intelligence will tell you what to do. Worry will not be frustrating, but simply, as you are now seeing it, it is simply going to be something more to perceive unitarily.*

P: *And do you think I will be able to make a wise and compassionate decision simply by listening and feeling the weight at the same time? Do you think?*

T: *Of course, because the moment you are attempting Unitary Perception, your whole brain starts to work and your brain will tell you what to do. Rather, your intelligence will tell you what to do.*

(Short pause).

Audience: Wow!

RFG: Wow! (laughter).

Audience: Great, yes.

RFG: Well, let's start with Cecilia.

Audience: I think it was very good. I was really excited because I thought maybe he was not going to do it so well.

RFG: Impeccable, right? Impeccable.

[Addresses a member of the audience] Is it flawless as we believe or have you seen a flaw?

Audience: Well, what was missing, but maybe it is not necessary, was “to realize that our brain is already perceiving,” but neither...

RFG: The brain is already perceiving. But he has done very well, he has done very well.

Audience: Congratulations.

Audience: I have something to say. Very good, I am very happy to see that tranquility. Good, great.

RFG: I'm getting to know him (laughs).

Audience: I only wanted to say, *intelligence*, not *his* intelligence, because his intelligence is not different from mine, then I say: “*Intelligence* will emerge, it emerges and whatever has to happen will happen.”

RFG: Intelligence belongs to everyone.

Audience: It's everyone's, it's not yours or mine.

RFG: *The* intelligence will tell you...

Audience: Aha, not *your*.

And then another thing, that “see all there is”. That is, “all that is, without naming.”

Audience: Yes, you said it at the beginning.

Audience: He did say “without naming.”

RFG: Yes, he said it at the beginning, “without naming.”

Audience: Well, and I loved the rest of it.

Audience: And it is not that important, although it is, but it's not as serious as saying [during therapy]: “Your own intelligence will tell you...”

RFG: Well, with what we have seen, we are congratulating him.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Now, is there anyone who has something to say?

Audience: There was something very interesting that has come up between the therapist and the patient. The therapist began by saying: “We feel the weight of the body”. The patient said, “When he said that, I adjusted, I changed position.” The therapist then says, “Are you comfortable?” So, perhaps start by... inviting to Unitary Perception, talking about feeling the weight of the body. It not only helps the position, but it seems to me that, being the least external of everything perceptible, it is a way for the patient to feel that he is being treated. I believe that starting with the weight of the body can be something good.

RFG: Yes. Here Natzio tells us that it would be good to start, as Chuy [*the student in the role of therapist*] did, with the weight of the body, because it seems to be the most internal thing, and that makes the patient feel that he is being treated, with something as intimate as feeling the weight of the body.

Very good, very good. Then forty-five minutes passed, and you have five minutes left. The patient tells you that he is very comfortable, although he still does not know what to do, and in those last five minutes—you have five minutes left—, what do you do?

Student (T): [*in the role of therapist*] *How did you feel with the Unitary Perception attempt?*

RFG (P): [*in the role of patient*] *I feel very calm; in fact it seems that I had no problem, although I know I do. What you tell me about trusting in intelligence, which will lead me to solve this serious problem that I have... Well, I actually feel grateful to you. Although all I can say is that I think I need to*

see the problem more to solve it. It seems to me that intelligence is not going to be enough. It's like I need... or I think maybe I need something more. A little luck ... I don't know what.

T: *Very good. You tell me that you feel good in these moments, that you are attempting Unitary Perception, I ask you to tell me, do you prefer to feel as you felt before or how you feel at this moment?*

P: *No, of course, like now.*

T: *So the answer is to keep attempting Unitary Perception constantly, even if you forget it every now and then, but as soon as you remember, to attempt it again. At first it will be something difficult, but not impossible to do, the constant attempt.*

(Short pause).

RFG: Thank you.

Audience: Very good.

RFG: Does anyone have something to say to wrap it up?

Audience: “If you want we can meet again the following day”
(laughs).

P: *Would you give me another appointment?*

T: *Of course.*

RFG: Yeah, right? Because he is...

Audience: Conflicted.

RFG: Very conflicted. Then it is convenient that, since he leaves with that feeling of something incomplete, we invite him to return.

I think I have to congratulate you, you were very good.

Audience: Exceeded expectations.

RFG: Exceeded expectations, no doubt.

Audience: And as a farewell, a cry of metanoia (laughter).

RFG: Metanoia, metanoia! I don't know if you heard all this in Buenos Aires and if you have something to say.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] No, people here think it was very good. Congratulations to the young man.

RFG: Yeah, well, you know him, Gabriel, Chuy; he surprised us all.

Audience: Since he was thirteen, yes.

RFG: We were all surprised, really.

Well, then it seems to me that since we are talking about young people... I'm not sure if there is nothing else to say in Buenos Aires.

Audience: Yes, well, there's a little detail, the only one... I don't know if it's worth saying, because it really was all very good, but he said "seeing everything" instead of "seeing the whole field of vision" but seeing everything that exists is actually impossible. But it was really so good that —especially the second part, that's why it's not even worth commenting.

RFG: Of course, many people say, "We have to perceive everything", and in reality it is not everything, it is everything perceptible, because you can't perceive everything. We cannot

perceive the planet Saturn at this moment, not even the Sun. That is, we cannot perceive everything, but we can perceive everything that can be perceived, the perceptible.

Audience: *[In CPH Mexicali]* But he did say “all there is” and said “one hundred and eighty degrees.”

RFG: Yes, yes. I am not referring to Chuy, I am referring to the comment that Arena has made, which reminds me of previous situations, with people who have said: “It is necessary to perceive everything”. And it is not all that is to be perceived, but everything perceptible. Very important. And do not forget “at the same time”, which many people forget. «PERCEIVING ALL THE PERCEPTIBLE AT THE SAME TIME».

Well, since we're with young people, *[looking at the youngest student in the class]*. Yes?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Come on. “Vinga”, as they say in Barcelona. “Vinga Deu”.

Student (T): *[In the role of therapist]* Hi, good morning.

RFG (P): *[In the role of patient]* Hello.

T: *Please, could you explain why you are coming?*

P: *The last person left in my life, who was my grandmother, has died, and all the others have died by accident or illness, and I feel very sad. I want to see if I can reduce that pain or relieve the mourning.*

T: *You want me to help you.*

P: *Yes, yes.*

T: *Okay. What we are going to do together is called Unitary Perception Therapy, because the patient and the therapist make an attempt of Unitary Perception. So, trust me and you will gradually see that your problem is the same of all human beings.*

So, are you comfortable in this chair?

P: *[nods].*

T: *Now we are going to try to feel all the weight of the body, with the eyes open or closed, at the same time that we feel all the sound: the air conditioner, without labeling it...*

(Short pause).

At the same time as the whole field of vision: one hundred and eighty degrees. Listen to the sound that is occurring in the brain. And if a thought pops up, notice it and listen to it as if it were another sound.

P: *My grandmother left, right? I've always loved her so much, and I will not be able to see her, that hurts a lot.*

T: *See it at the same time you feel the weight on the chair, and your tension, if there is any.*

(Short pause)

And what we are attempting is new at every moment, and therefore it has to be, if you want, for every moment of your life.

P: *Are you saying that I have to keep listening and keep watching as you tell me, my whole life? But I'm a carpenter and I have to deal with furniture, so what do I do when I'm making furniture and I cannot do this?*

T: *If, for example, you cannot close your eyes, try to listen while you feel your body weight. But you are not understanding.*

P: *But won't that distract me from making a good chair?*

T: *Not at all. On the contrary, you may even make it better.*

RFG: Let's see, what do the participants say?

From left to right, like writing.

Audience: Well, yes, I see several difficulties in language. "Trust me", "little by little you will see your problem, that everyone has it." To start with, there he predisposes the patient in many ways. The patient knows that he comes with a problem that he considers to be almost unique...

RFG: It stops being mine.

Audience: It stops being mine. There you begin to predispose the patient. When you say "trust me," you are less trusted. Trust is earned in another way, be it empathy, etcetera.

And in the attempt of Unitary Perception itself, several important indications were highlighted. I think the weight of the body, in a more paused way, he also lacked more pauses. It looked as if he was not attempting it either; he was very rushed in his way of speaking.

RFG: Then, for Buenos Aires, Cecilia says that there was not enough pause, that he said it's a common problem that any human being has, which can make the patient feel that he is not special in this relationship. You said something else before.

Audience: Yes, "trust me" and "little by little."

RFG: "Trust me" and "little by little" are not good expressions for Holokinetic Therapy.

Audience: He also says: “If you want to, you can do it constantly.” “If you want to”.

RFG: “If you want to, you can do it all the time.” “If you want” is controversial.

Audience: Well, what about the rest of you.

RFG: [*Asking the student who had done the exercise previously*].

Audience: When he said, I don’t remember very well, but he said “this”. Instead of saying “this”, it was “Unitary Perception”...

RFG: So, do not use indefinite words like this or that, but say what *this* is and what *that* is. “Unitary Perception” instead of saying “this”. Is that what you're saying?

Audience: Aha.

RFG: He says that we shouldn’t use words like *this* and *that*, which are used a lot, unfortunately, I don’t know if especially in the north of Mexico or all around the world. “I told you that.” That, what? It's better to say what I told you. In this case, instead of saying “this”, say “Unitary Perception”. Is that all you saw here?

Audience: (Laughs) No, but really, what else can I say?

RFG: Good, thank you.

Yolanda? [*Addresses a student to ask for her opinion*].

Audience: I also noticed, although he did mention it at the beginning, that “we are attempting Unitary Perception”, but yes, probably, because I know what being there is like ... He got nervous and even began to leave his sentences unfinished, he didn’t end the phrases, he did not complete them.

RFG: Be careful when starting a sentence; whenever we start a sentence, we should finish it, very important, very important, because if not, the sentence loses clarity. Very important: to finish the sentences we started.

[He addresses another student to ask his opinion].

Audience: I saw a good attempt of Unitary Perception, already with the observations they have made... However, I think that by saying “the problem you have, all humanity has it” is making you feel that we are all part of everything.

Audience: But at that moment the patient does not understand.

Audience: He does not understand, it can be confusing.

RFG: The patient may be confused. The patient has not read the Written Work, so he may feel like: “What? So I’m not that special here.”

Audience: Yes, but I believe that was his intention and the fact of saying “trust me” is maybe a... what’s the word? A custom in Spain. *At the same time* means the same as *at once*. Maybe it’s an idiom.

RFG: “At once” is not used in Latin America. “At the same time” is used.

Audience: His idioms can make the difference.

RFG: Of course. We believe that in Spain and Hispanic America we speak the same language, and then we find that we don’t, and this must be borne in mind by all teachers in Argentina and Ireland, that the Spanish language is not the same throughout Latin America. Unfortunately there are many differences. I am married to a Mexican, being Argentine; it took me and Cecilia three years to begin to understand each other. Three years to begin understanding small things, such as foods that have another name, etcetera, etcetera, in Mexico and

Argentina. In other countries, such as Venezuela, for example, there is a very particular Spanish from Venezuela, and so on, Nicaragua... That is, we do not all speak the same Spanish.

In this case, *at once*, we should take into account that it is not used in Latin America, it is used in Spain. Let us remember that if we say 'at once', let us also say 'at the same time'. "At once, that is, at the same time."

That is why I repeat a lot, because I have traveled a lot, I know these differences, sometimes I seem repetitious, because I want to repeat, for the sake of clarity.

Audience: As a teacher it may be better to stick to the polished language of Holokinetic Psychology, so as not to be confusing.

Audience: That is precisely what we are reviewing.

RFG: That's what we're talking about, polished language.

Audience: He did not check how the patient felt. Not only to ask, but to wait for the attempt of Unitary Perception to become a fact, and then ask.

Student: I've left that for the second... First I have to teach him...

Audience: But the session is over. Before it concludes there has been no questioning the patient, seeing how they feel and giving their time to the Unitary Perception attempt, and actually seeing what has happened, how it feels.

RFG: Yes, someone here says that it is good for the therapist to know how the patient is doing, asking or seeing how relaxed he is, etc., etc.

Javier? [*He addresses another student to ask his opinion*].

Audience: Nothing for the moment.

RFG: Nothing.

Blanquita? [*He addresses another student to ask her opinion*].

Audience: Well, to realize, as I said earlier, how hypnotic, egocentric and temporal language emerge in ourselves.

RFG: For example, in this case, where did you see it?

Audience: Hypnotic language: “trust.”

RFG: *Trust*. In each imperative verb, such as *relax* or *trust*, in each imperative verb there is a hypnotic act. Very important, if we can't eliminate it, at least see it when we use imperative language. *Trust, relax, sit down*, and so on. Be careful with imperatives, because they are all hypnotic. Anything else?

Audience: Yes, that is very important.

RFG: Of course, all we are saying is for all of us. Anything else?

Audience: Well, not for the moment, they have already said...

RFG: Yes, watch out for the imperative verb. *Relax, trust me, sit like that*, and so on.

Karina? [*Addresses another student*].

Audience: Nothing at the moment. They have already said all.

RFG: Anything you want to say?

Audience: He said: “You’ve come to me for help.”

RFG: What do you have to say about “You’ve come to me for help”?

Audience: Yes, there you see an attitude that maybe a patient won't find comfortable, that he can be helped.

Audience: They can feel inferior.

RFG: The patient may feel inferior.

Audience: The patient may feel inferior.

RFG: The patient can feel inferior if we tell him...

Audience: "You've come to me for help," reaffirming something that's implied, because...

RFG: We already know that it is so. It is not appropriate to say "you've come to me for help," because the patient may feel belittled.

Anything else?

Audience: That was what I felt was missing.

RFG: Very well, we keep learning, a lot. All this has to be seen and we will continue to see it class after class, more and more clearly and more deeply, until we get to the complete medical history, I insist, that will be done later.

We continue.

Student: Well, after the comments...

RFG: You have less ego. No! (Laughter).

(Short pause).

Student (T): *[in the role of therapist] We feel the weight of the body: our weight on the chair, the weight of our feet on the floor, in our head, our neck.*

RFG: You said that in Barcelona, I think.

Student: Yes.

RFG: And it was said that the weight of the head should not be alluded to. The weight of the head is not really mentioned, because the weight of the head is not something that we really feel. Mysteriously, that is the case, you do not feel the weight of your head, except when there is an uncomfortable position, and that is what you are saying from the beginning, that you sit comfortably. If I sit down like that, for example [*sits leaning towards the therapist*], some patients sit that way out of respect, they are in your hands and they sit that way. That patient will feel the weight of the head. But when the whole body is leaning forward and the center of gravity is normal... Then, when you invite him to make himself comfortable, the patient is looking for the center of gravity. When you find the center of gravity that makes you feel comfortable, you do not feel the weight of your head. But, well, if he was sitting like that, I would invite him to sit comfortably, but not to feel the weight of his head. That is the same mistake you made in Barcelona, but it is important that we see it.

(Short pause, the exercise continues).

Student (T): [*in the role of therapist*]: At once...

RFG: At the same time.

T: *At the same time, all the sound that reaches our brain. The car... without labeling it. Do you feel it?*

RFG (P): [*in the role of patient*] *I feel it. I hear it.*

T: *I recommend you to do it with your eyes closed. Then, all at once, if a thought arises, listen to it as just another sound. Realize that the brain is already perceiving.*

P: *That the brain is already perceiving.*

T: *Without effort, without expectation.*

(Short pause).

P: *You think I have to get rid of that desire to see my grandmother even though she's dead, right?*

T: *No. You have to perceive it at the same time, not wanting to get rid of it.*

P: *That is, perceive it as you say, while listening to the sound.*

T: *Yes. Only then will you be able to get rid of it. Not by wanting to get rid of it.*

P: *It's kind of contradictory. It's different from what one is told. "Go to the movies, forget your grandmother," as my relatives tell me: "Go to the movies, forget your grandmother," and I do not feel like going to the movies.*

T: *Well, this is not going to be easy at first, but if you try it constantly, you will realize that it is a total change.*

You really feel it.

P: *I feel calmer, yes, calmer. Even though I remember my grandmother, I do not get that feeling of deep sadness that I felt before coming.*

(Short pause).

T: *I invite you to read the Written Work to help you better understand, and to be able to distinguish what helps you and what does not help you in the attempt of Unitary Perception.*

P: *But if this is about listening and feeling the weight, why do I need to read?*

T: *To have a better understanding, to settle those ... To read, you have to read while attempting Unitary Perception, and reading itself will bring us here.*

(Short pause).

RFG: Let's see what they say. Let's start, as always, on the left.

Do you want to say something? Chuy.

Audience: When you say "get rid", you do not get rid of emotion or thought, you do not get rid of them but realize that they are there.

RFG: Yes, he said so.

Audience: He said, "You can get rid of it."

Audience: "You can get rid of it" and at the same time "not wanting".

RFG: And then he said that apparent paradoxical contradiction, "not wanting to get rid of it." I also saw that, that mistake, and I also saw how he tried to correct it.

Audience: And when you are specifying, "Feel the weight of the body, feel the weight of your feet on the ground," you have to emphasize that "at the same time that you feel the weight of your arms", because then you are defragmenting.

RFG: Beware, because when he says "at once," he means "at the same time." In Spain *at once* is *at the same time* here.

Audience: Yes, but when he fragments the weight of the body, he does not say "at the same time". That is, he says: "Feel the weight of your feet, feel the weight of your arms". Then feel the weight of the feet, and then the patient begins to feel the weight of the arms.

RFG: “At the same time you feel the weight of your arms.” He lacked that: “At the same time that you feel the weight of your arms, feel the weight of your feet.”

Audience: And for the rest, I want to congratulate him because the emphasis was so great on that the brain is already perceiving and one has to realize it.

RFG: Very well.

Audience: And that has to be Unitary Perception without expectation or effort.

RFG: Yes, he said it.

Yolanda? [*Addresses another student*].

Audience: I also noticed that he started talking about effortlessness, and when he says you are already listening... But also... I don't know, maybe it is the language barrier; I feel that he still leaves sentences unfinished.

RFG: Do you remember an example?

Audience: “Perceive”. “Attempt to perceive”. Perceive what?

There was a moment where you said, “Attempt to perceive,” and when Ruben asks you, “Do you mean to perceive sound?” I think you said... There you did not finish the sentence.

RFG: Beware, yes, maybe it is something of the Spanish, but it also exists in northern Mexico, that people start the sentences and leave them unfinished. It is very common in northern Mexico, I don't know if it is as common in Spain.

Audience: [*Born in Spain*] Yes, it is.

RFG: Maybe it's the Spanish culture.

Careful, I insist, let's take be careful as therapists to start a sentence and finish it. Let it be clear, concise and concrete.

That is, complete the sentences, very important, very important, for all of us, that I think we all make this mistake, or not? Starting a sentence and not finishing it.

Blanca? *[Addresses another student]*.

Audience: Again, the egocentric language. He did it in “I invite you” ... The therapist [actually, the patient] could assume that “you [the therapist] know and that I [the patient] don't know”.

RFG: What is the example to which you allude?

Audience: When he says: “I invite you.” “I invite you.”

RFG: “I invite you.” Do you see that as egocentric?

Audience: The language.

RFG: How would you have said it?

Audience: You are invited to attempt to perceive unitarily. Perceiving together.

RFG: “We'll perceive together.” “We'll perceive together” instead of “I invite you,” because that would be egocentric.

Audience: “I invite you”, yes, but “I invite you to feel” or “let us feel the weight of our body together”.

RFG: “I invite you to feel together” or “Let's feel together.” “Let's feel together.”

That “I-you” sounds a bit egocentric. Well, it is egocentric. Very good, very good, I had missed that.

Anything else?

Audience: There is one thing that is present in most teachers, of us, that after the first complete definition: “We perceive everything perceptible at the same time, let’s listen to all perceptible sound, let’s see the whole visual field, let’s feel the weight of the body,” there may be a pause there and then this happens: “So, sound, weight, field of vision”. It is more important to say: “Listening, let’s listen, watching the visual field and being aware of the weight of the body”. Because the action ... you have to give the emphasis to the action, which is what you have...

RFG: I don’t know if you heard that, I will repeat it so that they hear it well in Argentina and in Ireland, that it is important to emphasize the verb. For example, he says that once we define Unitary Perception in therapy, we invite the patient to perceive everything that is perceptible at the same time, and emphasize that in several ways. After a pause someone says, “Weight, sound, light”, and what he is pointing out is that it is important to give a verb to those nouns, i.e.: “Let us feel the weight”, verb *to feel*, using the verb, that is what you're saying, right?

Audience: “Let's listen”.

RFG: “Let us listen to all the sound,” not saying only “sound,” but “let us hear the sound,” the verb. Finally, do not just say “light”, but “let's see the visual field”.

This is a somewhat surprising thing, because I believe we have all done it, those of us who do therapy, saying “sound, weight, light” without emphasizing the verb related to these nouns.

Anything else?

Audience: No, just that. I think everything has been said.

RFG: [*Addresses another student*].

Audience: I think it is important to also side with, obviously, the patient, I know that being there creates some difficulty. I'm talking about when we make some suggestion. Sometimes we can make a suggestion of what is best for one, but not necessarily for the patient. For example, saying, "I suggest you close your eyes," it may be given as an option, for the patient to decide whether to see the visual field with his eyes open or with his eyes closed. Then that can be left to him to decide.

Audience: "I recommend you," he said. "I recommend you to do it with your eyes closed."

RFG: Ah, did he say that?

Audience: Yes, "I recommend your eyes closed."

RFG: I thought he said "closed or open."

Audience: At first he said "open or closed", but afterwards he said "I recommend".

RFG: I recommend your eyes closed, okay.

What Javier is saying is that if we make a recommendation, for example to keep our eyes closed, let us not forget the option they have of leaving them open.

Audience: And another, the suggestion of reading. There are some patients who may want to know something theoretical, read, well, maybe in that case you recommend, especially if that is going to help a patient open, he can read. But if the patient comes: "Well, what I want is any therapy, and you are giving me homework, something I have to read at home, so no". Then it is important to see the need, as it is emerging from the person, and as one sees the need of the person, to...

Student: But that's for him to grind on the contents (laughter).

Audience: Yes, it's great, the psychologist should give him the reading, but not in the first consultation, because right now their conflict is on in the foreground.

Audience: Or you ask them: "Would you like to read something?"

RFG: Here in the CPH, we are talking about whether or not to recommend reading. I think it is always good to recommend reading. But Javier points out that reading would be an extra homework that could take the patient by surprise. Here in the CPH the books are in sight, and the patients decide, without anyone telling them anything, if they will buy a book or not.

Audience: In therapy, the second or third time I see the patient, I say: "Do you like to read?" "No, I don't like to read." [To another patient] "Do you like to read?" "Yes, I like to read". "Would you like to read some material?"

RFG: Cecilia tells us that she gives the patient the option: "Do you like to read?" And if they say yes, then she recommends reading.

Audience: "Would you like to read about Holokinetic Psychology, which will lead you to understand many other implications?" So we advance in the therapies a lot when the patient reads.

Audience: On one occasion, she told me that she made the suggestion, [for the patient], for example, if she told her about hypnosis, she would say: "And there is a document, if you want, I can send it to you." An electronic document, like, the *Dialogue with a Princess*, [from the book *Unitary Perception*]. "If you want, I can send it to you," she only makes the suggestion, and the one who wants to simply says, "Yes, send it to me."

RFG: She mentions that when talking about hypnosis with the patient, he is given the option to say, "Look, there is a

document about this. If you want to read it, it is interesting; I will send it as an attachment, attached to the email". So, the "Dialogue with a Princess" is recommended for that particular case, which is the most paradigmatic writing about thought being hypnosis. That dialogue in Venezuela with a professor of the faculty is really impressive; it tells us how her entire life was the product of hypnosis. In that case it was very obvious, but let's not forget that all our lives are hypnosis and are a product of hypnosis.

Then, very well, we return to the last five minutes.

Audience: I wanted to add something that, I don't know if it was already said while I was not here. Perhaps most of the invitations are not clinical. I don't know if we are talking about therapy only, where we expect to see them again, but outside the office, we usually see people once, and we don't see them again. Here, there, while on a trip... Then the recommendation of reading, if it is not in the office, *is* necessary. "If we do not meet again, I recommend that you read..."

RFG: What he says is that most of our contacts are not therapeutic, they are not in a doctor's office, then in those cases it is imperative, it is necessary to recommend the reading, and make invitations that are maybe not relevant in psychotherapy, but they are in most of our contacts, which we meet only once. Because people either don't show interest or, the few people who do show interest, we do not see them again. Then leave them with the recommendation that they read.

Audience: Here is a concept that consider very important –I also find the invitation to reading relevant –because in therapy, as I understand it, what is relevant is not the teaching of Unitary Perception, but the patient's sadness. So what is relevant is the patient's sadness, and what will cure him is the shared fact of Unitary Perception, not teaching. Then one must, as I understand the therapy, give theoretical approximations of teaching, just what the patient needs to stop resisting the attempt of Unitary Perception. So the relevant things are his

sadness, and the attempt of Unitary Perception. The aspects of teaching can arise, I imagine, if therapy is successful, the patient is truly interested, which is what is happening, then [interest in reading] may arise in therapy. But the act of teaching a person who wants, who cares about the truth, is different from a person who comes because he is sad. It is therapy or teaching, it's a matter of concept that's important, I think.

RFG: Yes, whether therapy is teaching or it is not is controversial. All therapy is a form of teaching. Actually what we teach in Holokinetic Therapy is to pass from C to B, and we say it sometimes in that way. We teach the patient to pass from C to B, because there is nothing else to teach. And it is not a knowledge; it is a way of perceiving, it is not a technique. And yes, it is a teaching that we are doing when we give the patient the minimum elements so that he begins to wake up.

Audience: It is like a “mini-workshop” that we give to the patient in the sessions.

RFG: What?

Audience: It is like a “mini-workshop” that one gives to the patient in the session.

RFG: Cecilia says that for her the therapeutic act is like a “mini-workshop” that she gives one to one to the patient.

Audience: Theory-experience-theory-experience.

RFG: Theory-experience-theory-experience; it goes from theory to experience.

Audience: For them to understand why it's important to pass from C to B.

RFG: For them to understand why it's important to pass from C to B.

There are all kinds of patients, and what she just said is important. But do not separate teaching so much from what we do in therapy, because what we do in therapy is a form of teaching.

JK when I say: “What should we call the teaching? What do we call what you talk about? “He said, “Call it *the teaching*,” the teaching. Then I say, “Teaching what? You say you teach nothing.” Well, we teach how to wake up. So, is teaching to wake up a teaching? No, because it is not knowledge, it is nothing more than awakening. This is something... We could make a very long and very valuable dialogue on this topic. Are we teaching something? Yes, to wake up, but it is not a knowledge, it is to wake up.

Audience: He once said: “The teaching is both preventive and curative.”

RFG: Who said that?

Audience: Krishnamurti.

RFG: Well, JK says ... sorry, [the student] says JK said that the teaching is preventive and curative. It certainly is. Yes.

So, shall we let him go? [*The student who is doing the exercise*]

Audience: No (laughter). Let’s keep going.

RFG: Well.

Audience: [*The next student*] to the stake (laughs).

RFG: Why to the stake?

Audience: The next one [to make another reversal of roles].

Audience: Because it’s her turn.

RFG: Ah! (Laughter)

I was saying I'm not sure if you want us to make another attempt or to start the dialogue, because there are several interesting things here. Something that had not been said came up, about introducing the verb when we put nouns as *sound*, *light* and *weight*. I don't know if you want us to complete the class with a dialogue about all this, which has been... for me, it has been a teaching. I hope for you too. We have learned a lot, and the comments have been, I think, very relevant. As someone said on the break, while we drank coffee, that these exercises we are doing help us all improve, if we can use the word, or do Unitary Perception well. What is being said is helpful for all of us, for our individual attempts of Unitary Perception, as well as helping us in therapy.

Maybe you want us to complete the class with a dialogue about all this. What do you think?

[Addressing a member of the audience] Do you want to expand on what you said about the verb? Or the shortcomings of meeting a person on the train, who is interested in what you want to teach. The train ride will last six hours and you have a lot of time, but six hours are not enough. That situation, which is not therapeutic, you see it as different from the therapeutic one. Can you say anything else?

Audience: Yes, for example, Krishnamurti spoke of activity and action. Activity as a reaction, of course, from Precinct C, of thought, as an effect of some cause.

RFG: Here [the student] says that we must differentiate, as JK did, between activity and action, the activity being a reaction of Precinct C alone.

Audience: I'm saying this because it being in activity is the condition of the human being, to live in the activity, doing something, concentrated, limited in time, with all the qualities

of the META process. Then it is very important to sharpen up and be aiming for *action*, which is what we have lost.

RFG: That is, Unitary Perception.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: In other words, he makes the difference between: careful with continuing in activity, which is that reaction of the META process, with all its laws, repetition, duality, and so on; and *action*, which is Unitary Perception, and that our life be also a life of action, not just doing something and doing something, activity and activity.

Audience: Yes, or doing everything possible to share the space. Then how do I live the space? By listening to the sound, seeing the light, being aware of and feeling the gravitation.

RFG: Be in space listening to the sound, seeing the light and feeling the gravitation. Be in space here. Therein lies the essence of action: to be here in space.

Audience: Yesterday we talked with Jaime and I do not remember what we said, and Jaime brought up something that he believes the Buddha could have said, which might be true: that we be vigilant of ourselves, of our own mind. Then it comes to me: “Sounds beautiful, but we can still polish it more.” In other words, the watcher [*Spanish “vigilante”*] is...

RFG: Beware of being “vigilantes of our own life”, because then we fall into a very great duality that is of Precinct C. That’s what the people of the Fourth Way already talk about, the “observant I” and all that. Beware of becoming watchmen of ourselves, which is the same as the police state, which ends up being overwhelming, dictatorial and monstrous, as it is.

We shouldn’t let our life be dictatorial and monstrous, like being watchmen of ourselves, but simply being here completely, listening to the sound, as you said. Be in space.

Audience: Effortlessly trying to live with death.

RFG: Of course, without effort, without becoming vigilantes.

Audience: Activity involves effort, right?

RFG: Of course, activity always takes effort.

Audience: And in activity, the self flowers.

RFG: The activity comes from the self and in it the self flowers.

Audience: And is reinforced.

RFG: Of course, activity is not action, action is Unitary Perception.

Audience: Exactly.

RFG: It is good that we see all these subtleties of language, and how we are contaminated with the egocentric, temporal and hypnotic language. Yes, the word *vigilant* has somber connotations. In the United States, *vigilante* is the one who takes the law into his hands and kills a person because he does not like him. That's what *vigilante* means in the United States: the ones who take justice into their hands. Those who renounce the popular consensus of having a court, having lawyers, having judges. In other words, those who reject civilization and adopt barbarism, and become a *vigilante*. In the United States the word *vigilante* has an extremely grim meaning, but if we see it well, in Spanish too, because we are not *vigilantes* of each other, we are in communion. I'm not interested in what Pedro or Maria do –I hope there's no one by that name here– I'm not interested in what Pedro and María do with their tail, do you understand me? If they're married or if they're unmarried. Those are their issues, I am not the watcher of them and their conduct; God forbid us from that. What we simply want is for us to be all awake, and if possible awake in communion. In an

ever deeper communion, more joyful and more energetic, it also helps us in the action that has to be done, which is to help awaken all humanity, while we awaken ourselves and we help ourselves here, in small groups, to be awake. May each of us help each other to be awake. It is not that we have to teach anything in particular, but to see if we can be awake in communion, in harmony, in peace and, if possible, with great joy.

Good. I don't know if you have anything else to say.

Javier? [*Addresses another student*].

Audience: A comment. I don't want to take too much time with this, but anyway. I remembered the example of joy. That sadness is not pleasant, and joy is. But in the same way, in Unitary Perception, both sadness and joy are part of the perceptible, meaning that the important thing is the fact of attempting Unitary Perception.

RFG: Of course. Javier points out that communion in joy can also be communion in sadness. That is, if we are in communion, we will also see the sadness that is in the human condition, not just joy.

It is true, as we said at the beginning in the dialogue with which this class began. We said at the beginning that it seems that the relationship, especially in friendship and marriage, begins with seeing together the undesirable part of human life, our sorrows, our fears, our anger, and if we do that well – seeing together in Unitary Perception- another way of relationship arises, which is the relationship in joyful communion. After having seen all the darkness of the human condition in the relationships of marriage and friendship. But it is true, if there is communion, as Javier says, we will have to see everything there is to see. If it is joy, joy, if it is sadness too. It is not at all joyful to see the state of humanity or the direction mankind has taken, and the possible fate of mankind if it continues as it is. That is not joyful at all, and we have to

share that vision, not with a depressing mood, but with a very alert, very alert spirit.

Anything else? Do you have any comments or questions in Buenos Aires?

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* No, thank you.

RFG: Anything you want to add from Dublin?

Audience: *[From Dublin, Ireland]* Yes. Krishnamurti said we could be a mirror of one another, a mirror.

[In this case, Krishnamurti's exact words can be reviewed, for example, in the Fifth Talk in Rajghat, February 20, 1949, and in the chapter "Relationship and Isolation" in The First and Last Freedom.]

RFG: Yes, Yes. JK said that we can be a mirror of each other, and that the value of marriage, he said... the most important thing about marriage is to be a mirror of each other. Just as in friendship, being a mirror to each other.

Audience: The mutual lesson.

RFG: The mutual lesson, being a mirror of each other. Marriage does not have to be a factory of human beings, when there are already many human beings. I believe that what we need now is not more human beings, but good human beings. So the most important thing about marriage is not to produce human beings, but to be a mirror of one another, and to see how we are contributing to the degeneration of humanity every day, whether we are being degenerated by humanity or if we are free of that degeneration. All this we have to see and help each other to see it, with a compassionate spirit, not with a condemnatory spirit.

TOPICS - CLASS 10

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 10 (592)
- FREEDOM FROM THE HUMAN CONDITION AND MISFORTUNE(593)
- IF THE WORLD WERE A CITY WITH 100 INHABIANTS (595)
- PRECINCT B IS NOT CYCLICAL (596)
- GROUP MIND, A CONTINGENCY OF UNITARY PERCEPTION (598)
- ABOUT SOME KRISTIAN MARTYRS (599)
- GREEK AND JUDEO-KRISTIAN WORLD VIEWS ON FORTUNE AND DESTINY (604)
- FUNCTIONAL BRAIN PRECINCTS B AND A (MATER OF STUDY (607)
- FATE AND PRECINCTS B AND A (609)
- THE SIMILAR FATE OF SOME CHRISTIAN MYSTICS (610)
- THE IMPLICATIONS OF GOING AGAINST THE CURRENT (615)
- REVIEWING CONCEPTS UNDER THE LIGHT OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (621)
- BENEFITS AND CONTINGENCIES OF UNITARY PERCEPTION (633)
- READING, HAVING DIALOGUE IN UNITARY PERCEPTION AND ATTEMPTING IT CONSTANTLY (634)

- REVIEWING IMPORTANT CONCEPTS IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY (636)
- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EVOLUTION AND MUTATION (640)
- CLARIFYING THE HORIZONTAL CONFLICT (642)
- THE UNIVERSAL MIND (648)
- ON THE *DHAMMAPADA* (WRITING ATTRIBUTED TO BUDDHA (653)
- ABOUT THE TAO TE KING (WRITTEN BY LAO TSE) (654)
- CONTROVERSIAL WORDS IN EXEGESIS (656)
- LOGOS AND LOGIC (657)
- THE FOUNDATIONS OF FEAR, ANGER AND SADNESS (665)

CLASS 10

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, October 10th, 2010.

RFG: Good Morning. Today is October 10, 2010, which means that we are in 10/10/ ...10. It is autumn here, a beautiful sunny day. I hope that you are enjoying the spring in Argentina. We are making contact with Ireland and we are already in contact with Argentina. And of course, we have to remember that this course is always dedicated to a humanity which is more and more divided and more suffering each day, having an unprecedented concentration of political, economic, military and religious power; such concentration has never happened before in the history of mankind. There was a kind of attempt to make that happen in Central Europe between the thirties and forties in the twentieth century, but never a concentration of the mentioned powers as immense as the current one.

And someone, not me, has already said that power corrupts and that absolute power corrupts absolutely. We can clearly see the growing corruption of humanity, in addition to its suffering. And we are doing this course in the name of all that, offering the solution that is Unitary Perception.

There was homework, reading the interviews that Karina gave me, which are four. I don't know if you've all read them or if anyone has any questions or comments about them, or any questions or comments before we start. Or, rather, that's what we'll start with.

Audience: There is a short quote... it has few lines, but if I get closer... shall I read it? So that they hear me in Argentina.

RFG: Yes, yes.

Audience: It is a quote from the reference text. “Being here completely makes us aware that we living beings are all “condemned to die.” This awareness is the beginning of the freedom from human condition.” Could you expand on that?

RFG: Yes, the awareness of Unitary Perception is the freedom from the human condition for as long as Unitary Perception lasts. I believe that since Lao Tzu, much before JesuKristos, when Lao Tzu writes his *Tao Te King*, also called *The Book of the Straight Way*, when Lao Tzu writes the *Tao Te King* he says that misfortune is the essence of human condition and that we have to become experts in misfortune in order to be free from the human condition. JK –Jiddu Krishnamurti– told us that we have to know ourselves. I think it would be better to say: we have to know everything –including ourselves– by ourselves and see that the human condition is misfortune, because even though we are well and eat well, we have to see the misfortune of Colombia, the Congo, Iraq, of Afghanistan as our own, and the misfortune that we see in our neighbors too, the misfortune that we have suffered in our own lives at some time. That is to say, since we escape misfortune, which is the human condition, we don't know the human condition well and then, I believe that the paragraph that Natzio brought could be explained in that way.

And that the solution or rather, the exit, is Unitary Perception. Because there are human problems that can no longer be solved, but there is a way out of the human condition, which is misfortune, which is Unitary Perception. I don't know if I'm answering Natzio.

Audience: Misfortune in oneself is conflict, it is suffering. Unitary Perception is then the act of compassion because it is the only one that allows suffering to be seen without calling it “misfortune,” without saying that it is bad, without saying that it is repugnant.

RFG: Right.

Audience: So... I think... there is a very big problem in all the

terminology. I think that in the same text, the same interview, there is a moment where Jiddu Krishnamurti is quoted as telling us not to name the internal conflict, because all the names it has: suffering, grief, discomfort, anguish, are names that condition us to not see it. So, precisely our condemnation is in not seeing it because we consider it bad.

RFG: Sure. That's why JK said: "Love your sadness if you want to see it." It seemed crazy to me. When I decided not to separate myself from sadness, when I first arrived from Argentina, where some one hundred thousand people had disappeared according to the information one has, well, one had great resistance to love one's own sadness, when one generally despises, hates one's own sadness as a sign of weakness. You're no longer a "macho" if you're sad. But the truth is that the human condition carries sadness and carries it from... not millennia, but perhaps millions of years ago. And if we don't love it, JK said, meaning if we don't see it clearly in Unitary Perception, there is no freedom from sadness, from fear or from anger, which are the fundamental emotions that are divided by thought, but they are one. It is the internal misfortune, which we believe to be always out there, that the suffering is of the others, but not of oneself and that the misery is of the others, but not of oneself because one has a bank account. And that war belongs to the others because it is in Afghanistan and not here.

But that's what the Afghans thought until the war came to them too, because the permanent war will rotate and will affect all the countries while the war is permanent and as long as it remains a business. So if we don't see all this with intelligence, we are, well, in trouble, to put it some way.

And, well, I don't know if there is any other comment or question.

I found a summary of what the world is, to have an idea, a numerical idea of what the world is, thinking that the world has a hundred people, to make it easier to see.

If the world were a city of 100 people, there would be:

- 59 Asians, 14 Africans, 14 Americans, 13 Europeans
- 51 women, 49 men;
- 50 under age fifteen;
- 10 of them own 90% of the village's assets;
- 90 are slaves or in danger of being slaves;
- 42 have no access to potable water;
- 33 of the 100 human beings of that imaginary town that represents the world are in wars;
- 6 are soldiers or police officers, a growing number;
- 50 can read, write and calculate;
- 45 have access to the doctor;
- 35 can buy expensive prescription drugs;
- 15 have a computer and 7 of them can access the Internet;
- 1 goes to the cinema and it is always the same cinema;
- 30 use 90% of electricity and natural resources;
- 5 travel on holidays;
- 70 are divorced;
- the village spends 1.12 trillion dollars in military expenditures and only 100 billion dollars in development aid;
- if you have food in your refrigerator and your clothes in a closet, if you have a bed to sleep in and if you have a roof, you are richer than 75% of all human beings;
- if you have bank account, you are one of the 30 richest people in the world, and
- remember that of those 100 hypothetical people around the world, 75 struggle to survive with less than two dollars per day, less than sixty dollars per month.

It is an interesting vision to have an idea, more or less, of what is the human condition, of what is the current world, what is the misfortune of which Lao Tzu spoke, the human condition.

The misfortune is not only of others, we also have to see that we are human beings and that we have misfortune as part of our life.

I don't know if there is any question or comment on this in Buenos Aires, in Ireland or here.

Audience: Ruben, I had a question from before which I had not asked. When in the text you say that in Precinct C, thought is cyclical and in... Precinct B... uh...

RFG: In Precinct B, brain functioning is not cyclical.

Audience: I did not understand that well.

RFG: Of course, we have to understand that when we say ABC, we are referring to functional precincts, which are not functions, but *sets* of functions. It is a new abstraction in the study of neurology. We can say that walking is a function, breathing is a brain function, sleep another function, but all these functions belong to a functional precinct that has its own laws, which is Precinct C, and in that precinct, the brain works with those same laws, which are repetition, cyclicity, duality, incoherence, unconsciousness, temporality, hypnosis. In that Precinct C also function thought and imagination, which are our life, which are all we know. That's why we say, I say repeatedly, that we live the imaginary life and not the true life that is lived only in Precinct B, which is the precinct of brain functioning where functions are not repeated in a cyclical way, but are always as if they were new. For the observer, which actually disappears in Unitary Perception. Everything that happens in Unitary Perception is new, it is fresh, and therefore it is not something that is perceived as repeated. I don't know if I'm answering you.

Yes, ABC are functional precincts that encompass many brain functions. But Precinct C has its own laws.

Audience: Like gravitation; it is not cyclical.

RFG: Gravitation is not cyclical and light is not cyclical unless we interpret it as waves, but waves are not precisely cyclical either.

Audience: Gravitation would not be a function of Precinct B. Perception of gravitation at the same time would, because what I have realized from this response, which had never been relevant to me, is that there is a brain function that is Unitary Perception, which consists of perception. Neurologically, in B something is happening, say in the body, which is perception, but a form of perception in which everything is perceived at the same time, but that is a fact that happens... I had never realized that it happens in the body and that is a function. I believed that Unitary Perception was something that happened only in the right now, in the totality, but not in the body, in perception.

RFG: No, in the body. Sure, the body. That's why when you wake up in Unitary Perception it's delicious because you know where the right foot and the left foot are, where the big toe is, where the head is. That is to say, it is a very exquisite sensation while one listens to the birds, as it happened this morning. Cecilia waters the garden almost every day at night and we have a few trees that harbor birds, so the place with more birdsong in the whole neighborhood is in the patio of our house, and one wakes up with those abundant trills and with the sensation of feeling the whole body as a block, but very relaxed. And also how the clarity of the day is increasing, that it seems miraculous how the clarity of the day increases gradually as you are waking up, and if you stay calm and don't jump out of bed, you can perceive that clarity increase until the moment when the body tells you it's time to start the day and leave your rest.

But that is very rarely done; through most of my life I woke up with an alarm clock, even when I was a child. You have to jump, you have to hurry and that is how they teach us to live, when in reality what we have to do is organize our day in such a way that we don't have to jump around and hurry, being able to maintain a fundamental calm in order to do what needs to be done. Doing all things calmly and without hurry, because otherwise we fall into irritability and acceleration that make our lives a misfortune, a misery.

Are we doing well? Is there any other question or comment?

Audience: In the text you also quote David Bohm as saying that group mind does not happen because there are areas in the brain that have not been used for a long time.

RFG: Of course, group mind is a secondary thing, one of the contingencies that occur after a certain time of constantly living in Unitary Perception. And group mind is one of the functions that the brain has that will appear only if we take life in Unitary Perception, outside imaginary life. And what David Bohm said was even simpler than what you say. He said that we have erected a barrier called “Ruben” that prevents us from being in the group mind, because if my electron is a particle... “If the electron in my brain, which is a particle, is in your brain in the form of a wave and the electron of your brain, which is a particle, is also in my brain in the form of a wave, why don’t we know each other?” asked David Bohm. We should know each other very well, but we don’t know each other because we are defended behind a wall called “Ruben.” It has our name, but it is the self.

That's what Bohm said. He says it in writing in a book that was published in a now-defunct scientific magazine that was called OMNI in January... 89. I think it was in January 89 when that magazine came out.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] [87.]

RFG: January [87]. A very interesting article by David Bohm, who puts his prestige in jeopardy by talking about group mind, which is synonymous with telepathy, with the difference that Bohm said the word *telepathy* should not be used because *tele* means “at a distance.” And when I perceive you, say, I perceive the other person, I perceive them in my body; I don’t perceive them at a distance, therefore it should be called group mind and not telepathy. *Tele* is something at a distance, *-pathy* is “feeling,” “feeling at a distance.” No, no, if you are in group mind you feel the person in your own body.

Any other question or comment?

Audience: It is very tempting to start talking about the life of all those Christian mystic gentlemen that you mentioned, but we would deviate a bit maybe.

RFG: I don't know if we have approached —yesterday we spoke with Cecilia about this— if we have dealt with exegesis enough in this course. I don't think so, but I don't know if you're interested either, right? I don't know if you have a major comment or question on that.

Audience: Yes, I'm looking for... one of the names... we talked about Bruno, for example, right? For example Kaspar Schwenckfeld, who died at age seventy-one in 1661 in Germany and wrote several books that were forbidden in the indexes of the Catholic and Protestant churches for emphasizing one's own deification over any organization, hierarchy, priesthood, belief, rite or formulated behavior.

RFG: Of course, he used to say that, in order to express that inner Kristos, which Paul talks about in his Letter to the Romans in the New Testament, when he says in the First Letter of Paul to the Corinthians in Chapter 2, Verse 16 if I'm not mistaken: "We all have the mind of Kristos." What this man that you mention says... can you repeat his name?

Audience: Kaspar Schwenckfeld.

RFG: He was a man who suffered a lot in his life; he was persecuted because he said that we simply have to express that part of ourselves in a complete way, as everything. As the peach tree is consummated in the peach, the human being must also be consummated and completed. And that part of oneself that is the mind of Kristos atrophies in an anti-Kristic society. I am referring to anti-kristics with a "k"; I don't refer to Christianity with a "c" which is a degradation of the Kristianity of Jesus Kristos.

What Kaspar said is that we have to give full expression to that inner Kristos, something that will not happen if we follow someone or get into a religious corral, a political corral or any type of corral that man has invented. Man must be completely free so that he can fully express that inner Kristos, that deification, which the primitive Christians called “the complete reception of the Holy Spirit” and that can only happen in complete freedom, complete freedom and in the complete absence of corrals. The human being invents corrals in which to get in an astonishing way. And power is the most terrible corral, because the desire for domination of other people makes us forget the expression of what we have inside and what Paul calls “the Kristos” in our brain, “in our mind,” and of course we have no idea what it is. Why? –I call it Precinct A– because we don’t have any idea of what it is, because that is not talked about, that is not written about, that is not discussed because that is for the insane, for the wise or for the priests, i.e., another corral. There is no talk of something as important as that in school, at home or among friends, as I think we should talk a lot about all that, because it means: the complete development of the human being, which Kaspar calls “deification.” It is something that has to happen, according to Kaspar, in every human being and that, of course, does not happen in any human being. This is what I say: the human being is born in Precinct C and dies in Precinct C; he does not know any other precinct of his or her mind.

Audience: It seems that he was one of the least unfortunate. He died when he was seventy-one. Others had their heads cut off.

RFG: I don’t know if you have Meno there.

Audience: Meno?

RFG: He's on the same list.

Audience: And there's Fox, George Fox also, who...

RFG: George Fox, things did not go well for him at all. But

Meno had a very bad time because he wanted to make the Earthly Paradise. He wanted to make the Earthly Paradise, that is, Paradise on Earth. We did not have to wait –he said– to die to be in Paradise. For saying that I think he had several pains in the neck (laughs). For saying that, he had several neck pains... the doctor treated him for torticollis.

(Brief pause and laughter)

I'm kidding. He was a man who suffered a lot. That was the origin of the Mennonites, who make the excellent Chihuahua cheese.

Audience: It's also, did you say Fox? George Fox, founder of the Society of Friends.

RFG: The Quakers.

Audience: We were very surprised by the name. "The Society of Friends," you could already tell that...

RFG: The Society of Friends. Hierarchies were over, images were over, everything was over. I was in one of their meetings in the United States when I was on a scholarship, because one had gone on a scholarship... It was called the Experiment in International Living. I received the scholarship, I arrived in the United States and I was in the house of several people. And one of those houses belonged to a Quaker, a follower of Fox. There everyone sat in silence and waited for the Holy Spirit to speak. You could not speak from yourself. You had to wait for the Holy Spirit to come and speak. And there were meetings in which nobody spoke, but the time I went there a lady spoke, she spoke at length about the Holy Spirit, sat down and nobody made any comment. And silence followed until the meeting time was up and everyone left. It was, if you want to put it that way, a devotional way of gathering that is very typical of Quakers. Another thing about the Quakers is that they are enemies of war, as was JesuKristos of course, who said: "*Eirene umin*," "be at peace." Furthermore, he says it just after

coming back from Heaven. He tells his friends: “*Eirene umin*” and he says it twice. “Be at peace.”

And Fox said that war is the worst of the crimes committed by human beings during their short life on this Earth. And their life of misfortune becomes a life of quadruple misfortune, thanks to war. That was not amusing at all for those who lived with the Quakers in the United States, and they did not have a good time, especially during the First and Second Wars of the 20th century, which are called First and Second, as if they really were the first and the second, right? And there were the Quakers, who did not want to participate. So they gave them non-war positions in the army.

I was also with Mennonites, I was with the Amish in Pennsylvania living in their house. They are also people who deplore war, they don’t want to participate in war because they are Kristians, they are Kristians with a *K*, not Christians with a *C*, and they deplore the war.

I don’t know if you have anyone else there.

Audience: So, Christian mysticism is understood here –say– as a religious interest beyond the organization? You see, mystic, mysticism...

RFG: *Mystic* is understood as that person who is developing the internal Kristos and of course does not have to belong to any religious organization, they can do it quietly at home, they can do it in the forest, by the sea, at work, at school, wherever they are, expressing that inner Kristos. A mystic is that person.

A mystic can have revelations. Oh, and there comes the problem, because when there is a patriarch or a pope, the only one who can have revelations is him. Then mysticism is discouraged, or organized, organized.

I don’t know if, for example, we are going to start from the left always, with Eduardo. Do you remember what the difference is between the feeling that a person has in a choir or in a perfectly

organized, military parade, and communion per se? Do you remember what the fundamental difference is between both feelings?

Audience: Yes. There is no such spontaneity, that spark that is not planned.

RFG: Right. That is to say, what I feel in a choir or in a parade is not communion, because the choir and the parade are planned things. Communion is something that is not planned. That communion can only occur in a person who we may call mystic in the good sense of the word.

And communion is a threat for all the rulers and for all the powerful, because if human beings are in communion, there is no power, there is no one who dominates, they all feel like brothers, they all feel precisely in communion, they all feel one . “Common union,” we all feel one in communion - I see it very often here at the CPH. It means that there is no one who commands, no one who leads, no one who plans communion; communion happens because it is a gift from God and happens when two or more people are trying to express that divine thing we have inside and that has become something secret without it having to be; it has become something that cannot be talked about, as I said, at home, at school. To speak of the expression of the internal Kristus or the deification of oneself, as Kaspar called it, is not a common conversation. “Not that conversation; get out of here with that conversation topic.” You cannot have it anywhere. You cannot talk about this topic.

But I think that in the CPH we can freely talk about this topic because it is one of the most important things in life: that the human being is completed, and that he does not live a cornered, miserable life, imprisoned in ideas, in organizations, in following religious or political leaders. That, I think, is a corruption, and it is necessary to see in oneself whether one is following someone or trying to see completely what oneself is, what the human being is. For that we have Unitary Perception as the cornerstone of human behavior, which encompasses all behaviors, because we can do anything in Unitary Perception

and from there we can see all of this which we are talking about.

Audience: There is a question in Buenos Aires.

RFG: What is it?

Go ahead Buenos Aires.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] I am Graciela Ruben, I wanted to ask you a question about... your dialogue “Freedom and dependencies,” in a few paragraphs I read that perhaps both Saint Augustine and Freud explained that causality is so powerful that it exceeds luck or free will, so that would mean ...according to this, everything would be predetermined by God.

RFG: Yes.

Audience: Then my question is: what difference would there be, or what factors are involved in destiny? And in a little word that I found there, which is *fortune*, which you say is a contingency of fate. That's what I don't understand; I'd like you to clarify it.

RFG: Actually all this has the same origin. The birth of Jesus is calibrated by the presence of the Magi and that is a mystery because we want it to be a mystery, but it is very clear. They were astrologers who had foreseen the arrival of a very special being. So, the problem is that if we accept astrology, we are falling into Greek polytheism, because the Greeks took astrology, at that time in year 0, as the fact that there were many gods and those gods had a form in space, which were the planets. There was the god Apollo who was in Greek Helios, because the Romans did nothing but copy this astrology from the Greeks. The Greeks called the Sun Helios, the Romans Apollo. Then there was Hermes for the Greeks who was Mercury for the Romans. And then we have all the planets as gods that guide our life. And that is the fundamental principle of astrology, alchemy and magic, which were the sciences at

the time Jesus was born. And what about fate? Hermes and Venus, which in Greek is Aphrodite; Mars and Jupiter, which in Greek is Zeus; Saturn, which in Greek is Kronos, are the gods that guide our life. So the Magi, with all their doctrines — astrology, alchemy and magic— went against (to put it some way) the Jewish vision that there is only one God.

So, what are we left with? Are there many gods that guide our life, who are the planets, or is there only one God who guides our life and who commands? That is the origin of all these words: fate, fortune, etc., which are the power struggles that existed at that time between the rabbis of Sanhedrin and JesuKristos with “K” —JesuKristos was written with a K— who said that we have to love each other and that loving each other was mankind’s best fate, and that we have to forget about the many gods in practice and live life spontaneously. That’s what JesuKristos was proposing and that is in opposition to the Magi, which are celebrated on January 6, I think that feast is known in Greek as “epiphany,” which means “the manifestation,” the manifestation of that star which was not a star, it was the conjunction of Mars, Jupiter and Saturn, that together in the sky were impressive, they are impressive when that conjunction occurs that seems to have happened at the moment that Jesus was born.

So there is the opposition, I insist, between that vision or that cosmology where there are many gods that are the planets ruling over fate and over fortune —which is the luck of being free from fate for a moment, like when you win the lottery for example, and you no longer have to work, which would be fate. On the other hand, having to work was considered the first punishment of God, don’t forget, and all this was part of fate.

Then, there is from the beginning that collision between the Greek worldview, which is represented by the Magi, and the Judaic or Jewish-Kristian with a “K” worldview, in which one wants to arrive at true, non-imaginary life, independent of knowledge of astrology and independent of the conditions that human beings have in order to be free in *metanoia*. That is why JesuKristos insisted: “*Metanoia*,” “let’s go beyond everything

known,” a word mistranslated as “repentance” or “conversion.” And then JesuKristos with the word *metanoia* summarizes and solves the collision between the Greek vision of the magi of astrology and the Jewish vision of one God. Many gods or one God? How does JesuKristos solve it? With the characteristic wisdom of JesuKristos, he says: “*Metanoia*,” “let us go beyond everything we know.”

I don't know if I answered Graciela.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Yes, yes, of course you answered me. So fortune would be an anti-cyclical contingency. That is what it means.

RFG: Of course, but that is also, according to the astrologers, determined by certain aspects. Even in astrology there is such thing as the “wheel of fortune,” so it is all predetermined and astrological even if you have the fortune of winning the Lotto, or the fortune of falling in love with someone who is faithful to you and live a life of happiness, i.e., that is also part of astrological predetermination. So, it is curious that Freud claimed that we are predetermined. What's more, if you talk to an astrologer who knows astrology deeply, he will tell you that human life has been predetermined since the universe began and since the day the stars appeared; human fortune, human fate, was already predetermined. It is a very deterministic worldview and also part of the *status quo*, or at least the *status quo* takes advantage of that worldview saying that if you are wretched, it is because fate says so and then it is easy to keep the *status quo*, which is what JesuKristos wanted to destroy. What JesuKristos wanted was a society without slaves, so he said “there will be neither Greek nor Roman or Jew, neither slave nor lord”. Obviously he wanted to put an end to everything he saw around him, which was the society based on *status quo*, astrology, magic and alchemy. He wanted a *metanoia* society, something spontaneous, based on the love for each other, and said that we need to go beyond everything we know.

Actually, reading the New Testament without any conditioning, we can see this in a very clear way.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Thank you very much.

RFG: On the contrary, Graciela.

I don't know if there is any other question or comment here, in Ireland or Buenos Aires.

Audience: Doctor, I don't know if you could comment a little on the difference in functioning between Mental Precincts B and A.

RFG: Well, that is also repeated in the sacred books, that if one lives life in a certain way, something unnamable, ineffable, which is sacred, will arrive. And then the question that I have asked myself since I was little is: how did the brain of JesuKristos work? If it was so different from all human beings, how did the human brain of JesuKristos work? That led me later to commit the madness of studying psychiatry. Well, let's leave it, joke, joke (laughter).

In psychiatry these are questions that nobody asks, but that we have to start asking. That is, how does the brain of an enlightened person work? How does the brain of a saint work? If it is true that there is enlightenment and if it is true that there is sanctity, how does the brain of such a person work? I am very interested in knowing how the brain of a person like that works. You already know what the aspects are. The aspects, which is the measure of reality with the meter. Psychosocial, molecular, energetic and quantum aspect. All these aspects are working at the same time in the mind of Jeff Dahmer, the serial killer, and in the mind of a JesuKristos or a Gautama Buddha or a Lao Tzu or a JK, Jiddu Krishnamurti. I mean, how does the brain of such a person work? How does the sacred influence the neuron or how does the neuron influence the sacred? That is to say, if specific neuronal changes are needed so that the reception of Precinct A, of the sacred in our life, may be present, so that the deification, the completion of the

human being, the consummation of the human being is manifested. As JesuKristos says on the cross, “*consumatum est.*” He is consummated, he was consummated, he was completed as a human being, but he even said that we are going to do bigger things than he did. It means that our consummation could be greater than that of JesuKristos according to JesuKristos himself. But how does the neuron of a JesuKristos work? How does the neuron in Precinct A work? That is what we have to study as part of psychology too.

Psychology studied these things when Psychology was done in the time of Socrates, but it stopped being so, it stopped being so. I don't see why the sacred has to be forgotten within psychology. I mean, Bohm did not forget the sacred within physics, why should we forget the sacred within psychology, which is apparently even closer to the human being? We shouldn't forget about the sacred and stop trying to discover how the brain works in a person who wants to live in the sacred, who wants to live their daily life in the sacred. How does that brain work? And how is that brain different from someone who does not live like that?

Precinct A, how does it work from the molecular point of view, from the psychosocial point of view, from...? In all aspects of life. From the energetic, quantum point of view, etc., how does the brain work? That is something that we have to start studying and that has never been done.

I don't know if I've answered you.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: We're not saying any of this is easy, but...

Audience: I also commented in relation to... for example, the fact of enlightenment, as it is a contingency that occurs with the constant attempt of Unitary Perception.

RFG: Yes. Constant.

Audience: For example, the constant attempt of Unitary Perception... It already begins to happen that the “seeing is doing,” that is, in the very attempt of Unitary Perception, we are talking about Precinct B. But if what sees is all there is, then when you see, I mean...

RFG: The sacred is acting.

Audience: Yes. In other words, if Javier is seeing the sadness that is happening or the joy that is happening... that is... everything would happen there, I mean...

RFG: Sure. The sacred is acting in the act of seeing.

And this is also said by JK, that we have forgotten that action begins with seeing and hearing, and that action is very different from activity, because we human beings are very active, but we have separated our life from the sacred and therefore we are active and nothing more. There is no action.

Audience: [We’re] reactive.

RFG: Of course, we are reacting in activity, but we are not acting, as I said or in the sense that JK gave it. To *act* means “seeing is doing,” in Unitary Perception, and listening is doing in Unitary Perception. It is not that listening means doing nothing or seeing means doing nothing. No, no; action is there, and if we could see and hear, and maintain our peace, it would be the greatest contribution we can give to humanity: our own peace, which comes from what? From that action in the universe that is exerted through our ears and our eyes in the act of seeing and listening at the same time. That is the action! Everything else is activities, said Jiddu Krishnamurti.

And he also said that we have to approach everything immediate in everyday life with the immense, he said, with the sacred. It doesn’t matter what we are doing, even if it is washing a dish or ironing a shirt, to approach it with the sacred,

approach it with the sacred. That is what Jiddu Krishnamurti proposed.

I don't know if I'm answering.

Audience: From John Hus, what can you say? I had never heard about him.

RFG: Yes, a Swiss, right?

Audience: Swiss. 1415.

RFG: Yes, 1415, one of the first victims of thinking in a Kristic way. He wanted to remove the images from the churches, remove the music –which is a product of thought. He wanted to remove the title of “sacred” from music, because music is not sacred; music is a product of human thought. So he wanted to get all that out of the church and it cost him, I think, his life (laughter).

Audience: They burned him.

RFG: Yes, they invited him to a council to speak. In the council they did not like what he said and they burned him. It seems that they did not beat around the bush much.

The authorities of the council did not... The authorities of the councils did not beat around the bush much. If they did not like what they were hearing, you would immediately go to the slaughterhouse.

Going to the slaughterhouse, what was it? In Greek, the holocaust. It means holos, “complete,” -caust, “burn.” We are going to burn you completely so that nothing is left of you, because you are a heretic, because you say that you have to get the music out of the church or because you have to take down the pictures here and there. Then you are a heretic, therefore we will not leave anything of you, we will make a holo-caust, a complete burning of you so that only your ashes are left and we

are going to throw them to the wind so that nothing of you remains. That was the idea, to leave no trace of a heretic.

Hus is one of them. Zwingli is another one of them. I don't know if Zwingli is there.

Audience: Huldrich Zwingli, also for the music.

RFG: Also for the music.

Audience: And the crosses.

RFG: And the crosses. He said that these are things made by the human hand, they are not sacred things, therefore they have to get out of the buildings where we congregate, because the building where we congregate should harbor peace and the absence of anything made by the hand or mind of the human being, to give place to the full expression of God in that building.

I think they burned him too. Zwingli.

Audience: They killed him. I don't know...

RFG: Ah, the nobles killed him. The nobles killed him.

Audience: They were very noble (laughter).

RFG: They were very noble. They were very noble and did not want to know anything about non-noble things.

Audience: Thomas Muntzer was beheaded for seeking Heaven on Earth.

RFG: Thomas Muntzer, they beheaded him because he wanted Heaven on Earth.

These are stories that we have to know to see how far the human being can go.

Audience: Meister Eckhart, who was he?

RFG: Meister Eckhart. Someone worth reading. He has his sermons, which are worth reading. He used a German word, the only German word I know, which is the one that Meister Eckhart pronounced. Gelassenheit, which means “let it all go.” Let it all go. It can also be translated as “let yourself,” let yourself go, abandon yourself. In other words, stop thinking about yourself; stop living self-absorbed, in yourself, inside yourself. No, no, the world is not just you. The world is something that is not being self-absorbed. That was constantly proposed by Meister Eckhart. And the Pope calls him and says: “You, what are you saying?” When he answers the Pope, the Pope gets very angry and I don’t know if they excommunicated him...

Audience: Heretic.

RFG: They called him a heretic, if that was the case, he got excommunicated. But I don’t know if they excommunicated him or not, but I’m sure he was close to being excommunicated.

Audience: It's not here, but...

RFG: Another very beautiful person, Meister Eckhart. I have read his sermons and they are inspiring, you can tell that he was inspired when he spoke.

Audience: All these are scholars of the Christian teaching.

RFG: They are mystics. They say: “I am here, inside this corral, be it “Catholicism,” be it “Protestantism,” be it “Orthodox Christianity,” be it “organized Buddhism,” whatever... Any organized religion is a corral. They said, like Juan de la Cruz, like Saint Theresa: “I am in this corral, but first my contact with God is direct, even if I am in the corral.” They did not realize that they had to leave the corral to have a direct contact with God.

Audience: Complete.

RFG: You need to leave the corrals completely. Any corral, invented by one or invented by another. And of any product of thought, be it music, symbols... Any product of thought. And then, he does the same thing Juan de la Cruz did. We are talking about...

Audience: Ah, right now we were just mentioning Meister Eckhart...

RFG: Yes. What he does is... Even when he felt cornered within a religious organization, he is what they call “a mystic;” he is a danger to the organization, why? Because he feels he has had a revelation from God, and to speak of that revelation is a heresy, because “you did not ask permission from the patriarch, the pope, you did not ask anyone's permission. You are talking about a Revelation that could come from the Devil, who knows?” Who knows if it is not from the Devil. The same thing they said of JesuKristos with a “K”...

Audience: And of Jiddu Krishnamurti.

RFG: ...“This man speaks from the Devil.” Or minor things like for example, I think it was Bartholomew, before he was Krishnamurti's friend, he told someone who was with him...

Audience: Bartholomew?

RFG: Yes. Bartholomew was one of the twelve friends.

Audience: But you said Krishnamurti.

RFG: No, I meant JesuKristos, JK-1. And ... Bartholomew says: “Who does this guy think he is? He pretends to be the Messiah, but he comes from Nazareth. Can anything good come from Nazareth?” Bartholomew said by the fig tree. “Can anything good come from Nazareth?” The invalidation of the mystic, the invalidation of the person who thinks for himself. The invalidation of the person who wants to free himself from the corrals in which he is involved. As

JesuKristos is freed from Judaism, in the same way the mystic is freed from the corral in which he is, whatever it may be.

Then the invalidation begins: “What can be good about this guy coming from Nazareth?” “What can be good about this one who comes from Sonora [Mexico]?” And “Javier comes from Chihuahua, can anything from there be good?” And “This Dr., even if he is a doctor, what can be good about him?” (Laughter)

Audience: Well, what about the Argentines? (Laughter)

RFG: No, that's already well-known. (Laughter)

So, first of all comes the invalidation of the person. If the invalidation doesn't take effect, there comes the elimination of the person, which is now called “neutralization.”

Audience: They don't kill him anymore, but...

RFG: They neutralize him.

Audience: Through advertising, television...

RFG: No, no. Nowadays, *killing* a person is called “neutralizing” them.

Audience: Oh, yes.

RFG: The word changed, but the fact is the same. But first, the intention is to deprive them of their dignity, to strip them of their humanity, to strip them of their right to be respected. That is, to invalidate them, “you are not worth anything.” And if that doesn't work, then comes neutralization, assassination: burn them, hang them, send them to the electric chair or kill them in the street there.

Audience: When it is said publicly or formally, it is the “neutralization” of someone dangerous...

RFG: Used among hit men: “We have to neutralize Pete.” That implies Pete has little life left. That's how it works.

That's why JK told me at the beginning: “Are you sure you want to go against the current?” I say: “Ehrm ... yes” (laughter). He says, “Well, then I have to ask you another question.” “Yes, yes, go ahead.” “Are you sure you want to go against the current?” (Laughter) He asks me the same question because he saw that my first answer was very insecure. Then I say: “Yes, yes.”

But we have a lot of fear, a lot of caution in going against the current, that is: what will become of us, what will become of us if we go against the current?

Audience: What will they say about me?

RFG: What are they going to say about me if I stop going to the religious organization or I stop going to the game or I stop going to all those cages that the human being built for himself, and that I abandon all that for the sacred? And that the sacred is not here or there, it is anywhere and especially within each one of us.

The sacred is not following anyone, anyone, anyone, anyone. And a person can come from Puerto Vallarta and become a JesuKristos. And a person can come from Monterrey or from Delicias, Chihuahua or from Hermosillo, Sonora, and yes, they can be JesuKristos, of course. No matter where a person comes from, the important thing is that they are a human being.

And that is what we have to take into account, not to lose our fear, not to antagonize the fear we feel in our guts. To SEE fear, to love fear and to see it in Unitary Perception, and to let it end. Let it end and let us do what needs to be done: being at peace in Unitary Perception, which is the best contribution that a human being can make to a world that has gone mad, a world that is completely corrupt. An anti-kristic world in the “K” sense of the word, which means against the fundamental, essential teaching of human life.

Audience: Jakob Bohme.

RFG: What does it say about him?

Audience: Considered heretics: Meister Eckhart, Miguel de Molinos, Jakob Bohme.

RFG: Miguel de Molinos was put in jail.

Audience: Molinos?

RFG: Yes. He also said that he had to come from inside and that there is no need to follow anyone, and they put him in prison.

Audience: But it's not ... it's not Saint Michael.

RFG: No, no. Miguel de Molinos is a very recent priest in history, who was imprisoned –they made him a prisoner and from there he did not go out until his death, I think– for saying that we must not follow anyone and that the way to God is a lonely one, and that the relationship with God is one to one between Ruben and God. That nobody can get in there. It's like a wedding; JesuKristos said it was a wedding, the mystical wedding between Ruben's soul and God. It's like Ruben and Cecilia, no one else is supposed to enter. Well, and in the relationship with God, which is another wedding, the soul of Ruben, who marries that which is inside Ruben, which is the internal Kristos, nobody can enter, because it is an individual thing. The only one who can know if one is good is oneself. Am I sincere? I have to ask myself that, because nobody knows but me. Simply because of that, because nobody but me can know. Am I generous? Am I a person –not following JesuKristos, but a person who is not anti-Kristic? Am I like that or not? That question cannot be answered by anyone but Ruben, for Ruben. That is, it is not a question that I can answer for another. Very important.

And all these victims of the inquisitions and religious organizations, some of which he is mentioning, saw this clearly and suffered terrible consequences many times.

Audience: And they managed to silence them.

RFG: Well, they managed to silence them, but how curious that when you want to delve into religion, the first names you find are theirs, and the first words you find are theirs. Very beautiful how all this works.

Audience: And it is more coherent than what we get today.

RFG: Sure, of course, they won't have the depth or... I've read Miguel de Molinos, I've read all of them, and maybe they don't have the depth of JK, be it JK-1 or JK-2, JesuKristos or Jiddu Krishnamurti, maybe they don't have that depth, but they have that sincerity, that devotion, that inspiration.

Audience: [They're] honest.

RFG: That honesty that is so beautiful to see in a person. The honesty of the one who knows himself to be imperfect, knows he is imperfect and says: "Well, God made us all imperfect so that we can help each other." God did not make any of us perfect; why? So that we help each other, not to be perfect, but to live together in communion and to live life a little lighter, in a lighter way than the life imposed by the prisons and cages that thought has built. The music that thought has built, which is another cage. All that has to fall, it has to fall because it is not essential. Yes. Just listen to some music to know that it affects you, and not in a nice way. There are people who are plugged into music all day and they are a whirlwind of conflict.

What were you saying?

Audience: You reminded me right now of something we saw in the reading, which tells us: we are similar to God, we are made like God.

RFG: Why? Because, what does he say...? The only time the human being talks to God in the Bible is with Moses. And what is Moses going to ask? “What’s your name? So we can call you by your name when we feel bad.” It was not out of generosity (laughs). And he says: “What is your name?” And God answers: “I am what I am. Go and tell those who ask you that I am what I am.” “Uh, but they will not believe me.” “You go and tell them that.” Then when he goes down they ask him what the name of God is. “I am what I am.”

Ah, they thought it was him, they already believed that he wanted to become God, so a tremendous mob formed, because that is what the Bible transmits, that there is something in us that is God. There is something within us, Precinct A, which is God and then Moses has to tell his friends “I am what I am.” “What did he tell you his name was?” “I am what I am.” “What?!” They wanted to eat poor Moses alive.

All this shows us that there is a very great coherence between Moses himself and JesuKristos, that is, Moses reproduces in a lesser way what is later seen in JesuKristos. That is why JesuKristos is called “the second Adam,” because Adam is born in Paradise and JesuKristos brings the sword that closed the door to Paradise so that we can enter Paradise. Then he is the second Adam, the teaching of JesuKristos opens the doors to Paradise for us.

Very beautiful comparisons are made there to give coherence to teaching. But the teaching loses coherence if the one who reads does not have it. If the reader does not have coherence, the coherence of Unitary Perception, he will not find coherence in the Bible. On the contrary, he will get confused.

I don’t know if there are more questions or comments.

There are not?

Audience: It is about what is said of fate, or what a serious astrologer can say about astrology, of what may be predestined, or what is the fate humanity has to go through.

Being careful not to see that as a law, in the sense that JesuKristos says: "I have come for you to do greater things than what I did." Then it would seem that if humanity began to work in Precinct B, or in Precinct A, that which is cyclical at this time ... it seems there would be things that could change, but perhaps the change is precisely there and can be brought by the attempt of Unitary Perception. By that I mean that the course of humanity... would occur to where Precinct A takes us.

RFG: Yes. In the United States there was a general named Patton, who was a very war-loving man. His comrades told him: "They have trained us to be army men, but what happens in you is that you love war." Patton loved war and said things like this: "Compared to war, all other forms of human endeavor shrink to insignificance." He had taken it from Hannibal; he had taken it from history, because he liked history, especially military. And he believed in reincarnation, he thought he was the reincarnation of Napoleon, etc., etc.

And then all those beliefs are very old in humanity. That no human behavior, or something like that, is as beautiful as war, as the behavior of war. So, that's in the memory of humanity, but if you study astrology, the god of war is Mars, which in Greek is Ares –that's where the word Aryan comes from, you know. The god of war is not necessarily the god of war. Actually, he should be the god of initiative. Every time a person exercises an initiative, they do so, according to the astrologers, for the Mars they have in themselves.

Then, even the interpretation of astrology can change if we let go of history: of Patton, of Hannibal and of all those who said that the most sacred behavior was the behavior of war. Oops, wait a second, do you know what I mean? We are conditioned by that.

Audience: Yes, because, excuse me, the planet Mars, as far as I know, cannot be in Unitary Perception and the human being can.

RFG: Of course. And I can see Mars in Unitary Perception and get rid of the warlike influence Mars might have if that were true.

So how we interpret things also depends on what kind of perception is interpreting. Yes...

I don't know if you remember, for example, making differences ... Mars, god of initiative or god of war. But do you remember the luminiferous ether? Lord Kelvin said that ... the luminiferous ether ended when Einstein came up with the theory of relativity; the *luminiferous*, which means "light-bearing," ether ends. And when Bohm comes, he talks about *luminigenous* Holokinesis.

Holokinesis does not transport light as the ether did, but it GENERATES light. Luminigenous.

Does luminigenous Holokinesis replace luminiferous ether? No, they are two completely different concepts. They are associated because when one disappears, the other appears eighty-six years later. But it is an association that thought makes. [A false correlation.]

The luminiferous ether was the substance of the cosmos that transported light. When the idea of ether disappears, with the concepts of Einstein, and Bohm appears, then now we speak of luminigenous Holokinesis, which is the Holokinesis in which light is generated. And Unitary Perception is the conscious contact with Holokinesis, that's why it gives so much energy, so much regeneration. And Unitary Perception releases energy and is perceived as great peace. All this, of course, occurs within the four aspects, which we have already said: psychosocial, molecular, energetic, quantum.

I don't know if there are comments, questions, before continuing.

Audience: The thing about the morphogenetic fields is not so clear to me.

RFG: That's an idea of an individual who has lost his way. He takes the concept of Holokinesis from Bohm and invents the morphogenetic fields. It is something that you can read in the book *The Psychology of the 21st Century*, in an article called "We Are All One." This whole matter is well explained there. I recommend you read "We Are All One" from the book *The Psychology of the 21st Century*. There it is well explained, in detail, but you don't need to read anyone mentioned in that article.

Whoever created the morphogenetic fields now plays with fungi and eats mushrooms to feel in the transcendent space. He has lost his way completely. He is the one who makes fun of Jiddu Krishnamurti in a meeting between Krishnamurti, Bohm, the psychiatrist [Hidley] and this individual called ... Rupert. Rupert lost his way. Already when he mocks Krishnamurti, one already knew that he had lost his way, but after that, I confirmed recently, he has completely lost his way.

So... we talk about different things when we say "intelligence." Intelligence of C or B? The intelligence of C can be measured with the revised Wechsler Test. But B's intelligence cannot be measured. It is the ability to know when to be in Unitary Perception and when not, without thinking.

They said to me: "You are talking about the present, about living the present." And I say to them: "What present, B or C or A?" They are different presents.

The most difficult thing is to differentiate between C and B. There is a time of B and a time of C. [*To a member of the audience*] Do you remember what they are? B time and C time.

Audience: Yes. The time of C, from here to there, and...

RFG: What is it called? Absolute.

Audience: Absolute.

RFG: Absolute. The time of C is absolute. And B's?

Audience: Irrelevant.

RFG: Irrelevant, of course. Thanks to Holokinesis you can scientifically talk about time being irrelevant. Not in a mystical way, in a scientific way too. And the consciousness of C and B are two different consciousnesses, that's why it is difficult to define consciousness. The consciousness of C has its laws; the consciousness of B lacks those laws. Why? Because in B there is freedom from the past, which is where the laws are. It is in the past where the laws are. In Unitary Perception there is absence of the past, the laws of repetition, of duality, etc., are not there, and the real responsibility, which is compassion, can only be in B, which is Unitary Perception. Because, what is the responsibility of C? The exchange: I give you and you give me. I will be responsible as long as you are also responsible. Then if you give me, I give you. But the responsibility of B is to know that something has to be done and it has to be done. And there is no one who does it and I have to do it myself. That is called responsibility. You see what I mean?

My brother tells me: "What are you doing? You are spending all your money traveling around the world." I say: "Yes." "You went nuts, what happened to you?" "No, I have the responsibility to see that there is something to do and nobody is doing it." Simply. That is called "responsibility." Then that responsibility comes from the freedom from the past. The freedom from the past that told me: "You have to buy a little house with a garden," you know what I mean?

And what does *responsibility* mean according to JK? It is the ability to respond, the ability to respond. Have you seen between friends or in marriage, when one asks a difficult question that remains unanswered? "Honey, what happened to the thing I left up there?" "Do you know if Marta and Jorge are going to come for dinner this Saturday?" Do you understand me? "So, what about the question I asked you?" (Laughter). That is, there is certain unwillingness to answer the things that one asks, why? Because there is no capacity to respond, there is

no responsibility. It is in everyday life, it is in everything we do. And for there to be responsibility there must be real compassion, which only exists in Unitary Perception.

When we speak of *free will*, which is another thing that is spoken in the interviews that we had to read for today... Free will. What does free will mean? If we are conditioned by the past and hypnotized, what free will are we talking about? Free will can be understood only as the primitive Kristians did: completely accepting the will of God. That is the freedom we have, that is free will: that we accept God's will completely. Human beings don't have another freedom. "I can stop eating as long as I want." Well, sixty-eight days, know what I mean? It is limited, and as long as there is limitation, there is no freedom, there is no free will.

Is there freedom from the cosmos? That is, can you free yourself from gravitation, which is one of the laws of the cosmos? No, [an example] we're all going towards the center of the Earth, like it or not. All towards the center of the Earth. Sometimes in an earthquake the earth opens and we go to the center of the Earth. Is there freedom from gravitation? No. I mean, we're not free from the laws.

Is there freedom from repetition within Precinct C and freedom from duality? No, there is no freedom.

Is there freedom of the gene? Ask a diabetic, ask a schizophrenic if there is freedom from the genes.

Is there freedom from hypnosis? That is, thought is hypnosis, are we free from thought completely? Well, be careful.

Jeff Dahmer, I always use him as an example. A serial killer, repetitive. He repeated the same thing several times: murdering African-American people, young men, because he was homosexual. And he can be defined as an obsessive compulsive, as an autistic, as a homosexual, but all that is genetic. You can add the indifference of his parents in his childhood. Oh, then you can understand Jeff Dahmer a little bit more. But what freedom did Jeff Dahmer have to not do what

he did? Before dying he said: “I never wanted to kill anyone. I never wanted to kill anyone.” What made him kill so many people? His genes, the indifference of his parents, which made him what he was.

It’s like what we talked about the communion of the choir and the parade not being communion because it is planned. Communion is unplanned. It is the same as nonviolence. Gandhi’s nonviolence... JK-2 said, Jiddu Krishnamurti, said: “Gandhi’s nonviolence is violence.” Why? Because it is planned. Nonviolence is something that is not planned.

Nonviolence only exists in Unitary Perception. If I have the plan of nonviolence and I sit down to block the flow of cars, I am doing an infinite amount of violence.

Then... the case of Eluana Englaro...

Audience: Huh?

RFG: Eluana Englaro, an Italian girl who died in April 2009, in Italy, after seventeen years in a coma. Her father manages to stop artificial feeding, which was the will of Eluana herself before dying. But the Church fought against the will of Eluana and her father for seventeen years. This girl was in a coma for seventeen years. To what extent can the organization affect the life of the individual?

The organization does not leave the individual alone even when the individual is in a coma. “Can’t you leave her alone? She is in a coma. Can you leave her alone?” “No.”

Can we be free from war? Apparently not: it has become permanent. There have been two wars every year in the last five thousand years of written history. We don’t know what happened before written history.

And then when we define “the mind,” let’s not forget the Precincts A, B and C, and the difficulties in differentiating B and C. Let’s not forget that when JK writes about the mind, he

does it without clarifying what mind he is speaking about, A, B or C. You have to deduce that from the context. I know it because I know he speaks about the mind in three ways, then you have to deduce it from context, and Krishnamurti readers don't know this, who are those who invalidate Ruben (laughs), among others who invalidate Ruben.

Another thing Krishnamurti readers have is the confusion that "there is nothing to do." "There's nothing to do." Actually Krishnamurti talked a lot about doing Unitary Perception, and he said to me: "Do it and see what happens." Do what? Unitary Perception, which he called "meditation" until he renounces the word meditation. "Do it and see what happens."

Audience: What Karen Horney says about the thing you just mentioned about nonviolence. It says: "Psychologist Karen Horney defined neurosis by saying that it was *planning the action*."

RFG: Exactly. That is, I plan the communion of the choir or the parade; that is a neurotic act according to Karen Horney, because true communion is not planned.

Audience: It would be necessary to say "for psychological well-being." "Plan the action to be well psychologically."

RFG: Well, planning the action is neurosis according to her.

Audience: Anything.

RFG: Any action, of course.

So, be careful not to say that we don't have to do anything, because Krishnamurti said, "Do it and see what happens," and he meant what he called meditation, which has nothing to do with the word meditation used by anyone else. I was talking about Unitary Perception, and he asked me to use the word Unitary Perception in 1975.

Did JesuKristos speak of Unitary Perception? I think so, when he talks about *metanoia*.

It's something that happens now, not in the past. Is it about improving our life or about ceasing the life we unnecessarily make in Precinct C? JK says that it is not about improving our life, but about the cessation of what we are, which is Precinct C, for That, the sacred, to begin. It is not to improve our life, it is not to make Precinct C better, it is not to decorate the cage. It's getting out of the cage.

And in the five thousand Christianities with a *C* that exist today, is there more freedom or more hypnosis? What is there? More freedom?

Audience: It is very clear.

RFG: It's crystal clear. Let us ask ourselves if in the five thousand Christianities of today we find more freedom or more hypnosis. The children say it right away. "Well, today we're going to the congregation again, sweetie." "Nooo!" (Laughter) The children want to teach us, but we don't listen to them, we don't listen to them.

Remember that group mind is not Unitary Perception, many people still confuse group mind with Unitary Perception. Beware; group mind is a secondary contingency of Unitary Perception. Group mind is not Unitary Perception.

Do you remember that we said the brain does not produce mind, but the mind is in the brain? That the brain does not produce sodium, but that sodium is in the brain. That's very important, because there is an article by JK called "The stream," mistranslated as "The current," where the implicit question is: where is the consciousness of John's ghost? So, the brain does not produce mind, but mind is in the brain. Now, if the ghost of John has no brain, where is the consciousness of John's ghost? An interesting article to read, "The stream." Without any arrogance, I think my translation is the best there is, in Spanish. I can send them to you in Spanish and in the

original English. My Spanish translation and the original English.

So, where is the ghost's consciousness? Is it in the one who is observing the ghost? He is the only one who has a brain. The ghost does not have a brain.

ABC. ABC is the complete functioning of the brain. Is it about unifying reality or seeing that reality is already united? Reality is undivided, therefore it is already united; it is not necessary to unify it, and the brain functioning completely in ABC can realize that. Otherwise, it can't.

This is related to something very simple, but very interesting and very important: do I think about listening or do I listen? People who tell me that they don't feel the benefits of Unitary Perception, patients for example, tell me they don't feel benefits, I tell them: "Are you thinking of listening or are you listening? Which of the two are you doing?" Because they are two completely different things. One is C and the other is B. Thinking about listening is C and listening begins to be B.

Do I think I see or do I see? Do I think I see or do I see? Do you remember Fernandez, Dr. Fernandez? He crashed against the Coca-Cola truck. "I saw the road as I had always seen it." So, "I saw the road as I had always seen it. I believed it so much that I almost killed myself." He lost his car.

So the question: "do I think I see or do I see?" is not as stupid as it seems. Do I think I see or do I see? Do I think about listening or do I listen?

Another thing is that unfortunately we can't tell a person to be in Unitary Perception. Sometimes people come to the CPH to visit the CPH, to know it. They come from the street and don't know what Unitary Perception is and they are in a deplorable state of agitation, confusion, agitation, conflict. That shows right away. Those of us who are here in peace and who know what Unitary Perception is, we can perceive that. So be careful, the CPH is not a place of tourism; it is a place of teaching and

therapy, and that it is not really for anyone, for people to visit as a place of tourism, no. Because there are people who come with a huge conflict, which is easily perceptible to those of us who have taken Unitary Perception seriously.

When dealing with a conflict, remember in therapy, in conversation with friends if you want to teach Unitary Perception to them, not to look for the cause of conflict. We inherited that from Freud. “Well, let's see, why are you afraid? Let's see, let's see together why you are afraid.” Leave that alone! We are going to see fear, not why you are afraid. Let's see the fear, let's see the sadness, not the cause of the sadness. The causes of sadness can be a million and a half; thought can create all the causes you want, don't forget about that. So we are not investigating the cause of sadness or the cause of fear, but seeing fear together in Unitary Perception; very different. Very different. Forget about looking for the causes. Leave that to Freud. The past interferes with the solution, which is Unitary Perception. If I look for the cause, I put myself in the past, I get into C. What we want is ... That's why we say: the objective of therapy is to go from C to B.

We tend to forget these things because of how simple they are. Then we ask: “Let's see, what could be the cause of your fear?” Don't! You have to go from C to B, not get involved in C. The past interferes with Unitary Perception. The worst enemy of B is C and it is inside us.

We have about ten minutes for questions and comments.

Audience: An ABC brain is a brain in Unitary Perception. Because some get confused and think Unitary Perception is not That, it is not an ABC brain. Do I make myself clear?

RFG: Sure. As JK said, Unitary Perception is “to open the window to the sacred.” As we begin to listen to all the sound at the same time, feel the weight [of the body], we are opening the window to the sacred. I think that's where the brain starts working on ABC, ABC.

Audience: Even when immersing in the conflict in B...

RFG: Seeing the conflict. Seeing.

Audience: Seeing the conflict ... by immersing ... I mean that I am realizing that there is conflict. Because it is also sometimes believed that Unitary Perception is completely peace, when sometimes in longer or shorter moments, the absence of conflict may arise or not while it is being watched, depending on how dense the problem is or what emerges to consciousness as a problem.

RFG: Yes... and never forget the words of JK: “This has to end for That to start.” And it has to end, when? Right now.

Audience: And neither does that mean that –because Precinct B, which we are saying encompasses Precinct C– it does not mean that Precinct C ceases to exist.

Audience: Exactly.

RFG: Sure.

Audience: It is as I said to one of the students in the seminar last Saturday. They said: “How is it that conflict does not end?” I told them: “It's not about forgetting conflict, but conflict is no longer a conflict... it is no longer suffering, in Unitary Perception. Only in Unitary Perception can the end of conflict happen.”

Audience: Let's say it becomes irrelevant.

Audience: It becomes irrelevant.

Audience: It does not re-elevate to consciousness.

Audience: It does not re-elevate to consciousness.

Audience: Why should it stop re-elevating? It is not something that we have to flee from.

RFG: No. Many people get confused in the exam with the question of what happens with thought when there is complete mental silence and one is in Precinct B. The thought becomes unconscious. It does not disappear, it goes to the unconscious. Because if it disappeared, we could never think again. So, it goes to the unconscious. It is not that thought disappears; it goes to the unconscious.

We owe this concept in a scientific way to Freud, despite the fact that the concept of the unconscious already existed before.

Audience: Doctor, I wanted to comment... that is not the same as thought being repressed, which is something that happens in Precinct C,

RFG: No, of course, very different.

Audience: ...while in Unitary Perception the thought ceases and it is... where? In the unconscious. But not because it was repressed...

RFG: No, no!

Audience: It's just where it has to be.

RFG: It is where it has to be for what is known as “mental silence” to happen.

There's a beautiful JK movie called ... The Silent Mind? The Silent Mind.

Audience: Movie?

RFG: Very beautiful movie. Yes, video.

Audience: *With a silent mind.*

RFG: *Living with a Silent Mind.* Living with a Silent Mind. Well, that silent mind to which JK refers is when thought is

completely unconscious, and it is as if one were in Paradise of not noticing there is thought. It is beautiful.

Audience: Because we also define thought, which is 99% unconscious. Thought...

RFG: It is always unconscious.

Audience: 99% unconscious.

RFG: But that 1% could hopefully also disappear in Unitary Perception, then one enters the complete silence of the mind. But it is not that thought has disappeared, let's clarify that.

Audience: Or let's say that the emergence of thought to consciousness becomes merely functional, or much more functional, when it emerges [in Unitary Perception] than when Unitary Perception is not lived.

RFG: Sure. You use thought when it is necessary. Of course, the definition of intelligence in B is, what? Using thought only when it is necessary, and being in Unitary Perception the rest of the time. And intelligence in C is what is measured with *Wechsler revised*.

Audience: And Bohm says that the present I, which would be that emergence of Precinct C, the present I is the unknown.

RFG: Exactly.

Audience: Where it appears for its function, but not with the contents of repression... of the defense mechanisms that are in the unconscious, which produce conflict.

RFG: Sure. That phrase of Bohm is hard to remember, like every great phrase. "The present me is the unknown," said David Bohm. It means that... Well, what it means, it's tremendous. It has many implications.

I don't know if there are more comments or questions.

Audience: Which, between inverted commas, would not be the I.

RFG: Huh?

Audience: Which, between inverted commas, would not be the I.

RFG: Because it is the present self that became unknown. It is no longer the self that seeks profit and prestige.

Audience: And the observer in Unitary Perception becomes the void, he said in the interview, right? It disappears.

RFG: The observer enters Unitary Perception and becomes empty.

Audience: It would be WHAT SEES. What sees.

RFG: Nothing remains but what sees. There is nothing left but the consciousness of the universe, which is what is seeing, which is action. It is action, not activity, but the action that can be in any activity, but the action is that: the complete act of seeing. Not believing that I see, but seeing! Not thinking I'm listening, but listening!

I believe that we have made a valuable and fresh review of many things we needed to see before doing what we want to do at the end of this course, which is that each one of you confronts the patient completely, if necessary with the clinical history list in hand, of everything we have to ask, and have a complete idea of the person before beginning the therapeutic act. That complete idea, of course, is a legal requirement. Then, start the act after going through the clinical history. That is what we are going to do after this necessary revision.

I believe that what we have said so far is very necessary and very valuable for therapy. Don't fall into mistakes like saying: "Let's look at the cause of your fear." No, no, no. "Let's see

together your fear in Unitary Perception.” We are not going to see the cause of your fear. The cause of your fear does not matter to me because you can invent causes of fear, about one hundred thousand per minute. You can invent the causes you want for fear, for anger or for sadness, therefore the causes of fear, anger and sadness have no relevance. What is important is to see fear, anger and sadness in Unitary Perception.

Well, if there are no questions in Buenos Aires or in Ireland, we would stop here.

Audience: [From Buenos Aires] No, thanks.

RFG: Well, then we leave it here, we take a break.

[Fifteen-minute break]

Alright, second part of the class on October 10, 2010. We have done, I believe, a refreshment of what has to happen in Holokinetic Therapy and some exegesis. I think that exegesis has to enter psychology. While we have no idea what the brain of JesuKristos was like, nor can we have it, we can study exegetical subjects in a psychological way, in a neurological way.

One of the things I say about Unitary Perception is that Unitary Perception is peace, it is love, it is freedom and it is energy, and those things are lived in Unitary Perception. I knew love when JK taught me Unitary Perception; peace, the freedom from the cage that I had built for myself and that had been built for me; the energy that I felt and that I still feel even though I am already in my old age. Of course, that does not mean that one is going to be eternal, make no mistake, but one still feels the energy even though one has not treated the body very well, and in spite of the fact that I froze in Alaska on October 13, 1997 and my metabolic syndrome started, because the metabolism was paralyzed. I'm still fighting with that — “fighting” in a good way, with a doctor. Already... how long? 97... that freezing happened thirteen years ago, and I'm still paying the consequences. That is, simply because of the

carelessness of going out when it was twenty degrees below zero. If it had been forty degrees below zero, which is very common in Alaska, where my freezing occurred, I would not be here.

Without Unitary Perception, people ask things like: “Unitary Perception is peace and... is that all?” Of course, they ask that because they have never lived peace, and they don’t know what peace, love, freedom and energy are. The true physical energy.

The energy that allows for example, something that amazed me very much, sexual penetration for three or four hours. I thought it was a fantasy and I discovered that it was true. Of course, all this deserves study. It is necessary to attempt Unitary Perception daily to discover what it is. Do it and see what happens.

And also, according to JK, a fraternal periodic dialogue is needed, which can be weekly or monthly, with agreement of those who participate in the dialogue, without hierarchies, in a fraternal way, about what Unitary Perception is and what it is not, and whether there are complementary facts to understand and live Unitary Perception, such as: how to take care of energy, what is the best food, etc.

I call it “triple delight”: the triple delight of reading everything that has been written about Unitary Perception, of attempting Unitary Perception knowing what it is, not assuming what it is, and talking about Unitary Perception to be sure that we are doing what needs to be done and not something similar and therefore, something that leads to nothing.

Another thing that happens when we read is that what I don’t understand in the first reading, I understand it in the third reading of the same book. In other words, repeating the reading is not bad, it helps understanding, it refreshes comprehension, it revives the understanding that gives us life.

In Unitary Perception I have noticed that Ruben's thought has become more logical; more rigorous in the sense of being less

related to the absurd, to the stupid; more coherent; clearer; more rational. All this happens to thought when one attempts Unitary Perception. When I listen to myself, I listen to recordings of mine when I was twenty, twenty-five, thirty, before meeting JK and Unitary Perception, Cecilia tells me: “You don’t sound like you. You speak very fast and you use difficult words and you speak with a fantastic incoherence.” And yes, the way Ruben speaks has changed a lot, thanks to Unitary Perception.

Precinct C is fear, anger and sadness and is the essence of violence. And where do we have to see that? Do we have to see it in Barack Obama? No, we have to see it in each one of us, in ourselves. Not to say to another: “Look, you are violent,” but to see ourselves, to see the violence in us, to see the fear, the anger and the sadness in us, in Unitary Perception.

Then, as Graciela said in Buenos Aires, words emerge during the reading, which are difficult to define: *determinism*, *luck*, *providence*. Why are they confused? Because they are not defined. Also, when they are defined, they are usually not defined in a way, as I say, CCCCC: clear, concise, concrete, coherent and complete, in the definitions.

We have to know the difference between determinism, luck and providence. Providence originally means “that which God gives,” “that which God gives us.” It means that it is something external and will always be *providing* ... Is that the word, *providing*? Since we don’t believe in that, that’s why fraud and plunder arise, because we don’t believe in the providence that God gives.

There is a freedom that is different in C and in B. Freedom in C is the freedom from what... From your wife to leave with a girl. So it is a freedom of something and for something. The prepositions that condition freedom are there. So in C, in thought, what is freedom? Freedom of something to do something. That is, it is not pure freedom; it is a sought freedom, which leads us to contentment for something. But freedom in B is for no reason and for nothing. Freedom for no

reason and for nothing, content for nothing. And you don't look for freedom in B, it just comes. Why? Because there is no past in the consciousness and the content arrives for nothing. Content for nothing.

Sometimes Ceci tells me: "What are you going to do? Are you going to stay here today all day?" "I say: "Yes." "Don't you get tired of that?" I say: "No. I'm happy for nothing " (laughter). Then one is on a permanent vacation, but why? Is it because you are doing nothing? No. Yesterday I answered more than three hundred emails and I spent a very busy day in things, in activities. However, one is on vacation, why? Because the void of Unitary Perception is there. There is no past, therefore one is free and one is always on vacation, even if one is working on what one loves.

We have already said that there is a love of C and a love of B. The love of C: I give you and you give me. The love of B: I give you, I give you, and I give you, without effort or expectation.

And then we have words that we have to take care of not to use in therapy - what we are going to enter in what follows of the Sunday Presential Diploma [*Course*]. The word, the verb in imperative form, for example "relax," is that a form of violence? Is it a form of hypnosis? Of course it is. In what is called the Divine Law, in the Logos, one of the commandments is: "you shall not kill." So what is the difference between "relax" and "you shall not kill"? Both are imperatives. Could it be that the fact that "relax" is said by a human being and that "you shall not kill" is a divine command implies a fundamental difference? We have said that in Greek, *nomos* means "human law." *Nomos*. But it also means "name." Ruben. So Ruben has to comply with human law, *nomos*. Ruben, the Ruben *nomos*, has to comply with the human law *nomos*.

And the law tells us: "Kill in the organized crime of war," and excuses appear, right? For democracy, for freedom, for the homeland, for God. And human law is telling us: Kill in the organized crime that war is. But remember what Jesus says:

“*Eirene umin,*” be at peace. What Jiddu Krishnamurti says, when he says: “What? Are you going to Vietnam, are you going to kill?” “I tell him: “If I don’t kill, they will shoot me for treason.” “Ah, they’re going to shoot you, but you’re not going to kill anyone.” That is, the freedom from human law is the beginning of the Divine Law. If we want to live without killing, we have to be willing to die so as not to kill.

And then, let’s not forget when we give a lecture or when we are in therapy, that verbal expression has to be slow, and that is easier when we are listening to the sound as we speak. And there has to be good pronunciation, because all Latin Americans pronounce very badly, all of us. Then we have to help each other: “Ruben, I did not understand that word. Say it again well pronounced.” That is to say, we have to help each other in that because we are all Latin Americans who pronounce Spanish poorly.

Audience: The Spaniards don’t?

RFG: Huh?

Audience: The Spaniards don’t?

RFG: I don’t know if the Spaniards pronounce badly. Do they pronounce badly?

Audience: [*Nods.*]

RFG: Sometimes they do. Well, that’s what we’re here for, to help each other not to mispronounce. And to use the subject, beware of saying “that.” “I told you that.” “Which “that”?” “What did you tell me? You told me many things.” So, instead of saying that, let’s say Unitary Perception, let’s say Precinct C.” “That” of what we are talking about has to be repeated. For what? For clarity’s sake, otherwise it is not clear. The verbal expression has to be, first of all, clear, concise, concrete, complete and coherent: the five C’s, right?

We can, as I am doing now, summarize the presentation of a topic with a guide. I am following a guide, where I don't have everything I say, I simply have words. The word *nomos* is the only thing I have written. Then I talk about *nomos*.

I think that for the next class you could read something exegetical. For example, "Satanas," "Dialogue on religion"...

RFG: Because in the break we mentioned that we are giving little importance to exegetical issues, and those issues have to be introduced in psychology. We don't have to be afraid of those issues, even if they are beyond words. Let us not forget that when we are explaining Unitary Perception, we are talking about silence, which seems so stupid and so paradoxical and so contradictory, but if we don't talk about silence, how can we live in silence? If we don't teach silence with words, how can we live in silence? Or rather, with a silent mind, which does not mean "without speaking."

Alright, then... When we say that there is a danger in philosophy and that philosophy is dangerous, we are talking very seriously, it is not a joke. Because philosophy, what does it do? Perpetuates Precinct C.

Audience: It gives continuity to it.

RFG: It gives continuity to Precinct C, that's all philosophy does. For example, it is philosophical to say: "Who is in Unitary Perception?" Then we started badly, because in Unitary Perception the observer disappeared. And a philosopher does not understand or refuses to understand that.

Audience: It is difficult for them to realize how thinking gives them so much pleasure.

RFG: That is the pleasure of the philosopher par excellence, and of all of us when we philosophize. When we think and feel the pleasure of thinking, and that thinking can become routine, as it is: repeated, dual, incoherent, unconscious...

But Unitary Perception cannot be routine, it cannot even become routine, even if we insist on Unitary Perception and constantly attempt it. It does not become routine, as thought does, which is a routine; as the monologue, the inner monologue does. I have a dialogue with myself that is almost permanent and, it has to stop! I know it has to stop, but you don't have to put a lot of force, just listen, listen to all the sound, and that internal monologue is going to slow down until it disappears. That monologue is routine, it is a routine which is very difficult to leave. The internal monologue: "What will become of me?," "How will this problem go?," etc. "Who does he think he is? Why did he insult me in that way?" That kind of things, all the things that our monologues are.

Afterwards, we talked several times about the promises of JK-2, which are in Dialogue 18 with Anderson. What does he promise? He promises that those who are in Unitary Perception will constantly live in peace, will live with great energy, with great regeneration, that soon the group mind will appear, and the vision of auras, healing, clairvoyance, etc. And all that appears in a very natural way, it's nothing extraordinary and it's nothing in which we have to stop.

When we hear that the right brain and the left brain work, remember that mathematicians and sculptors are functioning with their whole brain. It is not that the mathematician works with the left brain and the sculptor with the right, no. Both the mathematician and the sculptor work with the whole brain.

Audience: Fragmented.

RFG: And both are in C and with their brains fragmented, of course.

There is a very beautiful phrase: "*Do not avoid the void.*" Don't avoid emptiness, because if you start Unitary Perception, if you start attempting Unitary Perception, suddenly you can be faced with your own sadness, which is not funny, or with the void: "What am I doing here?" And at some point ask ourselves: "Why am I not in peace?," If I'm not in peace. Could

it be that I'm very busy? And when we ask ourselves, "what else should I do?" The answer may be doing less, doing less.

And there are words that are extremely stupid like "I wish to evolve" (laughs). "I wish to evolve." First I *wish* and then *evolve*. Evolve what? Let's see, water, here I have some water. Does water evolve? (Laughter) And if it evolves, what is it transformed into? Steam? But it's water steam. I put it in the fridge, it turns into ice, but it's still water under other conditions.

Audience: "Dust you are and dust you will become."

RFG: But "I want to evolve" is not what you say. That evolution means "I'm going to become better than I am." But water does not change, sodium does not change and the brain of the human being is today as it was when the human being began. That is demonstrated by geology, anthropology, that is, there is no demonstration that the human being has evolved. And if it has, it has done it in a very fast way and it would no longer be evolution, but mutation.

Well, let's not forget that Pupul Jayakar, when I told her about Unitary Perception, told me I was talking about *Maha Raja Yoga*, which is the greatest of yogas, the original yoga. The yoga that Patanjali destroyed when he began to talk about contradictions, that is, "If you feel fearful, think yourself brave." That's what Patanjali thought. He places yoga within Precinct C, in the dualities and oppositions of Precinct C. "If you feel sad, think yourself happy." "If you feel fearful, think yourself brave."

Audience: This is what they also call "reverse psychology."

RFG: Yes, now it has another name. They change the name, but it's still the same. It is updated, let's say.

Audience: It is updated (laughs).

Audience: It evolves (laughs).

RFG: Evolve. And Patanjali has been updated. Patanjali has been updated.

Well, then, the yoga of duality begins with Patanjali, which is the known yoga; the original yoga is not known, unless we read JK. I insist that one of the things Patanjali said is: “Think about courage if you are afraid,” that is, it leads us to the opposites, to the duality of Precinct C. It does not take us out of C like the original yoga.

Love and generosity are not things that are learned, but things that are lived in Unitary Perception. They are not learned in a cumulative way: “one, two, three, four...” They are when Unitary Perception appears or they are not.

We should make an initial assessment of a patient, right? And we would have to do it in writing to make it legal. And then meet to make a critique of the writing. Now, how shall we do all that? Shall we do it in the class, on camera or outside the class, and then criticize it under the camera?

Audience: Better.

RFG: It seems it would be better like that, right? Doing it off camera and bringing the criticism so it doesn't take so long once the interview is completed. We would do it like we did in the first Presential Diploma [Course], in which a student gives therapy to the teacher and the teacher plays the role of a patient, who can be a schizophrenic patient or a mourning patient or whatever... or in depression, etc. The student has to discover that in the clinical history and start therapy, right?

Then, we will do it off camera and we'll present it summarized. Do you agree?

Questions or comments?

Audience: A little more of that. We'd make the whole evaluation off camera and then present the summary. Then, it would not be now, during the class hours.

RFG: It would be outside the course hours, and bring the summary, in writing, that you have done, and after that from left to right we criticize the writing: what is missing, what should be removed, what could have been said better, etc. I propose that you bring a text based on the clinical history you already have. If you don't have it, I can send them to you. You have it, right?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: And so write about a patient X.

Audience: Last time you sent the patient and everyone brought the full evaluation.

Audience: In fact, you already sent it with the patient's clinical history Juan Pérez.

RFG: Aha, aha, it can be Juan Pérez and you bring it completed to make the criticism here, because that is what you are going to do if you dedicate yourself fully to Unitary Perception. Part of it is going to be therapy, and a good part, I hope, will also be teaching.

Another thing that should not be forgotten is horizontal conflict. Horizontal conflict, which is facilitated by the technology of the TV viewer, is very important. The viewer fortifies his or her "I" in the act of watching television and fortifies the horizontal conflict, which is the belief of feeling separated from the news report.

The horizontal conflict is one of the two major concepts or columns on which the platform of Holokinetic Psychology stands. One is Unitary Perception and the other is horizontal conflict, which is the summary of Precinct C, the belief that we are separated from what we observe, why? Because we don't

realize, in Precinct C, that reality is undivided, then we believe ourselves separated from the tree, from the bird, from the friend, from the wife, from the people, from the Iraqi, from the Afghan. “They are the ones who suffer, we don’t.” Then we fall into the horizontal conflict, and in that way we lose compassion, peace, freedom, etc. It is the basis of all conflict.

Are there any questions about this horizontal conflict?
Commentary?

Audience: In fact, from the previous topic, I forgot to ask you... to what extent... because this wasn’t considered... to what extent is there certain evolution, adaptation and to what extent are mutations also a possibility? That is, what shows...

RFG: Let's say that... The problem of evolution. In the United States there is a division between evolution and religion in a way that I still don’t understand how that happened (laughs), but it happened. Here we are not going to fall into that; we are simply going to say that if evolution exists as Darwin proposed, the only thing I am saying is like what I say about the “divine spark.” I am not saying that the divine spark does not exist, simply what I am saying is that the divine spark is not the self and that the divine spark is not what thinks, as neither does the self.

Audience: It doesn’t evolve either.

RFG: Neither does it evolve, of course. Just as water does not evolve nor does sodium evolve. But if there is a biological evolution like the one proposed by Darwin, the only thing I say is that it has not been demonstrated in the human being. But is it because I am against Darwin? No. I’m saying that... What am I saying? That for there to have been an evolution, let's say from the chimpanzee, which is very close to us from the genetic point of view... The chimpanzee’s genome is 1.7% –if I am not mistaken– less than us in terms of number of genes. So we are very close genetically to the chimpanzee. Closer than we thought. Now, if there was an evolution, it would have to have been in a much longer time, right? Much longer. That is,

there was no time for an evolution of the chimpanzee to man. And if the man comes from the chimpanzee by mutation, for example by fine radiation, a star explodes or the Sun itself has a big storm and the gamma radiation of the Sun or X rays from the Sun produces a genetic mutation of the chimpanzee and the human being appears. That is easy to understand. But to say there has been an evolution, well, there has not been enough time then. There has not been time for the chimpanzee to become a human, due to the moments in which one and the other appeared.

So the human being we know and how we know him has always been the way he is. There is no evidence that there has been an evolution of this human being.

I don't know if I answered you.

Audience: Yes, yes.

RFG: Any other question or comment?

Audience: The mutation of this syndrome of which you spoke a while ago, of the quadruped man...

RFG: An involution.

Audience: An involution.

RFG: Yes. The man from ... I don't remember where, a place in Turkey.

Audience: In Turkey.

RFG: That they walk on four legs. Which happens, as Jung would say, in a very synchronic way with a very profound moral degeneration of humanity.

Audience: In the horizontal conflict, perhaps it would be interesting to see what is left in the observer and what is left

outside the observer. That is, a division of the whole is made, what is on this side and what is on this side?

RFG: Sure. One day I, just for fun, asked Bohm after a conference in Ojai, California, a hundred kilometers north of Los Angeles, where the Oak Grove school is, founded by JK –I was one of the founders... I asked Bohm after the conference, I told him: “If I tell you that I am that tree, what do you say?” He says: “I’d tell you that you have a coherent perception” (laughs). So he did not see it as incoherent when I told him that I was that tree, because he saw reality as undivided. He asserted that reality is undivided and that there is no division between us and the tree. There is not; thought invented the division. As there is no division with anything in the universe either. We are the universe. So, what is here and what is there? That is what thought determines, and limits are determined by thought. That is to say, here is Ruben, and where does Ruben end? On the skin? Obviously not, because if not, there would be no vitamin D, which comes from the sun's rays and which is transformed inside the skin, which goes to the bone and fortifies the bone, etc.

Audience: So, what is in oneself is the same as what is in everything?

RFG: Sure. It is like...

Audience: And all in one.

RFG: Of course, from the electronic point of view, the electron is particle and a wave, therefore the electron in my mind or in my brain is a particle, but in you it is wave, but it is the same.

Audience: So, that's also why there are no hierarchies. No one is more than one or less than one, it is the same.

RFG: Of course, that's why I like Francesco's words, Francesco d'Assisi, who said: “Brother Sun, sister Moon.” That is, it is not that the Sun has a spiritual hierarchy, as it is currently said in some spiritual circles, that the Sun is

spiritually superior to the Moon. Reality is undivided and has no hierarchies.

Audience: Francesco also said: “What we look at is what looks.”

RFG: He also said: “What we look at is what looks.” That is why I stopped to study Saint Francis of Assisi, who, when he knew that there was going to be a crusade against Egypt, went to Egypt to tell the caliph that the crusade was coming, so he could defend himself. And the caliph of Egypt won that crusade. And the Pope, who was very clever, takes the papacy and in those circumstances in which Saint Francis had declared in a behavioral, verbal, spiritual, economic and political manner his independence from the Church, he is immediately sanctified. The first thing the pope does is to declare Francesco d'Assisi, who of course had left the Church, a saint.

And then, now we say Saint Francis of Assisi as if he was from the Church, but he left the Church, he left the cage. He said wonderful things like, “What we look at is what looks.” He put an end to the horizontal conflict there. What we look at is what looks. So similar to Krishnamurti: “The observer is the observed.” Tremendous.

I was looking at a nephew of mine at a family reunion. I was looking at my nephew who was sitting on the sofa watching his father talk about him: how he was born and how they had saved his life with many difficulties, because he was born very premature. And he is looking at the father... and I... the father was making the story very theatrical, but I was looking at the child. I was fascinated by the boy who was completely his dad. He was his dad, he was his dad talking about the story, and he was completely lost, he did not exist. He was sitting there, he had left his body there and he was the dad. The observer is the observed. Then I saw it, I saw it in action. I think we talked a lot with Ceci after that, about how this four-year-old nephew becomes his dad in the story his dad is telling. Beautiful.

This is related to the identification of Precinct C, but also to Unitary Perception. There is a line there between the identification described by Freud within Precinct C and Unitary Perception, where the horizontal conflict ceases and the observer is the observed, as JK says and as Francesco says when he says: “What we look at is what looks.” That is, what I look at is what looks, that is, the universal consciousness that is there. And the nephew was lost, he was dissolved.

All this is very beautiful to see, and it is wonderful when it happens in therapy that the horizontal conflict ceases and both the therapist and the patient are one, not as an idea, but as fact. That both are lost in action, in communion which is action, and both are no longer important and are in communion. That has a high, high healing power. Tremendously healing.

And then, do you remember that we had talked about the Greeks, who made the difference between *nomos*, Ruben, me—who is unique, there is no other Ruben that I know of—but also in Ruben is the mind of Kristus? As in all of us, and that's what the Greeks called *logos*, the *logos* I, which is the one, which is the one. It is no longer unique; it is the one with everything. That way of seeing life has disappeared since the Greeks. Could it be that we have to start redefining this and studying this as part of the human identity? That there is a *nomos-uniqueness*- identity and a *logos* –oneness-identity in the human being?

Is the horizontal conflict understood?

[To a student] Do you understand?

Javier, would you say it in some other way? Would you add something to this about the horizontal conflict? That is, everything we have said: the observer is what is observed, what we look at is what looks, the action is seeing and doing and that it is an action related to the universal mind, not the mind of Ruben only. Would you say it differently or...?

Audience: I would only add the relationship of time...

RFG: Time ceases, it becomes irrelevant.

Audience: The horizontal conflict, the separation of time... is also there.

RFG: Sure. Horizontal conflict is created by absolute time.

Audience: Ruben, could we talk a little about the universal mind?

RFG: The universal mind ... David Bohm defined the universe as something that is full of matter, mind and energy. The universe is matter, mind and energy, and matter is universal, that is, all the components of your body are in the whole universe: carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen are in the whole universe. I don't know if hydrogen was the one that is highly distributed in the universe, hydrogen, and carbon in us. Everything is in the whole universe.

And I always use sodium as an example, because it is also in the whole universe. It is in small amounts in our blood, and it enters for example with table salt, sodium - sodium chloride - and in our blood there is sodium. But sodium, as instruments show, is in the last star too. It is in the Sun, it is in the Moon and it is in all the planets of the solar system. It means that sodium is universal. It means that matter is universal. Matter is universal.

Matter is 1% of the universe. 99%, to simplify it, is energy. But, Bohm added, something that was being said already, but not in such a clear way as Bohm proposes: that there is an interface between matter and energy in the universe, which is the mind. It means that the mind is also universal; it is not only Ruben or the ant that eats the animal, the group of ants that come together to eat an animal. There is mind there, but there is also a mind in you and Ruben.

He said: "Even in the electron there is a mind, because the electron plays, jumps from one orbit to another, reproduces

when the split happens.” It has a mind; it behaves as if it had a mind: it plays, it reproduces, it communicates, as the EPR experiment shows. It means that the electron is universal and therefore energy is universal and light is universal. That's why we see the stars, because light is in the whole universe. Light reaches our retina, that's why we see the universe, we see the stars. Then the light, the energy is universal; Sodium and matter are universal, and is mind universal? There's the problem, it's hard for us to see that the mind is universal. “The mind is something of mine,” that is what we are led to believe, that mind is something of yours or something of mine, but no, Bohm says that the mind is also universal. The example he gave was the orchid and the wasp, remember? They form a symbiosis that causes the orchid to deceive the wasp in order to reproduce the orchid. That act of intelligence and mind, does it belong to the orchid or to the wasp? Bohm says: “No. It is simply that mind is universal. Simply.”

Audience: There is no hierarchy.

RFG: And there is no hierarchy.

And the mind of the whales that come to Baja California to reproduce... That's why a Mexican joke has never been made—Mexicans say that whales are Mexican (laughter). They reproduce... Mexicans tell Argentine jokes at me (laughs); I shut my mouth. Mexicans say that whales are Mexican because they breed in Baja California, and it's true. They come to breed here in Baja California and they go back to the Arctic. So, they are all Mexican. And the fact is that... is that universal mind too, what brings them here, what takes them to the Arctic, all together?

Audience: The butterflies, like...

RFG: All together. The butterflies. But whales have one more thing that is interesting: that they communicate with something that looks like a language. The funny thing is that the language is not the same in 1989 as in the year 2001 or in the year 2010. The language changes every year. Then Bohm says: “Well, if it

is not thanks to the language they communicate with, it is thanks to the universal mind that brings them and takes them.”

All this is fascinating; it is a subject that deserves a deep study. But we have as a starting point that Bohm defines the universe as mind, matter and energy, and that the three forms of the universe are universal, they are in the whole universe. I don't know if I answered you.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Even the mind, which is the most difficult to swallow, that the mind is universal. And that the universal mind is what sees. The universal mind sees you through my eyes and the universal mind sees me through your eyes. If we look at each other, it is the universal mind that looks at itself, do you realize? It is extremely interesting that when we look at each other, the universal mind is looking at itself.

Audience: Krishnamurti said in the dialogues which were ... What was the name? The Ending of Time. In Spanish translated as “Beyond time.” The Ending of Time.

RFG: Yes, poorly translated.

Audience: He said that: “There is a universal mind,” and then Bohm said: “No, the scientific community would not believe that.” “For me it is a reality.” “And how does it show?” “Well,” he says, [*something like*] “if you realize that the self is time and that time is an illusion, then the other is obvious” (laughs).

RFG: Sure. By inference. By inference.

Audience: That made me see...

RFG: These are things that we have to infer, because... they become obvious.

Audience: In Argentina they did not understand what he said...

RFG: Oh, did you not understand in Argentina?

Audience: I don't think they heard us.

RFG: Are you listening well in Argentina?

Audience: [*From Argentina*] Yes, it was said that the self is time and time is an illusion, I think that was said in the dialogue of Bohm and Krishnamurti *The Ending of Time*. Is that it?

RFG: Yes, and therefore when Krishnamurti says to him: "How do you prove that?" Bohm says: "Well, if the self is time, the other is obvious."

Audience: The other way around. Krishnamurti is the one who said it.

RFG: Of course, Krishnamurti says: "If the self is time, the other is obvious." That is, by inference we can understand what we are saying.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Yes, thank you.

RFG: Well, then just as the implicit order was discovered by an inference, from the technology of the hologram, it is also by inference that the technology of the hologram allowed us to deduce or infer that reality is also undivided.

Audience: Returning to horizontal conflict... Horizontal conflict is imaginary life. That is, it is not that there is the real observed and the unreal observer, but that... Well, on that point...

RFG: Of course. Thought imagines that it is separated from the tree; thought imagines that we are separated from each other, until one day, as happened to me in Venezuela, when I became aware of a thought of Cecilia, who was in the United States. The group mind begins between us, between Cecilia and me. I say: "Oh, dear." I remembered what Krishnamurti said: "Do it

and see what happens.” I want to confirm it and I talk to Cecilia, I say: “Why do I have to talk to you, if I spoke to you five minutes ago?” She tells me: “You hung up and they called me, they told me that my grandmother had died, so I'm going to Mexico –she was in the United States–, I'm going to Mexico, so call me at my mother's house.” That is, group mind can be very useful, very useful when one is in Caracas talking with the wife who is in the United States. Interesting, interesting.

Audience: Returning to horizontal conflict... As we see with memory, which is time, which is me, of course we cannot realize that the observer is not separated from what he observes... because that is the separation itself.

RFG: Time.

Audience: Time, self, memory, which is what sees and...

RFG: “I saw the road as I had always seen it.”

Audience: “I saw the road as I had always seen it,” and of course it is the conflict par excellence... separation.

RFG: With regard to what happens in the couple, yesterday we were reading a book of Esperanto with Cecilia. Does dialogue stop? No. It simply becomes less verbose, less verbal. The dialogue continues, but it is less verbal. She is not as advanced in Esperanto as I am. She is advanced in everything else with respect to me, except in Esperanto. And there were times when she knew the meaning of the word, and I said to her: “How do you know the meaning of that word, which is a difficult word?” “I just know.” Is that group mind too? I don't know, but it happened several times. That she knew the meaning of the word and I don't know how she knew it.

Yesterday we were talking, she left after reading the book, she left and I tell her ... tell me “good night,” because after age seventy, people die in their sleep (laughter). We were laughing at that, but this reminds me of a joke, can I tell it?

Audience: The joke is what was missing (laughter)

RFG: Yes. There are two children and one says: "My father felt a pain in his left hand and said: 'Maybe I'll die today,' and he died that night." And the other one says: "Wow," I remembered because of this conversation, "gee, he knew?" "Yeah." "Same as my grandfather." "Is that so? Your grandfather?" "My grandfather knew exactly the day and time he was going to die." "And how did he know?" "By the judge, who sentenced him to death" (laughter).

There are different ways of knowing. Cumulative, non cumulative (laughter).

I don't know whether to leave room for dialogue, because I think we have not had much dialogue. I don't know if I'm being negligent with the dialogue. In the break we said that we are not giving enough space to exegesis.

Audience: We could perhaps include the re-translations you have done considering the *Tao Te King* or maybe the *Sutta Pitaka*. To read that. I think we did not do it in the first generation. I don't know if that would be...

RFG: No, no. But for example, in the *Sutta Pitaka*, one of the things that really moved me was that the *Dhammapada* seems to be the only book that Buddha wrote, and scientifically, the *Dhammapada* is attributed to Buddha, but not all the other things that are in Buddhism. The *Dhammapada* is a book like John's [Gospel], it must have fifteen or twenty pages.

Audience: Is *Sutta Pitaka* and *Dhammapada* the same?

RFG: The *Dhammapada* is in the *Sutta Pitaka*. *Sutta Pitaka* would be the basket of teachings. The *Dhammapada* is one of them, but it is the only one that seems to be genuinely by Buddha. The only book genuinely written by Buddha.

In the *Dhammapada* there is something that moved me a lot, which is when it says: "When you are already dead, if you have

not freed yourself from the world, you will be looking for a womb. And you're going to seek for the womb of a virtuous woman, of a woman who does not drink alcohol, of a woman who is not a liar, of a woman who is in the company of a man so you can have a father... and it may be very difficult to find a woman like that," he says. So he is implying that reincarnation is an opportunity less, not another opportunity. It is another thing that Buddha, JesuKristos and Krishnamurti all do, that the understanding of reincarnation –which people take very lightly, but in the *Dhammapada* it is seen with an impressive detail, especially that bit about looking for a womb; what kind of womb will you find in a completely corrupted humanity?

Audience: Only that.

RFG: Only that. Let alone living in a corrupted world, etc., and not touching it, etc.

Audience: It also seems to me that reincarnation is an egocentric pretext to be able to do whatever you want at this moment, because "I will have another opportunity." A pretext.

RFG: Of course. What is clear in the great masters, such as Buddha, JesuKristos and Krishnamurti -JK, Krishnamurti- is that reincarnation is one opportunity less, not one opportunity more.

Audience: Because it comes with the complete consciousness of humanity at birth, which is becoming denser, more degenerate.

RFG: Increasingly denser and more degenerate, of course. Yes.

Interesting, just that from the *Sutta Pitaka*, and then things like... Things from Lao Tzu's *Tao Te Ching*, which says that the human condition is misfortune. There is a very beautiful phrase that says: "I am in the park, walking on this spring day..." Well, this is valid only in Buenos Aires; it is autumn over here. "I am walking in the park on a spring day and

everyone knows where they are going but me; I am completely lost.” One says, but how? A master who is supposed to be enlightened, why would he write like that? Yes, because he does not know where he comes from or where he is going, as chapter 3 of John says in Kristianity. He is completely lost in the park. Beautiful, beautiful.

And yes, there are things of exegesis that, besides being beautiful, have multiplicity of meanings. That is why exegesis is fascinating and has to have its place in psychology.

Audience: And that phrase means more things, not only that...

RFG: “I’m lost.” Everyone knows where they are going: to make money surely, or looking for prestige. Only I am lost. I am living the moment, therefore I don’t know where I am going. I’m not looking for money or prestige or power, do you understand? All that can be inferred.

Audience: It’s like: “The son of man has nowhere to rest his head.”

RFG: It can mean more things, says Ceci, as Jesus said, that the son of man has nowhere to rest his head. What else can you say about that?

Audience: Alluding to the other thing you are saying, that...

RFG: That he’s lost. The son of man has nowhere to rest his head. He is lost.

Audience: It is a “safe insecurity” (laughter).

RFG: Of course, the only security is uncertainty.

Audience: And when the thought emerges, it is not necessarily neurotic there. Functional, functional thinking that is not necessarily neurotic, which is the difference. For example, right now we were talking about Karen Horney, about how she mentions that something planned is neurosis in the same way

that something repressed is neurosis. But when that action embraces the thought and one realizes that it is functional, that is not the neurosis, it is not neurosis then.

RFG: What do you mean by “that”?

Audience: In other words, what I'm pointing at is that thought can emerge functionally in Unitary Perception, and that does not make it neurosis.

Audience: That fact.

RFG: Sure. That's all you want to say... of course.

Then there are words that in themselves have brought exegetical difficulties, such as the word *obedience*, because obedience originally means openness to life. It gives rise to the *abducere* muscles, in the thigh, which is the abductor, which opens the legs. That is, obedience, openness, are synonymous words. It does not mean to follow someone or follow something, whether yours or someone else's, it's simply opening up to life. Obedience means openness to life; it does not mean to follow.

And there are other similar words like *discipline*. *Discipline* comes from *disciple*, but does it mean “follow the master”? Or does it mean “being open to life to learn from it”? Which of the two things does it mean?

Obedience, discipline, there are many words.

Audience: *Sin*.

RFG: *Sin*, which means stain, but there are seven Greek words translated with a single word in Spanish.

Audience: *Religion*.

RFG: The word *religion* itself has brought exegetical problems. “Re-link,” says Krishnamurti, to be linked again...

with God? Krishnamurti gives him another tone, he says: "Reconnect with the energy," that is, it starts with Unitary Perception. When we connect with holokinetic energy in Unitary Perception, religion begins. It is the contact with energy. Re-linking with energy, reconnecting. *Re-link, ligature, religion*: re-uniting with the energy, which is to open the window to God, so JK's definition is not far from the definition of religion as linking with God again.

Audience: As you say, Unitary Perception is to gather all the energy at the same time.

RFG: To gather all the energy together.

Audience: Being aware.

RFG: To be aware of all the energy at the same time, which is like putting it together, because when the cerebral cortex releases energy, it does so harmoniously to the whole organism and that is perceived as energy. It is not a fairy tale, it is perceived as energy.

Audience: Yoga.

RFG: Huh?

Audience: The same thing you say is yoga, and yoga is also a problematic issue for exegesis. Well, because they have made it a problem...

RFG: Sure, because it means union with God.

Audience: There are dozens of yogas.

RFG: Yes. And dozens of meditations. That's why it's better not to use those words, but yoga means union with God. The original yoga is not the yoga of Patanjali that divides everything in two. According to Pupul Jayakar, the original yoga is being expressed by Holokinetic Psychology for the first time in history.

Audience: Logos ... In today's interview there is a very broad explanation about *logos* and logic.

RFG: Ah, *logos* and *logic*.

Audience: Where is that?

Audience: In the interview that you have not read. (Laughter)
[One of the four interviews made to RFG by Karina].

Audience: In the one you have there in front of you?
(Laughter)

Audience: In the previous DPD Diploma *[Course]...*

RFG: I know that Karina must be feeling very bad (laughs).
You have not read the interview, but well...

Do you want to read that paragraph? *Logos - Logic*. Logic originally means going through logos, moving through creation. That is, it is not thought, it is moving through creation.

Audience: “Law of God, logos.” Then it says: “In chapter 1 of the Gospel of John we read that everything comes from Logos and goes to Logos.”

RFG: Do you want to use the microphone a bit?

Audience: Is that the one? *[Referring to the paragraph to be read.]*

Audience: And then he says: “Allow me...” Karina intervenes, Ruben says: “Let me give you an explanation about logic,” and here comes an impressive explanation...

Here we have an important logical cycle in the Kristian culture. In some way the word logical means “the manner in which the mind moves in creation.” But with the rediscovery of

psychological precinct B, in the 20th century, we see that the mind moves in two very different ways in creation. The history of the word logic, however, demonstrates to us that it applies only to precinct C of the mind.

But it's not that easy either.

Aristotle wrote his "Organon" of the basis of logic but never used that word. To make things even more complicated, the Stoics of Zenon of Citium, classified the sciences of that period into, 1) Physics; 2) Ethics and 3) Logic and dialectics.

Then came Francis Bacon with his book "Novum Organum" and Renè Descartes with his book "Discourse on Method" denouncing fallacies in the "scholastic logic" of Aristotle and reducing the significance of logic to a doctrine of reasoning or of syllogism.

Bacon and Descartes looked on logic as a rhetorical instrument more than as a means of scientific discovery.

Logic was then seen as the essence of philosophy until Bertrand Russell affirmed that it was identified with mathematics.

Logic had become more mathematical and mathematics more logical.

Then the study of logic as the essence of science also began. But it's not that easy.

Logic appears to be a way of explaining the nature of rational thought, but more related to the Greek philosophy of Being.

To speak of being philosophically allows us to speak of the self without appearing egocentric.

If logic cannot be the essence of science, at least it has aspired to be the science of thought.

Aristotle began studying thought just as it is expressed in the language derived from Sanskrit.

Then thanks to thinkers like Bertrand Russell, logic abandoned the study of terms and syllogisms and dedicated itself to the study of concepts and even the essence of reason.

Now logic studies the diverse forms of thought itself and not only the form in which thought is expressed in language.

In the 19th Century, there commenced the science of Axiology, or the science of values, and of axioms, which are notions or indemonstrable assumptions, but accepted by all of the collective conscience of mankind.

This did not lead to the enrichment of logic, which had not yet advanced to discover the principles of rational thought.

What I have seen of thought whilst in Unitary Perception has allowed for a reduction in the frequency of fear, anger and sadness in me.

On slowing down the cyclical movement of thought, (a thing which occurs in Unitary Perception), there is the flowering of peace, love, order and the well being of freedom with neither origin nor direction.

Logic helps us to see that scientific syllogism which demonstrates something real, has the same formal structure as dialectic syllogism, which only considers probabilities.

The way in which Kant dealt with knowledge has to be different to the logic of Aristotle, which now forms part of a new comprehension of the mind and reality.

We see then that a single logic does not exist.

RFG: Sure, even Bertrand Russell... Even Bertrand Russell identifies logic with mathematics. That was the highest moment that logic had. And now, it is hardly remembered that

logic is the study of thought, all of which contradicts what is read at the end. So, you see all the trouble the word *logic* has caused and how it reaches its summit with Bertrand Russell and his identification with mathematics, and then falls back as a study of thought, but without contemplating the way in which thought becomes language, and it ceases to be the study of the essence of rational thought. And all this has no connection with the origins of the word *logic*, which is “going through creation,” going through the logos with something that belongs to the logos, or at least to that part of us that is the sacred. It is to contemplate things in a very profound way, not only the nature of thought, not only the nature of mathematics, which are ways of reducing logic, and which belong to the twentieth century.

So you see, a single word, all the complications it may have from the exegetical point of view. One word: *logic*.

Audience: Ruben, then is it also because of this, because of the first original meaning of the word logic, that we need that new way of doing science?

RFG: Do you see it? How can we leave logic out of psychology?

Well, anyone could say “so much for logic” after what we have just read. But it is possible to re-capture the term and perhaps give it a definition, I believe, sensible, within all this folly and fragmentation about a single word, which had a very important origin and which has been degraded and fragmented. To give it a definition again so that it enters the study of psychology and that it is not only a matter of philosophy, a matter of blah-blah.

I think we could start, if we define logic, with Bertrand Russell, and how logic relates to mathematics. I think it would be the most dignified way to dignify logic, seeing how it relates to mathematics.

Audience: He [Russell] was a friend of Krishnamurti. Maybe... that's where he got his coherence.

RFG: Another one who said that you had to leave the corrals, Bertrand Russell.

And another friend of JK was Bernard Shaw. All of them from the same time.

Audience: Bernard Shaw?

RFG: Bernard Shaw, a writer who wrote *The Importance of Being Earnest*, etc. [N.T., RFG here mentions the Spanish name, which translates back to English as “The importance of being called Earnest”]

Audience: The importance of... what?

RFG: ...of Being Earnest.

Audience: That's the title?

RFG: Yes, and I think movies were made.

Bernard Shaw also said: “Let's get out of the corrals we've built.”

Audience: But... I think that in English: *The importance of being Earnest*, *Earnest* has a double meaning.

RFG: The importance of being serious. The importance of being serious, poorly translated [to Spanish] as *The importance of being called Earnest*.

Audience: Although it was also the name...

RFG: Huh?

Audience: Although it was also the name of...

RFG: It was also his name. Bernard Shaw liked those things.

One day Bernard Shaw was at a party and a girl says, “Oh, if we had a child with my body and your brain, what a wonder it would be!” And he says: “Yes, but what if it had my body and your brains?” (laughter).

Yes, he was kind of brutal, that's why he was very close to Krishnamurti (laughter). But that sincere and humorous brutality.

Audience: I remembered a joke.

RFG: Shoot (laughter).

Audience: There was a guy at a, say... luxurious dinner. The dishes were like this and he starts picking bits of cheese and ham with his hand and pours himself a glass of wine. And a lady approaches him and says: “How disgusting! If you were my husband, I would have put poison in that glass of wine.” And he answers: “If I was your husband, I would gladly drink it.”

(Laughter)

RFG: Yes. More or less of Bernard Shaw's tone.

Audience: Similar.

He said, in a letter he wrote to Henry Miller that: “There is not one person I would like to know and who has more beauty than Jiddu Krishnamurti,” –in a letter from Bernard Shaw to Henry Miller. He says: “Krishnamurti is the most beautiful being,” after reading the first book, and that there would be no one he would like to know more.

RFG: No, but that was Henry Miller, because Bernard Shaw knew him.

Audience: Oh, yeah, right, it was Henry Miller.

RFG: Yes, it was Henry Miller, but Bernard Shaw was lucky to meet him, they were even friends. Even in a moment, in a conference, Krishnamurti says: “You may be very intelligent and read Bernard Shaw, but you lack Unitary Perception,” something like that. So he promoted his friend Bernard Shaw.

Audience: Arthur Miller ... No, it was Henry Miller.

RFG: Henry, Henry Miller says: “I would have liked to know him, because he seems very wonderful to me.” This is also said by Lebanese author Khalil Gibran, who says: “He entered the room, and I thought I saw the Lord Jesus entering it,” when Krishnamurti entered.

Audience: He called Krishnamurti “the Lord of love,” in other references of books.

RFG: By Khalil Gibran.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Without a doubt, Krishnamurti ... He made his impact with his presence, his beauty, his sincerity, that immense spiritual quality he had.

So, I don't know if there are any questions left in Buenos Aires or in Ireland. Comments. Or right here.

Audience: “No, thanks,” they say.

RFG: Here, no questions or comments?

Audience: About horizontal conflict... how the horizontal conflict –this came up in a dialogue here– is at the base of FAS [fear-anger-sadness] conflict. If you can elaborate a little on that... The horizontal conflict ... The perceptible or evident conflict is the conflict of fear, anger and sadness... the base is...

RFG: Of course, if we define horizontal conflict as the observer's separation from anything that he observes, it also

refers to the division that the observer makes with his own sadness. So, how do I look at sadness? How does Ruben look at the sadness that may arise in Ruben? I mean... Watch the news of the television channel, and something they say there causes sadness, something very sad. So, how does Ruben look at that sadness? As something separate from Ruben –Ruben is here and the sadness is there–, or is it like JK said: “Look at that sadness and don’t believe that you are separated from sadness. You are that sadness”? You are that sadness. I’m talking about a real conversation I had with JK. At first he told me: “You are that sadness, don’t believe that you are separated.” I say: “Well, I don’t see that I am sadness. I am looking at the sadness.” “No, no, no, you are the sadness.”

That helped me a little to see sadness in another way, and I think, ultimately to free myself from it, when I hear the crickets and suddenly, sadness disappears, even though I don’t forget what I considered to be the cause of the sadness, which was the disappearance of some friends in Argentina. No, the cause does not matter. What matters is the separation we make from what we believe is our sadness, as if our sadness was different from Ruben. “Ruben’s sadness is different from Ruben,” no, no. JK insisted: “See how you are sadness. You are not separated from sadness, you *are* sadness.” And that even made me a bit angry, how...

Audience: There is the horizontal conflict.

RFG: Right, “how can he simplify things so much? The thing is more complicated.” And the thing is not so complicated; we make it complicated. That’s why we cannot see sadness, and sometimes sadness grabs us and does not want to let go. And we feed it, we give it strength with thought.

Audience: Even with the mere fact of naming it as such.

RFG: Of course, or thinking about what causes our sadness, we feed it, we give strength to sadness, instead of listening to all the sound at the same time.

Audience: But that... in the dialogue that took place in Barcelona, in the workshop that is now a book, which is about sadness. Sadness is the META conflict, so let's say it has an aspect that is visceral...

Audience: The META process.

Audience: What did I say?

Audience: Conflict.

Audience: Oh, the conflict.

RFG: The META process, which is the mother of the conflict.

Audience: Then, that sadness has an aspect that is visceral, that perhaps is more evident to perception, but that it has an aspect –and there you insisted that it is never detached from the thought, and thoughts were perceptually less obvious, but substantial. So the question is, do those thoughts have to do with the cause or not? Is the fact of seeing them fundamental, are they really linked to sadness indissolubly? I think so, but if you could explain it again...

RFG: Well, today there is a lot of emphasis on therapy ... *Cognitive Behavioral Therapy*, CBT. CBT or Cognitive Behavioral Therapy. Much importance is given to that, it is attributed to Beck. Actually, it was started by Ellis, and I was in personal contact with Ellis right when I was going through my divorce, so I was in the perfect state to talk to Ellis, the one who really came up with the Cognitive Behavioral Therapy. He gave a seminar and I, as I was in the process of divorce, did nothing but go to seminars on weekends. I gathered about five hundred hours of medical education in a single year. Eight hundred hours, I don't know, a tremendous thing. And a good seminar was that of Ellis, who talks about how if I say something sad, I will feel sad, but if I say something cheerful, I will feel happy. It has a soft and distant relationship with positive thinking, but not so remote. So if I think a certain way about my sadness, I will help the sadness disappear. What is

that? It is Patanjali taken to therapy. The duality of thought is brought to therapy. That is: I'm sad, I have to think I'm happy, or I have to say something cheerful. Get up in the morning and make a statement: "Today I own the world and today I am completely free to smile and be happy." These are things that are recommended. So, what happens?

Audience: I own the world (laughs).

RFG: By saying words that are recommended to say.

Audience: A tremendous waste of energy to deny reality.

RFG: So you are denying reality, you are falling into the duality of Patanjali, in duality, which is a law of thought in itself, one of the laws. And what are you doing? You are of course hiding the other side of the coin, which is sadness, and as long as you hide the face of sadness, the other side of the coin that is sadness, you will fortify it, do you realize it? So, that is not a solution. That Cognitive Behavioral Therapy can help during a time of mourning, etc., but be careful, because by falling into duality we are strengthening the opposite. It is the problem of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy itself, fortifying the opposite by denying it. And that is what Patanjali did, but it is now done again in Cognitive Behavioral Therapy. CBT in English. It is what is done now everywhere: "You will have psychiatric treatment and CBT." "You will have a day in hospital and CBT." It's automatic. This therapy has become universal, because it seduces, seduces by its simplicity and because it denies the nature of thought and its laws. If we know thought and its laws deeply, we will not fall into the duality of Patanjali, which strengthens its opposite. Am I clear?

Audience: And the other way around, there what he is doing is that at first he is happy, but then again a bomb goes down.

Audience: CBT is deeply rooted in the culture.

RFG: Ugh!

Audience: Very ingrained.

RFG: Yes, it is very ingrained. And there is no place for dialogue. There is no room for dialogue to be able to say why we have to be a little more cautious not to universalize such a therapy, that first of all you put the patient in a mold. And secondly, if you are going to give a therapy, let it be the one that takes them out of the origin of the conflict, and not one that takes them back to the conflict through the duality of thought. That is, let's have that delicacy.

Audience: Merely stirring the mud.

RFG: Merely stirring the mud he says. So, would we leave it here? Unless there was any question or comment from Ireland or Buenos Aires.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] No, there are no comments here, thank you.

RFG: Well, good luck in Buenos Aires, enjoy the spring.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] Thank you very much.

RFG: Good luck, thank you for participating [*addressing Ireland*].

And see you next Sunday at ten. Thank you.

Audience: Is there no homework, Ruben?

RFG: I wasn't sure about giving you homework because you don't read them (laughter). You don't read them.

Audience: It was a nervous giggle.

Audience: They are accumulating.

Audience: But we'll do the clinical history, right?

Audience: A case will be sent to be...

Audience: But hadn't they said that the readings of the subjects...?

RFG: Exegesis. I don't know if they have them.

Audience: I have some.

Audience: Are you going to send *The Book of Ephesus*?

RFG: For example, that is one of those that deal with exegesis. But it is quite long. There is also *Kristos and 21 centuries of Christianity*. This...

Audience: *Church and churches*.

RFG: *Church and churches* now called *Kristos and 21 centuries of Christianity*.

Audience: It would be too much for the other week. It would be necessary to define which one.

RFG: So what we do is put a case in writing completely, to have an idea, which we can read here and criticize what is written. A complete case, the entire clinical history and the treatment plan. And we are going to pick one that is the most appropriate to start a therapy here.

And if you are interested in exegesis, then we could send a package of exegesis. You don't have it?

Audience: Well, I have some.

RFG: I sent an exegetic package a month ago.

Audience: Which includes [the article] Sanctity...

RFG: Did you receive it?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Well, that's it.

Audience: Ah, that one?

RFG: Yes. Then, we leave it here.

TOPICS - CLASS 11

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 11 (673)
- SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE (673)
- WORDS OF APPRECIATION FOR THE WRITTEN WORK ON HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (674)
- THE IMPORTANCE OF THE COMPLETE AND REPEATED READING (676)
- FIRST ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT - CLASS 11 (CASE PRESENTATION) (677)
- FIRST ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT - CLASS 11 (QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS) (678)
- SECOND ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT - CLASS 11 (CASE PRESENTATION , QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS) (686)
- THIRD ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT - CLASS 11(CASE PRESENTATION) (692)
- THIRD ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT (QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS) CLASS 11 (697)
- GLOBAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS: THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT (700)
- PRESENTATION: TIME AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH PREVIOUS PSYCHOLOGIES (717)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE FIRST TOPIC PRESENTATION: TIME AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH PREVIOUS PSYCHOLOGIES (719)

- PRESENTATION: OBJECTIVES RELATED TO HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (725)
- PRESENTATION: SLEEP AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH UNITARY PERCEPTION (728)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ABOUT THE THIRD TOPIC
PRESENTATION: SLEEP AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH UNITARY PERCEPTION (732)
- ANSWERS TO FREQUENT QUESTIONS IN INTRODUCTORY SEMINARS (734)
- COMMENTS ON FREQUENT ASKED QUESTIONS IN INTRODUCTORY SEMINARS (739)
- PRESENTATION: STRESS AND UNITARY PERCEPTION (745)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE FOURTH TOPIC
PRESENTATION: STRESSES AND UNITARY PERCEPTION (747)

CLASS 11

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, October 17th, 2010.

RFG: Good morning. Today we are in the class of October 17, 2010, in this second Sunday Presential Diploma [Course]. We know that we are contributing with Unitary Perception, which is the way out of the growing division of humanity and its most visible consequences, which are misery and the permanent war that has become a business.

I will make a summary of the history of science, which never hurts, for us to have an idea of the problems we have to face, – those of us who are dedicated to Holokinetic Psychology as teachers– which are incredible chronologies, especially in astronomy and psychology, which I bring up to help you see the dark part of the history of science.

For example, in the year 145 Ptolemy died in Alexandria, Egypt. He had the geocentric system, the Earth as the center of the universe. He catalogued 1022 stars and continued Hipparchus's work. 1400 years passed and on May 24, 1543 Copernicus dies, with the heliocentric system, with the Sun as center, and after Copernicus dies, another 100 years passed: In 1635 Galileo still teaches Ptolemy, from 145 A.D., in the university.

Then 154 years passed: in 1789, after the French Revolution, Copernicus began to be taught at the university, but not so much; we had to wait until Napoleon, after 1810. That is to say that, there were at least 260 wasted years and 1654 years in error.

In 1986 Holokinetic Psychology is born, when Holokinesis is formulated mathematically by David Bohm, which is nothing less than a complete conception of time. 24 years go by and we

are in 2010, there are about 20 professors of Holokinetic Psychology not all of them active, all over the planet. It means that we've had, more or less, an average of one teacher per year, although it is true that in the Eighth Congress of Mexico there were eight professors who graduated. It means that, actually, it's not that one teacher appeared per year.

But David Bohm is still not taught at the university, and Holokinetic Psychology -between quotation marks- "is not scientific" according to science before Bohm. If today we had the opportunity to enter the university, there are not enough teachers, but we always say we don't want more people but we want better people. We don't want more teachers but good teachers.

And today we have 110 years of fragmentary psychology since Freud and 32 psychologies in 2010, which essentially show the trivialization of psychology and its tremendous fragmentation.

Yesterday I received, one after another, three emails that I want to discuss with you. They are beautiful, that's why I want to comment them with you.

It says: "It's true, if we don't read the fundamental work on Unitary Perception, we are done for. I am reading at the same time The New Paradigm in Psychology and The Psychology of the 21st Century. The contribution that Rubén has made to psychology, and in general to all so-called social sciences, is fundamental. It is necessary to read and reread many times to really realize the paradigmatic change it sustains. Without that understanding, the attempt of Unitary Perception can be neglected. Moreover, without that understanding, which occurs when attempting, studying and sharing, it is impossible to flow in a dialogue in a stream of meaning. Thank you. Mireya."

And from Chile, they write, another [email] that says: *"As you read more about Unitary Perception, you realize how little you understand about it, and how necessary it is to continue reading."*

And [a student] of the Internet Diploma [Course], writes to his teacher in Barcelona, Spain: *“Thank you for not allowing me to pass the Internet [Course] in a mediocre manner,”* –because he recommended repeating the module. And it's true, we don't want more teachers, we want good teachers. Although teachers are very necessary, we don't want them if they are bad.

And I would also like to read comments made by people from the United States, who are currently coordinating a workshop in Phoenix, Arizona, United States, and says: *“Dear Dr. Rubén, I am reading The Great Leap of Mind (which is Lo Profundo de la Mente), for the third time. Reading your books is like leaving a cave after a long, cold and dark winter to enjoy the heat of the sun. The sun whose heat can supply the spark which lights a flame in one's own interior. A flame, which if one takes care that it remains lit, can give heat to warm and to give light to see. Even when the sun sets. Even during long and dark winters. Your work is a real gift to humanity, as you are. I am thankful beyond words. A warm embrace from Phoenix, Arizona, United States.”* And, a psychologist from Guadalajara tells us: *“The language is polished to express the complex in a simple way, therefore it improves the teaching and Holokinetic Psychology can be accessible to more people. The reading of Rubén invites constant attempts. The reading and the attempt make Unitary Perception a permanent investigation. The written work is based on facts that can be verified by oneself. No time is lost in fantasy.”* And they also write to us from Portugal. And he says: *“I was just thinking about reading today, I was reading the Internet Diploma [Course] documents for the umpteenth time, and it's amazing how new things are discovered. The learning is constant; I could speculate and say that it has no end. With each reading, together with the attempt of Unitary Perception, everything becomes clear, the water becomes more crystalline. This is a new thing for me, since the texts of other authors are very dense, heavy, and sometimes difficult to understand, one desists but not with this reading, which is always new, refreshing, and is also a gift of constant discovery. Hugs, Marcelino.”*

All this of course is related to what we say: that it is necessary to read the written work completely and repeatedly. Now, why do we insist on this, even though we know it can produce a hostile response or an unpleasant response? First, if all the written work is not read, the difference between the neurophysiological precincts B and C is not understood. The most difficult thing is to understand the difference between the neurophysiological precincts B and C. Without reading, the subtlety of time and identity, what we call “I” is not understood. If you don’t read, Unitary Perception is not seen from the points of view of all human activities and all those languages. If you don’t read you don’t learn to express the necessary ideas, without the distortions of egocentricity, without temporality and without the influence of hypnosis. And the second reading of the same text shows new things, as with any book, due to the natural volatility of attention. Attention, of course, fluctuates, and reading something again is always convenient, but especially with the written work on Unitary Perception, in which everything is new, even the understanding of the old. The understanding of the old becomes new. We easily forget, if we don’t read, words and key facts for understanding, and therefore the attempt of Unitary Perception is diluted and diminished. One forgets that one has to listen and see at the same time or that it is not something that is achieved, but that it occurs in the right now. The complete and repeated reading strengthens the attempt and the understanding.

I don’t know if we are still connected with Buenos Aires...

Audience: Yes, we are listening.

RFG: Good. Not reading the written work completely and repeatedly is of course related to the unfortunate fact of mixing what we say with everything that has been written or said before the advent of the understanding of Holokinesis and irrelevant time. Friends tell me that some parts of what I write can be seen on the Internet, mixed with the garbage of the new age market. They mix what I write with what some society or some guru says. They mix what I say –Rubén Feldman González is talking– with the 34 psychologies that appeared before David Bohm. This is predictable because the process of

invalidating what we say has just begun, and what we say is not well understood. We have to expect that those who teach Holokinetic Psychology and Unitary Perception will also be soon invalidated. When Sigmund Freud visits the United States, what he writes starts being known, the merchants of psychology begin to invalidate him, and even demonize him in order to promote other so-called psychological products. It would be a historical exception that the invalidation of Holokinetic Psychology is not repeated, as happened for example with psychoanalysis.

I think this had to be said, before finishing the Diploma [*Course*], because it is simply very important, although we have said it, in a partial way, that you have to read the whole written work repeatedly on several occasions. Now we have said it completely and why.

Okay, here we have a student, who is the youngest in the class, who will present us the patient, which was the homework, the patient who is completely evaluated with the clinical history, fully evaluated, with his diagnosis and its treatment. Do you dare?

You will present a case and the treatment plan, and before that the diagnostic plan. Or rather, the diagnosis, the diagnosis plan and the treatment plan. Go ahead!

Student: Name: Pedro Gutiérrez; age: 20; sex: male; marital status: single; occupation: works in a bank; date of consultation: January 2, 2010; education: high school; **Description of the patient:** strong and thin without excess, dark bags under his eyes, rigid posture, a little agitated and not comfortable in the chair; **Description of the problem:** he says that he is almost always tired, that he sleeps badly since adolescence, 15 years old, and he has constipation; **Illness:** none; **Family history:** Mother Lola, 45, says she is always tired, has insomnia and has had arthritis for many years, has never been evaluated by a psychiatrist, works at home; **Father:** Pedro, 48 years old, social worker. The patient speaks very well of his parents, says to have all the support, affection and love of them; **Psychiatric examination:** no problems of

orientation or lack of sanity, the IQ is moderate to high, has a good memory, is clear and consistent, ends his sentences, is cultured, laughs mildly at jokes, due to exhaustion; he likes to go out to parties at night, says he doesn't smoke, no use of illegal drugs; **Diagnosis in 5 axes:** axis 1: depression; axis 2: nothing; axis 3: nothing; axis 4: 5 points for insomnia; axis 5: 70 points. **Diagnosis plan:** refer directly to a psychiatrist; **Treatment plan:** after psychiatric treatment and regularized sleep, recommend Holokinetic Therapy.

RFG: Very good. Let's start with ... Chuy, do you have something to say?

Audience: Very complete.

RFG: Does anyone have to say anything about axis 5? 70 points? Axis 1: depression?

Audience: 45 is it?

RFG: 45... I would have put 40, why? Because, at least in the United States, one learns to use axis 5 carefully, since on axis 5 depends whether or not they give state support to the patient, that they give a year of disability or not. And a depressed person is a person who is disabled and who needs at least a year of rest and treatment with medicines, and as soon as he sleeps well: Holokinetic Psychotherapy. And then, you gave him a score of 75.

Student: 70

RFG: You gave him a 70, which is maybe, partly true, but if we consider the totality of the situation and the fact that on this depends whether he receives support or not, more support, it can be economic or it can be, e.g., that they send a person to help him, if he is living alone, in the cleaning of his house, or a person who does the shopping in the supermarket, etc., things like that are offered in the United States, I don't know about Mexico, but they depend on axis 5, so on axis 5 you have to be always moderate, and in a person with any serious diagnosis on axis 1 –all diagnoses are serious but I mean, with a heavy

diagnosis like depression on axis 1, it's good not to go over 40 on axis 5, because of everything I just said. This is clear, right?

Audience: I must say something in his defense: he had me read it and when I saw he had put 45, I said: "no, it's 70."

RFG: Is that so? (laughter) As they say in Argentina: the partridge popped! (laughter) Well, then, it was closer to 45 than to 70. It's the only thing I saw that would be disproportionate but of course very clear, concise, concrete, coherent, so I congratulate you. Very good.

Audience: Yes, really, very good...

RFG: We can see another, I don't know if Javier did it.

Audience: Yes, I did.

RFG: Could you be so kind to pass so you read yours?

Don't forget to talk near the [microphone] more or less at this height if possible.

Student: Clinical history, or assessment of a patient or initial assessment. Identification of the case: name: D.F.; age: 40; sex: male; married; occupation: forklift operator in a company; **description of the patient:** he wears clothes according to his age, sex and season, he is clean; he is cooperative with the questions, at times he is distracted, he looks drowsy. His physical complexion is average, cultured, makes little eye contact and looks sad, and has little mobility in his chair; his language is coherent and he seems to be a learned person. The source of information is himself; the interviewer is J.H.M.; the date of admission: it is October 16, 2010; place of birth: Mexicali; and the date of birth: October 30, 1969; its birth weight: 3.100 kgs, and the current weight: 81 kgs; current stature: 1.80 meters; maximum education: industrial engineer, in the school, an institute here in Mexicali; doctors who currently assist him: none at the moment.

Then we went to the **reason for consultation**, he says that he comes because of excessive stress at work, they have

threatened to fire him, and problems with his partner have already begun; he feels very irritable for any little reason, however he says that he has the support of his wife about what is happening; and then the **reason for consultation according to the therapist:** possible depression, and it is necessary to refer him to the psychiatrist; medications he is taking, prescribed or not: he says that nothing more than aspirin occasionally, natural products: none; street drugs: he claims not to use drugs. **Family and personal history:** he is an only child, he always lived with his parents until their divorce happened at the age of 18, he continued to live with his father, he married before finishing university due to getting his girlfriend pregnant, her father –he says– had them marry by force, he says that his mother suffered from depression and he now lives with his wife and has a 19 year old son at home. The three live in a house with two bedrooms, two bathrooms, dining room, living room and patio, no one smokes or drinks, and there have been no changes or separations in the last ten years. And in the **Development of the patient:** he spoke and walked at ten months, he spoke at one year and walked at ten and a half months, he was born at nine months by natural birth; **Medical and psychological history:** vaccines... I mentioned polio here, maybe it was smallpox, and I put tuberculosis. He was hospitalized at age seven because of a fracture of his left arm and there was no sequel. He says he suffered fainting spells that occurred during his youth and that he did not pay attention to them, he simply recovered, and he does not have a history of AIDS, diabetes, allergies of any kind, nor has he suffered from epilepsy, arthritis or some other mental illness, and he has no police record or problems with drugs or alcohol. He was medicated only at that time by a traumatologist when his fracture occurred, during his recovery. Sexually active in his marriage, denies having had any sexual promiscuity before. Premorbid personality, in the behavior of the person before manifesting these symptoms that he is mentioning, because he says that he had much less stress, that he concentrated better at work, and therefore had much less problems with his job, and he says that now he feels quite stressed and wakes up at night, has little appetite, tired and is easily irritated. And then adjustment guidelines...

RFG: The word *desganado* [tired] is not used in Spain, right?

Audience: Well, *desgano* is exclusively related to lack of appetite, lack of desire to eat...

RFG: How curious...

Audience: ...and not with the lack of desire to live.

RFG: *Desgano* in Spain means lack of appetite –it is very well said in Latin America–, so how would you also say tiredness?

Student: Well, lack of physical energy, listlessness?

RFG: Sure.

Audience: Isn't it Anhedonia?

RFG: Anhedonia is part of listlessness, a part of the lack of energy. The lack of energy manifests itself (in Latin America) as *desgano*. *Desgano* also exists in Spain, as lack of appetite, which is another symptom, but it is important that we see this discrepancy of the Spanish language so that we take it into account, if we want to do for example international therapy, like the ones we do here, that here we have a patient, don't forget, from France, we have a patient from the United States, and patients from all over Mexico, and some patients who have come from other places in Latin America, so it is good that we take into account that the language is not the same Spanish, and a word means different things, we have to be as clear as possible. But it was nothing more than a comment, it's very good.

Student: OK, and also physical listlessness, in the whole body, he is tired...

RFG: Sure, but in Spain it means nothing more than lack of appetite.

Student: And then ...with the adjustment guidelines during his adult life: he has tried to get distracted by movies, going out, etc., but it has not worked for him; and the **Psychological and**

Psychiatric Examination: his mental state: he is oriented in time, space and person, there are no hallucinations, there is coherence in speaking, IQ apparently normal or even above average, he has good short term memory and in the long term, he has good judgment, although distracted at times, and his mood is sad. He is aware that he needs professional help and is motivated by himself and his wife. The M.E.T.A. process manifests in him cooperating in the session, his voice is audible, he pauses when he speaks, he recognizes sadness and he accepts expressing three desires, one of them to get ahead in life, as he mentioned, good relationship with his family and at work. And in the insights or understanding of his state, he says he needs treatment; **Neurological examination:** no symptoms that require the need to do the exam, for now. And then the **Diagnosis in 5 axes:** axis 1: depression, and I wrote serious, at the beginning of axis 1, well, the first thing that is put is the ICD 10, the classification used in Europe, as far as I know (and the CIE 9 MC, which is what is used as a key in the United States) and then this one, I just mentioned, that's where I wrote serious, and well, in axis 2...

RFG: Let's say that on what you said before, let's not forget that the DSM V aims to be closer to the ICD-9 [*International Code of Diseases*] and that the DSM V appears in May 2012.

Student: And then, on axis 2: there is no diagnosis, but you have to put something even if there is no diagnosis...

RFG: There is a number; do you remember what it is?

Student: It is V71.09.

RFG: Exactly, that means there is no diagnosis. You always have to put code, no diagnosis.

Student: And in Europe, EZO3.2. And then axis 3: I put a left arm fracture in 1976, which is the year that fracture occurred.

RFG: You should add: without complications, he did not have them, right?

Student: No.

RFG: “Without complications” would be missing...

Student: No complications. Then, axis 4: I gave him 5 points, due to the threat of job loss and the suffering of depression, and on axis 5: I was also checking, and yes it seems that above 50-60 fits, but it is below the table. It also mentions depression at 40, in the others, it is a little lighter, says light insomnia, then for the care of the patient, as you have to put the one that is most protected within the health, in this case 40;

RFG: Sure.

Student: And Treatment plan...

RFG: Ah, also when the patient is referred, if the patient were schizophrenic or had depression, and has a psychotic episode, they look at axis 5. If he has 60 or above 50, in the hospital they refuse to admit him because there is a shortage of beds, and if he has a very high axis 5 they refuse to admit him. So it's always a compassionate act to give him on axis 5 no more than 40, if he is in an outpatient clinic, and in a hospital no more than 30. Because all this is involved, the support he may have, and even hospitalization, they look at axis 5. If you are a bit above 50, ah! You can't go in...

Audience: That became very controversial, did not it, Rubén?

RFG: In the United States it is not controversial, but here, sure, the system is different, because suicidal patients are not admitted to a hospital, but in the United States it is automatic: if they talk about suicide they go into the hospital...

Audience: Because I understand that here [*in Mexico*] if the patient doesn't want to, the patient won't get into the hospital.

RFG: Yes, of course, that in the United States is not so easy. If he said suicide, he gets committed. But in Alaska some say suicide to get admitted; the Eskimos come and say: “I am suicidal.” “And what else?” “Nothing else.” Because they know that with that word they go to the hospital and spend fifteen days in their Mickey Mouse slippers (laughter). I mean, they have their clothes ready, they have their bag ready, to

spend fifteen days in the hospital (laughter) and they have a great time, because the hospital is always better than an igloo or a wood cabin.

Audience: In other words, axis 5 is what any other person who can have a capacity to decide on the patient, will look at. Every person outside of medicine is going to look at axis 5.

RFG: Or rather axis 1.

Audience: Ah, axis 1.

RFG: Yes, if you are involved in medicine and you want the patient to have support, and in some cases hospitalization, you know that maybe if they are schizophrenic they will have a psychotic episode one day that needs hospitalization, then you also take care not to go above 40, in an outpatient clinic, like here, in axis 5, but if you are in a hospital, even less, if you are in a hospital you don't have to go over 30, because they are already in the hospital.

Audience: Did you mention the patient's suicidal ideas? No, right?

Audience: No, no. Because if he had suicidal ideas, I think it would 30 at most.

RFG: Suicidal ideas, 30 or less! No, no, suicidal ideas are less than 10. If there is danger to themselves or to others, that is suicidal / homicidal ideas, it is less than 10.

Audience: And those in bed, too?

RFG: Of course, if you are incapacitated, but in bed, it is less than 10. If you are incapacitated but still walking, for example in chemotherapy, you walk around with your serum, talking with all the people in the hospital, with the device hanging from you; that can't be more than 20. And if you're in the hospital and you walk and you're doing well, you can't have more than 30, why? Because you are inside the hospital, in axis 5. All this is important to know.

Student: Even if you have another diagnosis? That is, it can be a person who is very well, let's say...

RFG: Yes, let's say, if you are in the psychiatric hospital, the reason is usually a psychotic episode, suicide, very rarely for another reason. The depressed one who says "I want to kill myself" or "I think a lot about killing myself," many times the doctor makes the effort to get them into the hospital, but the director of the hospital, another problem that exists in the United States, I don't know how it is here, is that the hospital director runs the hospital, and if you come from outside, and you are a psychiatrist and you come with your patient, the psychiatrist does not go with the patient, the family goes maybe in a taxi or with an ambulance, but they come with this paper from the psychiatrist, and what will the director of the hospital or the psychiatrist of the hospital look at? Axis 5, and then they can make problems in case they don't have beds. Although there are always two or three beds that are reserved for very exceptional cases. But the patient comes under normal conditions and is admitted, but immediately seen by the hospital psychiatrist, and the psychiatrist who sent him is no longer in charge. The psychiatrist who sent him can visit him as a family member, but not to make any medical determination or decision, because that decision is made by the psychiatrist who is in the hospital. That's something that many doctors in the United States don't like, but that's the way it is. It is like that.

Audience: The concepts could be danger, mobility, and ease of relationship.

RFG: No, not ease of relationship. It is above all danger to oneself or to others or incapacitation. Those are the three concepts, or two: danger for oneself or for others and physical or psychological incapacitation. What does physical or psychological incapacitation mean, especially psychological – in this case we are talking about psychiatry or psychology? It means that he can't attend to his needs by himself, and that therefore he can't work nor can he be in an educational entity. All of that, criteria so you can enter the hospital, danger to yourself or to another: 10 points or less; incapacitation: 20

points or less; or simply that he is in the hospital, walking from here to there talking: 30 points or less. And there is only one thing... but first I would like to see what they all say... Chuy?

Student: I did not finish.

RFG: Oh, you did not finish? Sorry... (laughter)

Student: And then, Treatment plan: as I mentioned, stabilize him with the psychiatrist and the psychiatrist will give him the medication and the appropriate dose,

RFG: Fundamental.

Student: ...and after his sleep is regularized and he gets rest, if there is energy to attempt Unitary Perception, well, twelve sessions of Holokinetic Psychotherapy.

Audience: There is a question here...

RFG: Are there exceptions to that? I would say that at this moment, let's say, we have a patient who has come from far away to the CPH Mexicali and, suppose that patient was depressed, and is not sleeping well, but he has few resources and has to come back soon to his hometown, which is very far from Mexico, in that case we can make the exception of starting Holokinetic Therapy, even though he is not sleeping well. There are very exceptional cases, and you always have to see it from the individual point of view. In a case like this, I believe that therapy could be started at the same time so that he can come back knowing what to do far away, at home. But in general, the sensible thing is that Holokinetic Therapy does not begin until they sleep well with antidepressant treatment. I mention this because you have heard about such a case.

Audience: There is a question here in Buenos Aires.

RFG: We'll let him finish first.

Student: Well, and then in the prognosis: I wrote excellent with medication and with Holokinetic Psychotherapy.

RFG: Sure, because he is... how old is he? 40. The prognosis at that age is generally very good. That age or less, very good prognosis.

Student: Now I'm done... (laughter)

RFG: Done?

Student: Done.

RFG: Well, now, the question from Buenos Aires. Thanks, Javier, I thought it was excellent.

Audience: Hi Rubén, I am Georgina.

RFG: Hello Georgina.

Audience: What you were saying... I don't know how it works in the United States, but if someone is depressed and you still put less than 40, aren't you giving him a problem? If his problem is not so serious, afterwards when he has to work...

RFG: No, because...

Audience: No, I mean, when he goes to a job, isn't that in his records?

RFG: No, of course, that is recorded but it remains in the hospital files and is only released if a judge asks for it. Now, if asked by, say, the head of a corporation that wants to employ the patient, they ask the psychiatrist, in this case it would be the psychologist, Javier, who treated him, then they will ask Javier for a letter that says whether you are able to work or not, then Javier will make a decision about that. If the patient is in the United States and they have given him one year, as they are usually given, one year of incapacitation, with 1800 dollars per month, that is, that patient has a very good time with his incapacitation, and when the incapacitation ends a person interested in giving him [the patient] a job may ask for that letter, and the one who is going to answer that letter, is in this case Javier [psychologist], who is going to say –if he considers it appropriate– “Yes, he is qualified to work, despite having

suffered from major depression, which is in a state of remission, that is, at this moment the symptoms are not showing, so yes, I recommend that you give him the job, if you want.”

In general, no psychiatrist or psychologist will say that he is not ready for work. I have done it in a very exceptional way with some schizophrenic, which is the schizophrenic that I always use as an example, that I saw since he was 18 years old, and I recommended him not to work.

But everything that Javier read [the medical history] will never come to light. It does not come to light unless, as in the case of this same patient of mine who went to court for a problem of legal crime, robbery or theft, which is considered small in the United States, and I went [to the Court] to defend him and then they did not send him to jail. In this case, the psychiatrist is also asked to give his opinion. But the medical history would only be read if the judge asks for it, which is very rare. That is, confidentiality, which was previously called professional secrecy, is always maintained.

Audience: Thanks.

RFG: On the contrary. So, I can only say, about what Javier said, which I thought was excellent, that the use of illegal drugs is mentioned separately from the use of alcohol. Actually they are mentioned together, the patient says not to drink alcoholic beverages and not to use illegal drugs, and you should put that together, because it belongs to a very particular diagnosis called dual diagnosis. Dual diagnosis means that the person has depression but is also using illegal drugs or alcoholic beverages. Then it is always put together in the story: illegal drugs yes, alcohol no, etc., but always together. You said it very well, but they were separated. That's the only thing I saw. Any criticism?

Audience: No, it was pretty good.

RFG: Alright, I think it was excellent.

Audience: It may be useful to always write that down: no hallucinations, no delusions, never spent 48 hours without sleep, not suicidal, because it has not been asked... the topic of suicide came up but no questions were asked of the two, he is not suicidal, he has never spent 48 hours without sleep, he has no hallucinations, he has no delusions, to discard in advance may be useful...

RFG: He referred to it when saying he was coherent...

Audience: He said he was coherent, it's true, but I'm asking if that isn't useful, right?

RFG: What Cecilia is saying is very important, that you have to mention if there are signs of psychosis or not, that has to be in writing. Javier did not do it, and it is not problematic that he has not done it because we know the patient is not psychotic, due to the fact that he said he was coherent, but what Cecilia says is true, it is good to say that he does not have psychotic symptoms because more than one schizophrenic person escapes the diagnosis, because the doctor forgot to check for coherence, hallucinations, positive and negative signs, alogia, abulia, and so on. That is, you have to mention if there are positive or negative signs of psychosis.

Audience: And always ask about suicidal ideas, even if it looks somewhat informal...

RFG: And always ask about suicidal ideas without fear, in a clear way: have you ever thought about suicide? You don't have to have any subtlety at all; in a frontal way ask each time you see the patient if they have had suicidal or homicidal ideas, attempts, etc. That's very important, and in writing, because if the patient committed suicide and that does not appear in writing, the psychologist, usually in the United States, which is where I practiced and I know, the psychologist or the psychiatrist can lose their license, if the patient commits suicide and it is not written that he did not have suicidal ideas when you saw him and that's why you did not put him in the hospital. You can lose your license. It is very important to state

that there are no suicidal ideas, and if there are any, automatically: to the hospital.

Audience: And then the clinical history is done every time the patient is seen?

RFG: Yes, maybe not so extensively, but what you have to put in is the mental state. Which is what? The mental state is how memory is, how attention is, how intelligence is and how orientation is. All this has to appear every time the patient is seen, how he presented himself, how his clothes are according to the season, according to sex, etc., all that has to be done every time you see him. The mental state. That has to be done every time.

And as for the axes, you look at the axes and you can put: on axis 5, if there has been improvement, from 40 points it will go up to 45, you can do it; even diagnostic addendums. For example, in this case the patient was sent to the psychiatrist, very well, as Javier did, he goes to the psychiatrist, the psychiatrist gives him, say, Prozac[®] (fluoxetine) treatment, 20 mg in the morning, and the patient begins to take the Prozac properly, and on Wednesday an aunt from Acapulco arrives and because of the change of routine in the house, he forgets to take the Prozac. And after that he continued to take his pills on Thursday and Friday properly. Now, was there interruption of treatment or not? There was! Therefore you have to add a diagnosis, you have a diagnosis of depression in axis 1 and now you have to add this to axis 1, and you say, today we add to the diagnosis V15.81, which means non-compliance with treatment, why? Because that day he did not take his medicine. Then you add it, you add V15.81 to axis 1. You have to add it because that's what happened. The causes don't matter, but simply that he did not continue with the treatment. And it can also be, if they misplaced the prescription, you have to put it, if they've lost the prescription, I mean, you have to write it: they lost the prescription! It is a very serious thing to lose the prescription. It means that he has a very big lack of judgment and is very close to psychosis. When someone loses the prescription, that means they do not give importance to their health, to their treatment. That is serious, but having forgotten

medicine one day is very serious, especially with certain medicines such as imipramine, because it means the end of the treatment with that medicine. In the case of Prozac, treatment can be continued, but it must be well written that it was interrupted and added to axis 1 as V15.81: treatment interrupted.

Audience: Would the psychologist add that?

RFG: Anyone who sees the patient, psychologist or psychiatrist, has to add that diagnosis, so that when the psychiatrist sees him again, he will know: “ah, the psychologist saw him and he interrupted the treatment.” The psychologist has to collaborate with the psychiatrist, and the psychiatrist with the psychologist too. The psychiatrist, when he sees that the patient sleeps well, returns them to the psychologist to continue with therapy. And the psychologist has to ask if he is taking the medicine, if he stopped taking it, why he stopped taking it. That is, teamwork, which is what we do here, luckily.

So, don't forget to put drugs and alcohol together, the use and abuse of illegal drugs and alcohol, put those two words together...

Audience: And in what part of the clinical history?

RFG: Drugs?

Audience: Yes.

RFG: That can go mostly in mental state or in the history of the patient, especially if there were hospitalizations or for example rehabilitations: the patient spent year such and such in a drug rehabilitation center, etc. It is very common in the new Hollywood celebrities “spent a year in the rehabilitation center...” and there are great actors like Downey, Lohan, etc., etc. And well, that has to be...

Audience: Charlie Sheen too.

RFG: Charlie Sheen too, he went by himself, although it seems his dad influenced a lot...

Audience: Britney Spears.

RFG: Britney, her dad was also influential enough for her to go... and it's good to know these things that, more than gossip, are comments that in those cases is necessary to write: "was in a rehabilitation center" in the patient's history. Well, I think Javier was very good.

Chuy, did you do the homework? Did you do it?

Audience: Not as well as they did...

RFG: How did you do it?

Audience: No, I did not understand what I had to do very well and I did something very simple but...

RFG: Well, come on, come here, let's see what you did...

Audience: But ...I forgot my notebook at home.

RFG: Oh, you forgot your notebook...

RFG: Well, then we skip you and let Lénica pass.

Student: What happens is that in what you just said... Initially I had made a summary of the history of this patient, and then I did the axes and the data, the history. Can I read the summary or...?

RFG: No, read everything.

Student: Everything?

RFG: Everything, because that is the task today, so that it is clear how the patient is seen for the first time. In the most complete way possible.

Student: Well, Esther Borbon is presented to consultation looking slightly unkempt and with clothing consistent to the season. She comes to consultation accompanied by her husband. He seems friendly but says few words. She is 67 years old, schooling: technical school; she does not collaborate

with the housework since her illness does not allow her. The husband has a grocery store, and he cooks and does the house chores.

RFG: Excuse me, I missed it, what disorder is it?

Student: This is the summary of what I saw of the patient.

RFG: Yes, what is the disorder?

Student: Bipolarity.

RFG: Ah!

Student: They have been married for 40 years, she says she is in love with her husband to date; two children, one married (age 35) and another (age 29) who is single, and two granddaughters. The couple visits the office because they have problems of infidelity. That is the problem for which the couple comes, initially. She wants to fix the situation at home because two months ago she went away for a weekend out of town with a man, they took money from the husband's shop and they left together. She is sad, she feels bad. The husband does not talk about it at all; she says that her youngest child is sad. They already visited a shaman in the city to cure her and he says that the patient has no cure. She has spent more than 48 hours without sleeping repeatedly since she was 40 years old. Since then she is on medication but when she feels well, she stops taking the medication. She has the metabolic syndrome, is constantly ill, currently ill with cough.

RFG: Ill with what?

Student: Cough. “She speaks incoherently because the medication they give her is too strong,” the husband says. They have social security medical services for the youngest child. She takes medication for high blood pressure and bipolarity. In the last 10 years it began to be predictable for family members that every month she will have sleepless nights. And I started doing the clinical history: axis 1: bipolar, we would add... is the V15 leaving the treatment?

RFG: V15.18 [81] which is: noncompliance with treatment. What was the reason in this case?

Student: Because every time she felt good, she went off the medication.

RFG: The most typical of a bipolar.

Audience: Is it V15.81 or 18?

RFG: V15.81

Student: Axis 2: V71, well, nothing.

RFG: That is, nothing, 09. [V 71.09.]

Student: Axis 3: blood pressure, metabolic syndrome, loss of immunity; axis 4: 5; axis 5: I put 35.

RFG: Could you repeat axis 3?

Student: Axis 3: blood pressure, metabolic syndrome and loss of immunity.

RFG: Very good.

Audience: High blood pressure.

Student: High blood pressure, axis 4: 5; axis 5: I put 35 but I don't know if it's okay.

RFG: I think it's very good, very good, because that woman has many problems.

Student: Well, personal data: Esther Borbon, married, two children, two granddaughters, 67 years old, telephone X, address X, city X, schooling: technical school, date of consultation: November 10, 2009, date of birth X. The description of the patient: she comes to the office looking a bit unkempt, but with clothes consistent with season and age, well oriented, has had suicidal ideas two years ago. Patient's reason for consulting: problems with her husband; current illness (according to the therapist): bipolarity with psychosis.

RFG: With psychosis?

Student: Yes, because her husband said she spoke incoherences, and well, because every month it was already predictable that she would not sleep for days...

RFG: That's not enough to call her psychotic, the two days that she doesn't sleep, to call that [*Schizophrenic*] psychosis there must be delusions, do you remember? Incoherences, delusions, hallucinations, positive signs, right? And the negatives: alogia, abulia and flat affect.

Student: Family history: the family is already used to the patient's illness; developmental history: the patient has spent 27 years with bipolarity and already shows all the complications of bipolar depression...

Audience: Stress...

RFG: Of stress, yes.

Audience: Of stress, you're right.

RFG: Very well corrected.

Student: Yes, very good. Clinical history: she has never been admitted to any psychiatric hospital or clinic in the last seven years out of pity for the family members; currently taking medications; and has social security medical services.

RFG: It is good to put what medicines they are taking. Never forget, if they are taking medications, what they are and what dose. It's like I always say, the medicine has its first name and its last name, I tell the patient, the name is Prozac, the last name is 10 mg, 20 mg, 40 mg. So be careful, don't let any medication be without first and last name: imipramine 75 mg, etc.

Student: Yes, because it could be imipramine but you don't know how much...

RFG: You don't know the last name.

Student: You don't know if it's 25 mg...

RFG: Of course, you lack a hugely important piece of information, yes, especially for that medication, for any of them...

Student: Habits and adjustments of the patient's life or family history: the children and the husband have taken responsibilities to keep their sick mother at home; Diagnosis plan: urgently visit the psychiatrist, urgent therapy for husband and son, visit the nutritionist doctor, and that's it.

RFG: Sure, because she has metabolic syndrome. And it's very good that you wrote therapy for the family, which is generally forgotten. The family is relegated, forgotten, and above all in schizophrenia the patient is treated and the family is forgotten. It also happens in other diagnoses such as bipolarity.

Student: And this story is a case of real life, really.

RFG: Yes? Good thing, it does sound very realistic. Well, in reality everyone who presented cases presented very real things. But here there is a completeness that seems to come from reality. What was missing then would be, numerically, what she is taking, with its first and last names, for example Depakote® 250 mgs, every night. First name, last name and address (laughter), that is, first name: Depakote, last name: 250 mgs, address: at night. Take 1 at night. The more you say about the medicine, the better. It is a very big help for the doctor and the psychiatrist who will see him. Yes.

Student: What else did I miss?

RFG: Well, let's see, what do you say about this presentation... what do you see to criticize?

Audience: Well, more than criticize, I liked, in my personal opinion, that it was that long, that helps a lot...

RFG: Of course, don't let it be more than a page and a half, but say everything that needs to be said. I believe that both are

fulfilled here, it does not exceed a page and a half and yet everything is said, all that is really worth knowing.

Audience: And rather than details, let it be...

RFG: There are many people who, due to ignorance, put unnecessary details. Well, you know the anecdote, the first clinical history that I did, at the University of Pittsburgh, I go to my supervisor, it had 35 pages, and he saw it and said “what is this?” I tell him: the clinical history of the patient that I had to bring. He did this, took out the garbage bin he had there, and threw away the medical history without doing nothing but touch it. He did not read it. And I was surprised. I say: it seems unfair that you don’t give me the chance of reading it and telling me how that story is, it seems very unfair (I was burning), and he says: “No, you have to bring a medical history that can be read, don’t forget that we came here at 8 in the morning and we leave at 5 in the afternoon, and that we have more or less a population of 1500 patients (in the hospital that I was in, which is the school, in the University of Pittsburgh) and that we can’t make a clinical history longer than one and a half page. When you have a clinical history of a page and a half, bring it to me. Meanwhile I’m going to throw it away; I don’t have the time or the desire to read so much” (laughter). So, that was my first experience that of course taught me a lot, the blessed Dr. Oshino who ended up being a great friend, I already told you that he was Japanese and that in the war he was a pilot who was bombing Japan, while his family was in a concentration camp. His Japanese family was in a concentration camp in California, and he was piloting a United States plane dropping bombs in Japan. So his life was very hard, in all these aspects. But that aside.

Very well, I think the clinical history of Lénica is very good.

Audience: What I liked about the other presentation, is that it was very precise in its sections, well defined, mental state: this, clinical history: this, diagnostic plan: this; I think that this presentation lacked that.

RFG: Even though it's all said, you say it needs more order...

Audience: Even though everything is said, it is still necessary to complete the clinical history, what the mental state is, what the diagnostic plan is, what the treatment plan is...

RFG: That is, more order.

Audience: Having it well defined.

RFG: More order according to the plan of a clinical history.

Audience: Yes, in fact at first I had some confusion because she said that since she was 40 years old she was not sleeping well, and then she says that she has slept well for the last 27 years, and then there is the coherence of the patient... how long has she been sleeping badly?

Audience: When the sections are well defined...

RFG: There is incoherence in that we don't know if the patient has been sleeping well for 27 years or not...

Audience: Those are details that must be made clear.

RFG: Having all the data clear and in its right place. That is, in personal information, the name, address, medical history, if they were hospitalized or not, military service or not, such a university or not, which was their highest level of study, and so on. I think that I have not seen it mentioned but it is important for the clinical history because it is very different to speak with a person who has gone through high school and a person who has only gone through elementary school.

Audience: Also in the case of Javier, he mentioned that he was in charge of cargo? He operated a forklift and he was an engineer, right? So, why does he have a good career but is working as a forklift operator?

Audience: Very realistic (laughs).

Audience: Very realistic, yes, but that would also be a very strong cause of stress for him...

Audience: "...I studied, for what? To operate a forklift?"

Audience: But he did say that he had stress; he was going through stress, right?

RFG: In stress you put 5, right? You put 5 points in stress, right?

Audience: Yes, I put 5.

RFG: Sure, maximum stress. It is like in Argentina, where in Buenos Aires you can see... I don't know if that is still going on or not, but I have seen in Buenos Aires, when taking a taxi, that the driver told me "I am a doctor." And "well, colleague, I am your passenger, and why are you not working?" "Well, because we are too many doctors in Buenos Aires," he told me... I'm talking about twenty years ago. I don't know how the situation is now, but there were many doctors driving taxis.

Audience: Here there are even taco venders.

RFG: And here there are doctors who sell tacos. Well, if there are doctors selling tacos, it means there is a serious social crisis. Tremendous! That's also a problem in Italy, from what I heard on the RAI, that there are many professionals also out of their place. I don't know how Spain is doing, but...

Audience: Well, now Europe has the small advantage of having freedom to work in one place or another, for example, the spare nurses in Spain go to Ireland and England and earn a good living. There starts to be a little compensation...

RFG: Here Natzio says that the European Union allows nurses who can't work in Spain to go to Ireland. And that is the benefit of the European Union. Well, one day there will be—I hope—the union of Latin America, the political union of Latin America.

Audience: I wanted to say that one thing that impressed me about the clinical history is how real, consistent and also how difficult it is, because one makes a story that is schematic and that is very good because everything fits, because it is

schematic, but the reality is that when you go and meet a person, even if it is simply to realize if they have depression and refer them to a psychiatrist, you will find a complex picture and it will not be so easy. It's not going to be a gentleman who comes and says, look I don't sleep, I am tired, constipated and my mother...

RFG: He's not going to give you all the details; you have to ask them...

Audience: You will get a whole case, that's what impressed me, it's a story, reality, and it is...

RFG: Very complex...

Audience: Very complex, and I have noticed and this reminded me, in my family there is a case, that yesterday I realized was depression, and I have been studying this for two years but I had not noticed it, and it is creating a serious problem, and yesterday I received a letter and I say: this person has depression, it is so clear... she had been close to me for two years, I was studying and I was not able to see it and give her the necessary advice for...

RFG: Yesterday I was talking on Skype with a friend who tells me he's starting depression treatment, and he's one of the professors of the IAS, no less! So he, despite everything we have studied, had not realized that he himself was depressed. Beautiful. But well, all this must be taken into account.

Audience: But I think that in the same way, the scheme gives you the order, due to the time you have to do the evaluation, and the psychotherapist or psychologist should know how to ask the right questions to order the answers in that scheme. *[Evaluation]* It is not that... that some detail will slip from you; you can ask about the detail and at the same time you can put it in the right place so that no detail from those required for the diagnosis is missing.

RFG: Sure, and don't forget that having depression is not a stigma; it's a metabolic problem, and having a medical problem

is not a stigma. Let's not forget that David Bohm had depression and he changed the history of physics and of the entire science. It means that having a medical problem is not the end of the world nor is it something to stigmatize anyone. I don't know if someone wants to make some other comment. I don't know if anyone from Argentina wants to make a comment or question...

Audience: On top of that, the medical staff often does not know how to diagnose depression correctly.

RFG: Or the psychological staff!

Audience: Because they continue to give benzodiazepines to depressed patients...

RFG: So they sink even more.

Audience: Exactly, they exclude insomnia from depression.

RFG: Or Tafil[®] (alprazolam).

Audience: There are no questions in Argentina.

RFG: Well, there are no questions in Argentina. Are there questions or comments here?

Audience: A question: I would like us to see an example when stress would not be 5 points, but let's say 3 points. About that and how to differentiate...

RFG: But someone with 3 points in stress... who can it be? Who among my patients has a stress of 3 points? I have a patient that we share here with a therapist in the CPH, who is 18 or 20 years old, depressed, and he interrupted his imipramine treatment, etc., why? For not following it, because he forgot his appointment, a boy who has a very high IQ, he is two years away from graduating as an engineer. It seems impossible, and one feels tempted, in the stress axis, to put 3, because he has both parents who help him, he is two years away from being an engineer, but nevertheless, if you look closely and analyze well, the fact that he missed an

appointment and lost treatment with imipramine, which is one of the best antidepressants that exist, that alone is a tragedy for him. And while he does not have many complaints, he agreed to start therapy, fortunately, pushed a little by the parents, especially his mother who is very cooperative with the treatment. But does the fact that he has a good mother, and the fact that he is in such a privileged situation in society make him have less stress? I don't think so. I put 5 stress points in Axis 4 just because he has depression. In axis 1: depression, and with just that, he has a stress of 5. And we added that he interrupted the treatment, V15.81 added to depression, he should get a 6! But at first glance it sounds like he is in such a favorable psychosocial, economic, etc. situation, that one tends to make the mistake of giving him less stress points. But no, in an outpatient clinic with that diagnosis in axis 1: stress 5! Why? Because in the axis 4 he has five stress points, even if everything goes well and he has a lot of help, he is in a situation of stress 5. Very important. The same with the 40, in the outpatient clinic, regarding axis 5.40 in the outpatient clinic and 30 in the hospital, as a base. Before you put 50, no! Remember that he is in an outpatient clinic and that's why he only deserves 40, even though you gave that woman, who has such complex problems, a 35 very appropriately. What were you saying?

Audience: Maybe the weather, for example, can the heat in Mexicali be a stress?

RFG: What do you think? Look, let's not forget –let's say something that is worth repeating as many times as necessary. Stress is to medicine almost what Bohm is to physics. Why? Because it completely changes the way of diagnosing. We used to believe that we had to diagnose a cause for a disease: the Koch bacillus produces Tuberculosis –no! 98% of people have the Koch bacillus, meaning that there must be other causes for Tuberculosis. And stress, as Hans Selye said from the beginning, is a problem, a syndrome, a disease (he calls it syndrome) that is produced by multiple causes. For the first time that is said in medicine, back in 1935, and what are the causes of stress? Too much work, not enough sleep, too much

heat, too much cold, too much fatigue, radiation, exposing oneself to radiation is a tremendous stress, that's what happens to a careless radiologist, who does not protect himself with his lead apron, or to those who are working in an atomic power station without protection, beware of radiological stress! Infections: the flu is a tremendous stress, poisoning: "so, I ate fish, but that's irrelevant" –no! You have tremendous stress because you ate spoiled fish and now you have diarrhea, it is a stress; infections, poisonings, injuries, "yes, I got hit, I fell down the stairs, but nothing happened to me," well, I fell and broke two ribs, but there are people who are lucky and nothing happens to them (laughter), and is that stress? Yes, it is stress because you fell down the stairs, it is a stress, then those things are usually ignored, but they are stress. Many causes that produce stress.

Audience: Hardly anyone will come to the office with less than stress 4.

RFG: Of course!

Audience: They come because they can't stand it anymore.

RFG: Right. They won't come to the office unless they have stress 5. Very good.

Audience: Of course, also the culture we have is anti-medical, anti-psychologist, and once they come to the psychologist it is because they have a mega-depression, because they're in a very bad state already...

RFG: Yes, and let's not forget that we are going to feudal slavery again, therefore there is no feudal slavery that does not neglect education and invalidate intellectuals, as happened in Central Europe, where the intellectual... the students went up and threw their teachers off the rooftops. That is, those things happened in Central Europe when fascism rises, which is the exaggerated return of the feudalism that always existed, and exists, not even JesuKristos could put an end to it. And what does fascism mean? It means: that which is against the economic equality of humanity. Does that exist? Yes, it exists

more and more, and there is contempt for education more and more! And I speak with university professors, and here we have one present, but I mean other teachers, who complain a lot about the lack of quality of their classes, and the students lead the class, and it is not the teacher who leads the class. The world is upside down. Then, disdain for the intellectual, contempt for education, which is consistent, it is coherent with a feudal slavery regime, because you can't have slaves if they are learned people. The cultured person is less likely to become a slave.

Well then...

Audience: I don't remember if religion has been mentioned...

RFG: Yes, religion, I always ask, because I consider it important. It's very different that the patient tells you "I'm an atheist" than "I'm a Catholic..."

Audience: Or "I am a Jehovah's Witness," who don't allow blood transfusions...

RFG: Or that he tells you he's a Jehovah's Witness, or that he's an Islamist. Imagine if he told you he was an Islamist, and you were in the United States. It is a more difficult life than if he was a Catholic or a Protestant.

Audience: Even medical procedures, religions can prevent certain medical procedures.

RFG: Well, we already had the case of Eluana Englaro in Italy, a seventeen-year-old girl, she has a car accident, she had told her father that if she ever had a problem, that her will was to be unplugged; well she goes into a coma, and she was in a bed in a coma until age 34, why did they not unplug her? Because there was no written biological will and, apart from that, the Catholic Church said that as long as he was not killed by divine work, the human being had no right to take her own life. In fact, her life would not be taken away, but she is unplugged so that life continues according to what God wants, and then there was a polemic in Italy, which I followed through the RAI, which

lasted seventeen years. That woman was seventeen years old, from the age of seventeen, in a bed, in a coma. Why? For religious reasons. So I always ask about religion. Religion is sometimes very important: a Jehovah's Witness does not receive transfusions. When I knew that, I knew it in the United States, I almost fainted because imagine someone needs a transfusion, and “no, because I am a Jehovah's Witness,” and letting a patient die after a car accident, with bleeding, and not giving transfusion is to condemn him to death. Something similar but very different was the case of EluanaEnglaro. And well, I think you should ask about religion as I do, for everything we are saying. Besides, in many cases, a religious family is supposed to be more united, and supports the patient more, in general. This is not real in all cases but it can be true.

Very well, any comment or question in Argentina?

Audience: 15 minutes left for the break ... I'll let this on to see if we can cut and restart.

RFG: It seems good to me. We have to make comments about the clinical history, about the axes, about the diagnostic plans. Diagnostic plans were not mentioned, for example sending the patient to the laboratory to find out how the blood chemistry is, the blood biometrics that tells us how the red and white blood cells are, the X-rays of different kinds, if necessary, a consultation, the need for a consultation with another doctor of another specialty or with a general practitioner, all that can also be part, must be part of the diagnostic plan, which follows the diagnosis, before the treatment plan. I don't know if we have other things to comment, in reality there is a lot but...

Audience: Do you always send people to get those tests done, or not always?

RFG: I actually, almost automatically ask everyone, except in cases where they tell me they did an analysis last month, which are many; there are people who do monthly tests, and we are lucky to have several patients here who get tested monthly because they are seeing the general practitioner for diabetes, for example, a very common thing in adults, so I don't have to

ask for it, but you have to ask for it, especially the first time, to see how they are. If there is a need for consultation, which fortunately is rare, but in cases of hospitalization, it is often convenient to consult with another professional. I don't know if you here have other questions or comments, in the fifteen minutes we have left... Javier?

Audience: I have seen somewhere a text where some signs of people who may be susceptible to having suicidal ideas appear, and the list included people with high blood pressure, people who are Protestants... of religion.

RFG: Protestants of religion?

Audience: Yes, of religion, so I don't know what the association is between this and possible suicidal ideas.

RFG: Javier's question is why suicide is linked with the Protestant religion, something religious with suicide.

Audience: And also hypertension.

RFG: Or hypertension. Well, very good question. Many antihypertensive drugs, especially old ones more than modern ones, –and old ones are sometimes better than new ones– can produce a kind of depression that leads to suicide in the hypertensive patient. The first antihypertensive that was used was called reserpine, which is still used; reserpine produces a state of depression and in some cases suicides. So, it is not that reserpine produces suicide, but that the patient influenced by reserpine makes that decision or has that intention. And as for religion, it is incredible how religion is related to suicide, statistically, for example, the Catholic, of all religions, is the one who commits suicide least, except in Ireland and Austria. Of course, in Ireland Protestant Christians have been at war with Catholic Christians for the last 600 years, then, is it religion or is it war that determines the suicidal propensity related to religion, statistically? In Austria, for some reason that is not known, there are a high number of suicides even though it is a Catholic country. In Japan there is a very high number of suicides, and their religion is Shinto, which gives great value to

honor, and it is easy for a Japanese to lose honor, and then the causes of suicide increase. The insult of a friend, marital infidelity...

Audience: Getting fired from work.

RFG: Getting fired from work or the fact... simply that they don't treat you well, i.e., in Japan there is also that high number of suicides related or not to religion –but statistically, yes, related to religion. Shinto. I don't know if I'm answering you, Javier?

Audience: Yes, the collective unconscious also came to mind, how it influences there.

RFG: The collective unconscious and the collective consciousness both have an enormous influence on suicide. For example, in times of war there is little suicide, how interesting (laughter). Why? Because people are united by hatred, “we are all united, doesn't matter how, by hatred –but we are united...”

Audience: There is an expectation.

RFG: Of course, then the fact that people feel united in the war against the enemy, that feeling of union even if it is because of hate, diminishes suicide, how interesting!

Audience: I find cultures that defend suicide very dangerous, or even murder, for example the murder of Jihad or suicide like not only Japan, but China, for example one of the greatest pianists in the world, a very young boy, his father told him, he proposed it clearly, when he was not accepted into the best piano school in China, to commit suicide. Then those traditions are terribly dangerous because they are those that prevent the self from being aware that it is a fundamentally nonexistent entity, that is, I believe that they are traditions that will make it very difficult, the person will face a terrible dilemma and reject the understanding of Unitary Perception, because they carry the root of the self at all costs, until death or murder. Which all cultures do, but in particular the Muslim and the Japanese samurai traditions, which is also in China, I see it as a danger...

RFG: ...tremendous. And there are other statistical things related to suicide, for example, it was said that men after age 60 were more likely than women of that age, and that people of any other age, to commit suicide. But that changed, suddenly it appears that juvenile suicide in the United States between ages 18 and 24 increases disproportionately, in the United States, and that becomes the age of greater suicide in the United States: 18 to 24 years. In other words, it seems that psychosocial movements, i.e., changes in the collective consciousness, and changes in the historical situation of the world, also change the variables that lead a person to commit suicide. It was said that an old man, homosexual and alcoholic, was a highly likely candidate for suicide. And is it true? Well, that's what the statistics say. The elderly, homosexual, alcoholic man is the biggest candidate for suicide, but lately we have other statistical data, such as juvenile suicide, that change that perspective a bit.

Audience: There are questions in Buenos Aires.

RFG: Questions, go ahead.

Audience: If you have a patient, suppose with a moment of stress, because he says he is getting divorced, someone died, and he has...

RFG: Mourning.

Audience: ...a lot of stress and he tells you "I want to commit suicide" because his life has changed completely, how do you take that?

RFG: Well, in the United States, immediate hospitalization. In Mexico what we do is the recommendation not to leave the patient alone, because there is no obligation to hospitalize in Mexico, but in the United States there is an obligation to hospitalize to the point that if the doctor does not hospitalize a person like that, he or she may lose their license.

Audience: Sure, because here one would take it as a comment he made because he feels bad.

RFG: Exactly, right, in Latin America, depending on how the economic situation is, things are taken differently (laughter). It's like education...

Audience: "I'm going to commit suicide" –no, it's too expensive! (laughter)

RFG: Yes... or education, nothing is respected anymore in education and the student takes command of the class and the teacher is despised, etc. These are things that come with poverty. I think it is happening in Argentina, at least because of the news that I read, the demonstration that education in Argentina has fallen a lot is happening in a very common and very daily way, and I remember that when I went to school it was said (because it was true) that Argentina was the best educated country in Latin America, and it was true at that time. It stopped being true I don't know when, but it stopped being true, I suppose that the disappearance of one hundred thousand people in Argentina must have contributed to a catastrophe of all human activities in Argentine society, because an event of this caliber affects the intimate life of each citizen and the entire society, the social fabric, in a catastrophic way. I don't know if I'm answering you, Georgina.

Audience: Yes, but in principle, we should give more importance to what they say, that maybe it is overlooked...

RFG: Of course, if someone talks about suicide, out of compassion, that person should not be left alone, at least you should not leave her alone, and the ideal thing would be to take her to a psychiatric hospital, which has permanent specialized supervision, as is done in U.S. Now, I don't know if you can do that in some situations; it is very difficult sometimes to get someone to be with a patient all day, because people are either working or busy, etc. But the ideal thing is not to leave the patient alone, or rather, the ideal thing is hospitalization for a suicidal person and second, not leaving them alone, as in Latin America, at least take as a principle not to leave a suicidal person alone.

Audience: Although perhaps a person who is going through mourning says it because their whole life got taken apart, right? Not because they're actually going to commit suicide, in general...

RFG: Well, if a person tells you "I'm thinking about committing suicide," those are the people who commit suicide! That is, if a person talks about suicide, I take it very seriously. Once a thirteen-year-old girl came to my office, in the US, and she tells me: "on Saturday I took 6 aspirins." And I tell her: "what happened on Saturday?" "Well, my boyfriend and I broke up." What did I do? I picked up the phone and asked for a hospital bed, why? Because for her, 6 aspirins meant a suicide attempt, in her mind. I don't have to talk much, I don't even have to ask; I know she took 6 aspirins after breaking up with her boyfriend. Taking 6 aspirins is a suicidal act, especially in a person who does not know that 6 aspirins are not going to kill her, thankfully, but I sent her to the hospital, and she did not protest much, because she knew deep down that she was suicidal, even though she would not say it. I never forget that case, of a thirteen-year-old girl who takes 6 aspirins after breaking up with her boyfriend, and I send her to the hospital. For me, the idea of suicide must be taken seriously, especially in young people today. It's very fashionable –or the teenager who is a suicidal and homicidal at the same time, do you remember the case of Columbine? American schoolchildren who enter the school and kill colleagues with a very modern and advanced machine gun, which is easy to get in the United States, so they enter and kill their schoolmates and teachers, that is, it is something that has also become almost fashionable in the United States. That is, if a person talks about suicide, all the more reason to take it very seriously and also to ask the person, ask them, if we have questions. To a person who is very sad, a person who is very bitter: "have you thought about killing yourself?" Simply, "did it cross your mind to kill yourself?" "Oh, twenty thousand times," they'll answer you, and that's another person that should not be left alone. It's amazing how a teenager who tells you he's suicidal, and you send him to the hospital, and he leaves the hospital can be seen 6 months later in a state of euphoria, studying, passing

exams, in good family relationships, it's amazing how that person that you met six months ago wanted to commit suicide, but with a good treatment, with a good approach, they go on to live a full life and enjoy life a lot, that is: do not believe that because a person thinks about suicide, that person will stop living normally, it's not like that.

Audience: Thanks.

RFG: Yes, Georgina, any other questions?

Audience: The use of tattoos has not been mentioned.

RFG: Ah, the unconscious self-destruction, yes, another thing that is fashionable are the self-destructive behaviors, let's not talk about the cigarette that could be perhaps, in the 20th century, the self-destructive behavior par excellence. In the 21st century, I was in Moscow and I saw the suicidal desire of the people, smoking in a suicidal way, one cigarette after another. Self-destructive behaviors, such as smoking tobacco, the use of illegal drugs, the abuse of alcoholic beverages; those are all self-destructive behaviors. It is even fashionable for teenagers to cut their wrists, but not in a deep but superficial way, that is a self-destructive behavior that must be taken into account, a teenager who should never be left alone, even if it is a fashion among adolescents. I don't know if they're called emos?

Audience: The emos.

RFG: The emos, etc., they have their psychosocial name, and so on, but it is a behavior that mustn't be abandoned, the professional should not abandon that person. And self-destructive behaviors: is tattooing a self-destructive behavior or is it a new aesthetic notion?

Audience: Piercings.

RFG: The piercing, piercing the body with little rings that are put on the clitoris, which are put on the nose, on the tongue, on the ear lobes, on the lips, on the navel. And well, is that a self-destructive behavior or not, or is it a new aesthetic concept? I believe that it is a frankly self-destructive behavior, and also a

sign of degradation. That is, “degrade me”, “I am willing to be degraded”, in the case of women, which are the ones who get the most piercings, women. It seems to be a kind of announcement that “I can be degraded because here I am crossed by rings on all sides and I can also be eliminated, I will not complain.” That is the message. And the tattoo is linked with the piercing, they are made in the same businesses, by the same person, and what is it? Is it a sadistic behavior on the part of the one who deals with that? Undoubtedly, and is it a masochistic, and therefore self-destructive, behavior on the part of the one who allows that to be done on his own body? Definitely! No doubt it is a self-destructive behavior and that is the threshold of suicidal behavior or suicidal thinking, or self-degradation –because I believe that the increase of feudalism and the idea of slavery in humanity also increases in the individual the propensity for self-degradation to survive, because if I am going to live in a slave society, well, it is better that I get used to self-degradation because otherwise, when I am degraded as a slave, I will not be a good slave, nor will I get a job. All these things have to be seen consciously. When you see them consciously, you reject them before you consider them, because they are so absurd, but don’t forget that the first law of the unconscious is the absurd. This was already said by Freud that condensation and absurdity are the two laws of the unconscious of the META process. Condensation means that I dream mixed things; that I dream of my mom mixed with my aunt Pilar, why? Because once I opened a door and hit my aunt Pilar with it. So, why do I dream of my mom with my Aunt Pilar's face? Well, is there a desire to attack Mom...? Well, all those things are psychoanalytic things that have an absurd appearance, that if we look at them very well, carefully, maybe they are not so absurd. That is, condensation and the absurd as essences of the unconscious. Let us not forget that thought is 99% unconscious, therefore 99% absurd and subject to the laws of condensation, the condensation of images.

I don’t know if there is any other question or comment.

Audience: It occurred to me that we did not ask the imaginary patient if there were genetic diseases, such as diabetes, does a relative have depression, diabetes?

Audience: Well, it is understood that...

RFG: Hypertension...

Audience: For example, I don't know, I had put that... his mother was not treated by a psychiatrist but she had depression...

RFG: Of course, yes, you said that... but something that was also missing is the question of whether or not there were venereal, also called social, diseases. Now they are called social because we have already forgotten about Venus (laughter) because she is the goddess of love, then they say social diseases, which are AIDS, syphilis continues, let's not forget, and increases 80% per year, herpes, gonorrhea increases 80% per month, and those are things that have gone unnoticed because everyone thinks that the social disease of today is AIDS. No; gonorrhea, syphilis is also present, beware, herpes too.

Audience: Hepatitis.

RFG: And hepatitis is very important as venereal disease, and papillomas. Papillomas are very important because they can lead to cancer. And well, I think we all forgot about that, I forgot to correct it, you forgot to criticize it, and those who did the homework, to put it. Social diseases. I don't know if anything else was missing, military records were not mentioned, but it is also important, if there was compulsory military service, etc. In the United States, we must always ask because no generation was saved from the permanent war. Were you in Vietnam - if you are 40 years old - were you in Korea - if you are 60 years old - were you...? There has always been a war in the life of people in the United States. According to their age, a war corresponds to each age. If you are 25 years old, were you in Iraq or Afghanistan? And if you are 30 or 40 years old, were you in Vietnam? And if you are a little older,

were you in Korea? Or you were in World War II, as if it was really the second. There are almost no people who have been in the First World War, because they would have been 20 years old if they were in the war as soldiers and therefore they would now be 130 years old. But since the Second World War, we can still find people who have been in the Second World War. Then, according to age, we must ask what war they were in, especially in the United States.

Well, then we leave it here, unless there is another question or comments. Here or in Ireland or in Buenos Aires...

Audience: I wanted to comment on what has emerged about psychoanalysis, I have noticed...

Audience: Ruben? [*connection with Buenos Aires*]

RFG: Yes, Georgina?

Audience: No, regarding what you said about tattoos, right? I'm 44 years old, so I started with the generation that started doing tattoos and for me it was a horror.

RFG: The generation of what?

Audience: I mean, when I was a young girl the tattoos for me, when they started to be fashionable, 20 years ago, for me at first they were horrible, but nowadays I even accept it, it seems to me that one ends up transforming ... I don't know... the uses and customs change...

RFG: Of course, of course, especially...

Audience: I would not get a tattoo, because I'm afraid of getting infected, but if a 20-year-old boy comes and shows me a tattoo, it amuses me; it does not bother me like in those years...

RFG: Yes, yes. No doubt there is a whole social collective consciousness, but there is also the fact that we have forgotten the Christian foundation in this society, which considers the body as the temple of God and the only temple of God. Now, if

we see the body as the only temple there is, the only temple of God, then the body is respected and one takes good care not to stain it.

Audience: No, what you say is perfect, what happens is that what I say is that we let ourselves be influenced by the fashionable or social moves that there are...

RFG: No doubt! Hypnosis! Let us not forget that thought is hypnosis, Georgina, and we are all subjected to that hypnosis, and of course some tattoos are works of art, we are not saying anything against the tattoo but we are saying that we have forgotten the Christian antecedent of culture.

Audience: *[several people speak at the same time]* Yes, right, thank you.

Audience: I say that the social immorality that there is currently in every sense is also accepted as something normal, more and more...

RFG: Of course, just like (here Cecilia adds) that just as we accept tattoos, we accept behaviors that previously would have been repulsive because now they have become normal. The fact that children go to the night clubs (in Argentina they are called *boliches* and in Mexico they are called *antros*) is a normal thing, and they go at two in the morning and leave at ten in the morning and it is perfectly normal, and that would have been for my grandfather (for any of my two grandparents, José and Noé) a kind of heresy, no doubt. A kind of heresy because it is having fun in the hours that correspond to sleep, and well, that changes society and the way of seeing life.

Audience: The human mind...

RFG: Yes, and the human brain is so complex that... and lives in the hypnosis of thought, we all know that too, the human brain is very easy to hypnotize.

So I don't know whether to leave it here...

Audience: He was talking...

RFG: I'm sorry...

Audience: Yes, regarding what you have said about psychoanalysis, that I have found it surprising that psychoanalysis defines the laws of the unconscious, condensation and the absurd, and seeks the ultimate coherence of the human being in that absurdity. In other words, you see that there is an absurdity but completely disoriented from where, because it is a very serious contradiction, if the laws are condensation and absurdity and you seek coherence, look for it somewhere else (laughter) but what you can't do is look for coherence within that absurdity...

RFG: Sure, yes... but let's not forget that Freud himself was honest enough to say, before he died, that psychoanalysis was not a good therapy but it could be a good way to get to know the mind. He himself went back on his words that knowing the unconscious, man would be freer. He took that back! And he said that psychoanalysis could still be a way of knowing the mind, and actually reading the works of Freud is like reading a novel, a very good writer, and he says things based on observation that are very interesting. Now of course, does the scientific psychology of the 21st Century, which is Holokinetic Psychology, need to know what has been written of psychoanalysis in more depth, within the work of Holokinetic Psychology? I don't think so, because we have included psychoanalysis as far as possible to better understand the META process, and I believe that with the work that already exists, which already reaches more than 40 books, we have the base for the scientific psychology of the 21st century.

So, well, now we can leave it and we take a 15-minute break and come back, what do you think?

Maybe we won't have enough time for all the topics, but we'll see... let's hope so...

[Break]

RFG: October 17, 2010. We will move on to the topics that had to be prepared as homework, by the students, and we will

start with Javier on the subject of time and its relation to the end of all known psychologies, and with questions and comments from the classes, both here and in Argentina and Ireland. If you want, you can move here, so that your voice is heard more.

Student: Time and its relationship with all the previous psychologies. Well, I would like to start with this part of the topic about the relationship between the movement with displacement that occurs in the explicit order, which is from here to there... so, thanks to that movement, –what we know as time is related to it– then that, for us in psychology, thought, as memory, is what moves in displacement, that which moves from one content to another content. And that is where the relationship with the horizontal conflict is, in time, as we mentioned in the previous class. I brought some examples here: someone shouted at us or insulted us yesterday and now we see them with memory, that is, because that moment of insult is no longer here, but when we see the person again we see them while reacting to that content of the META process, then we are already distorting the moment of life that is happening completely, only now, here. Then that content of memory eats the life that is happening here. Of course, if we are in Unitary Perception we have the opportunity to realize that it is just another content. And well, traditional psychology is based on fragmentary perception, and the techniques of any of the traditional psychologies are based, well, on fragmentary perception too, and on time, on recurring to the past to look for some cause, which implies time. I am going to describe a little what the thought process that I mentioned just now is: the movement from a content of memory to another content, and this is how thought works, and we have functional thought, which helps us predict and operate and non-functional thought, which is actually what the horizontal conflict does. Now, here comes something very important: thought can't solve the problem that it has created. That is non functional thought, but thought can't solve the problem that it has created. So traditional psychotherapy is based on egocentrism, based on hypnosis and based on time in its attempts to solve the problem. Here I bring a definition of time: "time is the

relationship of *what was* with *what is*, and *what is* has already passed.” In other words, about that, I remember reading Bohm where he tells us how time is studied based on a movement that no longer exists. The movement of a point, from here to there, but in function of a movement that happened right now... but from a point that no longer exists.

RFG: What we are saying sounds like comedy, but it is a profound truth.

Student: Well, I wrote there: horizontal conflict is the relationship of what was with what is. And boy, here are many subtleties, right? And to be more specific I will move on to the examples, what we mentioned: “I saw the empty road;” that’s the example of the person who sees a red bus in the street –that was there but the person doesn’t see it, so “I saw the route as I’d always seen it, empty,” and the bus is there; there you see how memory distorts what is happening, and our perception of what happens. And another example is the wishes, the hope that something happens or not happens. And also a functional example, if tomorrow we have to get up at such an hour we can predict that we have to organize the moment when we are going to rest to be able to get up at a certain time, and be there, or a daily example, if we are going to go down the staircase we know, thanks to memory, where it is and where we have to walk to get off the second floor. Then [you see] how memory has its great function. Well, in Unitary Perception thought is a movement with displacement from here to there, and this is that B encompasses Precinct C; therefore if B encompasses Precinct C we can say that irrelevant time encompasses relative time and absolute time. That is, if we recognize each other now even if we are attempting Unitary Perception, we can be talking, and for example we can be talking because the contents of memory of the language are there, making it possible for us to speak, and if we recognize each other, when we are attempting Unitary Perception, that is because B encompasses C, then irrelevant time encompasses relative and absolute time. That is when we attempt Unitary Perception and thought is happening, but we also have the Unitary Perception attempt where there is the cessation of thought and therefore time there is only

irrelevant, which means that time does not re-elevate to consciousness, i.e., absolute and relative time are not re-elevated to consciousness but it also means that a movement without displacement of mind, matter and energy is taking place. That is, when we are attempting Unitary Perception and there is a cessation of thought, at that moment contact with Holokinesis is happening, which is that movement without displacement of mind, matter and energy. And well, traditional psychology is based, as I mentioned, on trying to solve problems through fragmented perception and that is why techniques are used, and since this is the product of hypnosis itself, the attempted solution is also hypnotic, which is to continue in C. That is why the solution is to live in Precinct B, which is only possible in the attempt of Unitary Perception. Well, I don't know if there are comments...

RFG: Lénica?

Audience: Yes, I'd add that thought created time, right? And that it can be functional and not functional. I liked it.

Student: Yes, and something that was interesting to me, well, let's say it's the first time we see each other, and that content of memory is not there to prevent me from seeing, but even if we see each other from fragmented perception, in any case we are already not realizing that we are one. So the division is actually there.

Audience: The horizontal conflict.

Student: When the attempt of Unitary Perception is absent in the relationship.

RFG: And would that make *what Javier was* want to communicate with *what Lénica was*, according to your definition of horizontal conflict?

Student: Ah, well, according to the horizontal conflict, yes, or even though I had not seen Lénica, images of the M.E.T.A. process will be coming, from transference and a lot of things that I don't... (laughter)

RFG: Of course, on top of the fact that what Javier was wants to communicate with what Lénica was, now, let alone what comes from memory, in the form of transference, etc.

Audience: Unitary Perception puts time, the self, in its right place.

Audience: ...and doesn't demonize it. It does not demonize time, it does not demonize the self, because they are functional, but they are not deified or sanctified either.

RFG: We don't demonize the unicorn (laughter).

Audience: Yes, thought is the flow of memory in motion, and from there arises time, so we should always mention the difference, when we are talking about time, to which time we refer to, if the time is absolute, relative or if it is irrelevant, to make understanding clearer.

RFG: But I think that if we want to go deeper, and for the person to understand what Precinct C is, what Javier points out is very important: that *what Javier was* wants to communicate with *what Lénica was*, and that relationship, purely imaginary, may be the only relationship we can have with each other, which is purely imaginary. *What Rubén was* with what anyone related to Rubén was, or anyone with whom Rubén thinks he is related. That is beautiful.

Audience: And from there comes the importance of clarifying that memory, thought, self and time are one single thing. Because the self that is related to that self which comes from the past is memory, it is *what was* with *what was*; what one was with what the other was, and it is only one thing: time, memory, thought, I. Time is intrinsic to all that.

RFG: Of course, the self is a product of memory, so the self is always what was. This is beautiful, as the essence of horizontal conflict: that I believe I am separate from everything, of course, because I am no longer there, I don't exist, what exists is the tree but I no longer exist.

Audience: And what sees is all there is...

RFG: But for that I have to go into Unitary Perception, to realize that *what sees is all there is*; I can see the tree now.

Audience: The comment I was going to make was regarding what is commonly explained in the university. How the 34 psychologies are, as Javier comments, based on time, on memory, and that there is nothing more. However, in the mental Precinct B we can understand the concept of irrelevant time...

RFG: Or maybe we can understand irrelevant time, in Precinct C, as a concept.

Audience: Sure, that's right.

RFG: As something known, but not as what it is.

Would you add something, Blanca?

Audience: When I was talking about the different ways of seeing or thinking that are the mental precincts C and B, the foundations in physics are also there to explain, to see Precinct C as something related to analyzing, thinking, and B as something related to immediate perception. I wanted to ask Javier if he remembers the two instruments that are used to explain or try to explain this relationship, which are the lens and the hologram.

Student: The relationship of what?

Audience: The two instruments that try to explain the relationship between seeing from C and seeing from B.

Student: Well, the instrument ... you talk about the scales, the lens and the hologram. Yes, good, but what about that? Those are instruments, but...

Audience: If you could add them...

Student: Oh, talk about that?

Audience: Yes

Student: Well...

RFG: They are paradigmatic instruments of Precinct C –the scales and the lens; the paradigmatic instrument of Precinct B is the hologram. Why? Because in the hologram there is finally the understanding that reality is undivided, and in the hologram there is also the understanding that a part of the object is in all parts of the hologram: undivided reality, and besides that, there is an implicit order. This complicates the epistemology of the understanding of reality. Then there is the reality of Precinct C, which is some-*thing* I *think* about, and the reality of B, which is what I see and feel and I hear right now. That is, the word reality itself acquires a new meaning when we understand the difference between C and B. Epistemology itself changes in its nature when we understand the difference between C and B, and when we realize that both C and B have paradigmatic instruments, instruments that are related to their nature.

Student: Did Rubén answer you? (laughter)

RFG: Is that clear? Because many people don't make the connection between the instruments and the precincts. And it's one of the questions that are there, of the eight questions I asked, that people don't understand.

Audience: Well it's not a question... It's just to comment on how ineffective all 34 psychologies can be, how the techniques are used as you commented on... that it is based on time. That is the comment I wanted to add.

Audience: Or simply that if the 34 fragmentations of known psychology had any effect, or the solution to problems, would life be as it is now, and the world as it is now? It is a comment.

Audience: In fact, since the 34 psychologies are based on memory, they are still thought and because thinking is dual, even when positive thinking is an apparent solution, it is still thought and by nature, thought is dual.

RFG: And as everything is taught as a concept, as another piece of knowledge, we don't perceive what you just said, the intimacy of the processes, which would make us clearer about reality if we studied them, and clearer about our relationship with reality and with the others.

Student: And I would add something... which is very important to me... that Holokinetic Psychology is the same or provides a new psychotherapy, but that it is much more than that because you rediscover the whole way of life, right? Life in Unitary Perception, which is different from saying that it is a psychotherapy to help you live in Precinct C, although out there we don't know it as Precinct C, so I think that is a big difference... a fundamental one because it is not to help you live better in the way that psychologically we know we can live. Then it's like saying, you know what? The complete way of life occurs only in this way, in Unitary Perception and one begins to live completely, more completely. That is why I believe that Holokinetic Psychology provides more than any model of psychotherapy.

Audience: In fact we are fear-anger-sadness, it is no longer a specific problem, as you comment.

RFG: Yes, and we have said it in previous classes, that when sadness appears, thought starts finding causes, and it will find as many causes as thought wishes. Thought is infinite in terms of finding causes, "I am sad for my dad, for my mom, for my wife, for my son, for Iraq, for Afghanistan," do you understand? You are adding things and you are sad for all that ... instead of seeing sadness! What thought does is to look for causes in the past, because thought is what *was*, then you are looking for causes of sadness, and we don't have to look for the cause of sadness in Holokinetic therapy. We have to see, as you are saying, see sadness. Don't look for the causes; see the anger. Don't look for the causes; see the fear. Don't look for the causes, because thought invents the causes, and does so in industrial amounts.

Audience: On Ruben's question, on how to explain irrelevant time to someone who has not heard of it. It seems to me that it

is precisely psychology, the discipline that is prepared to understand, to give the key of the irrelevance of time to all science.

RFG: Of course, I believe that one of the ways to begin to understand the self is to realize that the self is the past, that is, the self is what was. You can't pretend to have a relationship between what was and what is. So if I am *what was*, how can I pretend to relate to the wife *who is* or to anything that is, the tree that is, whatever, the dog that is. If I am what was, any relationship that I have, with everything I mentioned, is imaginary! If I don't see it, I'm doomed; I'm done for, as Mireya said when talking about the need to read the work completely and repeatedly. Because yes, all this is not well understood unless you read my written work in a deep and repeated way, because what we are saying is too subtle in its nature. Although simple, it has its subtlety that has to be understood. Subtleties will not be understood without reading, without study, they will not be understood.

Are you stopping here?

Student: Yes, well, I don't know if this example of the photographs that are based on the Cartesian coordinates is relevant now, that is, the distance... that there is distance and that there is a point to point correspondence, then about the relationship of fragmentary perception with the lens: it clearly has to do with the Cartesian coordinates.

RFG: Right, thanks Javier. Well, Javier has made a summary about time, I think he reached its peak when he talks about the relationship, or the lack thereof, that there is in the horizontal conflict between what was, which is Ruben, and what is, which can be the wife or anything that is observed. And then that phrase of Krishnamurti "the observer is the observed" becomes impossible while the self, what was, wants to have a relationship with something, and that is the horizontal conflict: that the self, which is *whatwas*, can't have more than an imaginary relationship with *what is*, with what exists. **It is very simple if you could understand this, because here is the essence of the whole of Holokinetic Psychology, if you**

understand that what was, which is the self, which is Rubén, each one of us, pretends to relate to what is, with what exists, with what is here.

Well, Javier presented time; he did it very well, and the relationship with known psychologies. Are you going to talk about the objectives?

Student: Yes.

RFG: Okay, then, would you give them the questions about the objectives, to make it easier so there's no need to memorize?

Audience: What is the importance of a workshop or a seminar in Holokinetic Psychology?

RFG: The question is: what is the importance of a workshop in Holokinetic Psychology?

Audience: The objective, right?

RFG: The importance or objective of a workshop in Holokinetic Psychology.

Student: Well, the answer is simple and I believe that every teacher has to have it very clear, and it is: to help awaken interest in the readings, which are essential for understanding, as reading RFG's books. And also to help, even if it's a one-day workshop, to attempt going from C to B.

Audience: And since you mention going from C to B, does Unitary Perception have any objective?

RFG: Since you mention going from C to B, does Unitary Perception have any objective?

Student: No, Unitary Perception has no objectives, because if it is a goal then it becomes another typical story of time, again, and the whole wall would fall.

Audience: You mention that there is a Presential Diploma [Course] and an Internet Diploma [Course]. Do they have any importance or objective?

RFG: Is there any importance or objective of having a Diploma [Course] on the Internet or a Diploma [Course] on-site?

Student: Yes, the Online or Presential Diploma [Course] is to be successful in passing the oral exam, in order to be a teacher and teach this.

Audience: So what you assess is Unitary Perception.

RFG: So what you assess is Unitary Perception...

Student: No, the test is only to assess whether the language is clear, concise, concrete, complete and coherent, in order to teach the most important thing in the mind and life, and that... that it is as understandable as possible.

Audience: Holokinetic Psychotherapy, what is the objective?

RFG: What is the objective of Holokinetic Psychotherapy?

Student: Well, in short, to go from C to B. [Applause ...] One more to go! (laughter)

RFG: Let's see, what is it?

Audience: Oh, what is the objective of C?

Student: Well, two more to go ... (laughter)

RFG: What is the objective of Precinct C? Let's start there.

Student: The objectives are profit, prestige and power.

Audience: And pleasure.

RFG: He said profit, prestige and power.

Audience: Non-functional objectives.

RFG: All of them are non-functional objectives. The self has its functional objective which is to predict and operate in the environment, but the non-functional ones are what you just said very well.

Audience: Hey teacher, and when you study the DSM (Diagnostic Manual), do you intend to train psychiatrists?

Student: No.

RFG: When studying the DSM, do you intend to train psychologists or psychiatrists?

Student: No, the only thing that we're trying is to see who can attempt Unitary Perception and who can't...

Audience: Who benefits and who does not.

RFG: Of course, from the point of view of professional diagnosis, who can benefit and who can't. Very good. We don't want to train psychologists or psychiatrists but simply to understand professionally who benefits from Holokinetic Psychotherapy and who does not. Luckily there are very few who don't benefit, 4% of humanity, at most.

And, did you have another? Another objective?

Student: Well, it was one we had included. There were seven of them, and we mentioned eight.

RFG: (Laughs) And how is that?

Audience: Because that of psychotherapy was included.

RFG: No, that was one of them already.

Student: No, it was, I remember well, the goal.

Audience: If you can go from C to B.

Student: Going from C to B, the one about DSM, we did eight...

RFG: I think everything was very good, right? [*Applause*]

You, could you say something about *We are all one*?

Student: Yes, I also had Sleep and Unitary Perception.

RFG: Yes, let's see if we agree to extend the class a bit, because the break was too long: fifteen minutes became forty-five minutes.

Audience: And we left later...

RFG: We went out later, right? Then maybe we'll agree to make the class a little longer, I hope so, and that you can present the whole topic, but we'll start with *We're all one*, do you think it's good?

Student: Hmmm, well... I prepared Sleep and Unitary Perception, and the next topic was sleep, the self and horizontal conflict.

RFG: And *We are all one*, did you not touch it?

Student: Yes, I had prepared sleep and its relationship with Unitary Perception, and then...

RFG: What do you think if, knowing what you have prepared the most, we begin with *We are all one*?

Student: ...what I have prepared the most is Sleep (laughter).

RFG: Well, then you don't want to deal with *We are all one*?

Student: But hey, the topic is dealt with anyway when one talks about Unitary Perception...

RFG: Sure, very good.

Student: Well, first of all I wanted to start talking about sleep. Sleep is a mental state, and according to Ernest Hartmann, it is a state of regular, recurrent and reversible behavior. Regular because on the basis of three types of registration, in all persons these same registers appear: electroencephalographic,

graphs of eye movements, and electromyographic. I also want to say that sleep is a homogeneous state because several behaviors can occur in sleep, such as crying, laughing, and even walking. Sleep is divided into two stages: S, synchronized and D, desynchronized sleep. Synchronized sleep is also called non-rapid eye movements and D is called rapid eye movements. In the stage of synchronized sleep, we have S1, S2, S3 and S4. It's the first 90 minutes of the night, and most of all I wanted to talk about S4, which is related to Unitary Perception, because in S4 there is a secretion of growth hormone, there is regeneration and there are no dreams. And that has a lot to do with Unitary Perception because when we attempt Unitary Perception there is a regeneration and we even feel how the body is calm, and in S4 that also happens, that there is no recognition of the self because if a person wakes up or is awakened, they don't know where they are, whether it is day or night, and there is a calm according to the encephalographic study, they are called slow waves. Well, that's the relationship, there is Unitary Perception at night, and that has to do with the importance of sleep, of sleeping well, and with Unitary Perception...

RFG: Do you remember where the S4 appears in the sleep? Is it at the beginning or at the end of the night of sleep?

Student: At the first 90 minutes of sleep, and well, those stages happen like five or six times, right?

Audience: In an eight-hour sleep.

Student: For those who sleep eight hours...

RFG: Eight hours and not three or four.

Student: That is a very rare thing, isn't it? That someone sleeps eight hours...

RFG: Yes, very rare, unfortunately, less common every day.

Student: And that they drink alcohol to sleep well is also very common in families...

RFG: And what does that do to S4?

Student: It erases S4 and there is no such regeneration. We also see the coherence of the intelligence, in that alcohol is not good “neither in the day nor in the night” that we see that it doesn’t do us any good... and also sleep, it seemed to me very good, that in stage D, rapid eye movement, there is sadness, nightmares, reactions that we also have in the day, it happens during wakefulness, when we are awake, and there one remembers what the self is. The S4 has to do with Unitary Perception, and the D sleep; I dare to say that it is practically the META process in function.

RFG: Without a doubt.

Student: Without taking into account those people who are in mourning. It has happened to me that when I'm in mourning, I wake up crying, but in the same way it's still the META process...

RFG: It's [the META process], yes, it is.

Student: It is very important to see that the self, and that Unitary Perception, exist consciously and unconsciously. Consciously for us who know, thank God, Unitary Perception...

RFG: [Unitary Perception] is unconscious only in sleep.

Student: It is unconscious. And well, for those people who exercise, there is a high percentage of the S4, and that is, I think, 24% of the S4, when one leads a healthy life...

RFG: When you lead a very good life.

Student: When one leads a very good life, which is also very rare.

RFG: Because otherwise it is 16% of sleep...

Student: And about D sleep, as we commented, it seems that it is practically the META process, and when the I exists it is because the horizontal conflict is what it is, then if the

horizontal conflict creates the I, we realize that we are totally fragmented.

RFG: Do we have any scientific evidence that we are all one?

Student: The EPR shows us that reality is undivided.

RFG: And De Broglie who said that the electron was...?

Student: Wave and particle at the same time.

RFG: Do you remember how that applies to the contact between two people? The electron, a particle in Rubén, is the electron wave of everyone here, and the particle electron of all of you is the electron wave in me, then: Why don't we know each other? That's what Bohm said.

Student: We already know why we don't know each other, because of the horizontal conflict, because of the self.

RFG: The barrier that the ego makes.

Student: Well, I bring up the experiment of rats, how a rat, in a season finds the way to reach their destination, in a labyrinth the rat finds its way out and other generations already know, because that result also makes us see that we are all one...

RFG: The information is in the implicit order, because it is not transmitted by genes, because the same thing happened to the rats of Scotland.

Audience: Not by imitation.

RFG: Not by imitation either, because the rats of Scotland and Australia have nothing to do with the first rats of Harvard, McDougall...

Student: And also, yesterday we talked about the new Nintendo games, when I was little I used one with a single button, and now there are eight buttons.

RFG: The Pacman?

Student: Yes, and now there are eight buttons and the children control them as if they knew it since birth. And that seems very similar to the experiment with rats. How a generation already knows how to use game controllers, which for me seems very difficult.

Audience: Yes, that's epigenetic.

RFG: It is a fact that something epigenetic is coupled with the implicit order, the learning of the implicit order, which is described in rats.

Audience: And the hypnosis of the human being, can it be transmitted in the same way, that we are born with an awareness of the self, by the same, by a similar phenomenon?

RFG: Sure, I mean, “water,” “who wants water?” “Water,” the child is two years old, a year and a half, and says “water,” and the mother was recommended by the pediatrician not to give him water until he says “me.” When he says “me,” give him water, then the boy has to learn to say “me.” It is an act of hypnosis, no doubt.

Audience: A question in Buenos Aires.

RFG: Go ahead, Buenos Aires.

Audience: Yes, Rubén, you said that the learning is in the implicit order. Now, the learning of the exit of the labyrinth is memory. So, I would not say... for me that is related more to the mind and to the explicit order than to the implicit order...

Audience: Group mind.

RFG: What “that” are you referring to?

Audience: To the learning of the rats, it is transmitted, as space is one, we can say that learning happens from here to here, but that learning is not implicit order, it is memory, therefore I would relate it more with the mind or...

Audience: Group mind.

Audience: ...or what would be, with what he calls the collective unconscious of humanity that...

RFG: No, no, no. The collective unconscious is Precinct C. What happens with the McDougall rats is that they also learn non-cumulatively, in the implicit order, otherwise the Scottish rat and the Australian rat could not learn something they never learned either by imitation, by genes, or through any known form of the explicit order, do you realize, Gabriel?

Audience: No, what I am saying is that this learning is transmitted in the implicit order, but that learning is memory, therefore I would say that learning how to exit the labyrinth is related, well, I think we might call it a morphogenetic mind, but I would not say that this learning, which is memory, is in the implicit order. I would not say that the morphogenetic fields are in the implicit order, but that they are memory and that they are transmitted through the implicit order...

RFG: Well, the concept of morphogenetic field is a concept that someone steals from David Bohm, don't forget that, and that is nothing more than the definition of the implicit order. Morphogenetic fields, by definition, occur in the implicit order. And it's a concept of someone who has lost his way and who has nothing to do with Bohm now. He simply stole the concept of implicit order from Bohm and called it morphogenetic fields. Don't forget that it is the same.

Audience: Okay, well... (laughter)...

Audience: He was not very convinced...

RFG: Learning is happening in the implicit order; otherwise what happened at Harvard, in the United States, could not appear in the transatlantic rats, in Australia and in Scotland.

Audience: Yes, of course, I agree that it is transmitted through the implicit order, in the movement from here to here, with that I do agree.

RFG: Sure, and the morphogenetic field is nothing more than a synonym for implicit order, don't forget.

So, something else? Well, let's do an experiment with Lénica. Do you have any problem if we continue the class a little more, there in Buenos Aires, because the break was too long?

Audience: No, no.

RFG: Perfect. Do you have any problem if we continue a bit more? *[Addressing participant in Dublin]* Well, see if he answers through messenger. *[Addressing the person who is recording]*

There are questions that they ask me in seminars...

Audience: They say it's okay [in Dublin].

RFG: It's okay...

Then... questions that they ask me that I wrote down last night, the eight that I remembered, but there are many more. I'm going to have to make a catalog of the questions people ask in the seminars. And for example, how do you answer, Lénica, someone who says: "I already do Unitary Perception but I did not call it that"?

Student: Well, it's a very common question.

RFG: Oh, it never fails to appear!

Student: I have also had that answer. "I do Unitary Perception; I already know what you're telling me." And it's because the brain, the memory, does not really know Precinct B because right away *[immediately]* it jumps to comparison, comparing what is being said with something that we like and well, first of all, Unitary Perception is in our brain but it is necessary that someone teaches it to us, same as learning how to walk, that sometimes the child needs the hand of his mother to take his first steps. It is a cerebral precinct that is there, that appears in the night [S4 sleep], but it is necessary that someone teaches it to you, that you read and don't compare it. Tell people not to compare what is being said...

RFG: Don't compare! And also in the last seminars, what I have done, for example in Barcelona, I have told the person who said this: well, what do you understand by Unitary Perception? And they give you a definition that is extremely fantastic and based on fantasy, and from there you can explain it even better. But there is another person, in the seminar, a seminar full of people, fifty people, exceptional, and there is one that says: "But what you are saying is the same as yoga."

Student: Well, actually, what is known today as yoga is a technique that only moves within thought and does not get out of there. If we are talking about a brain precinct, which goes beyond thought and which can see thought, while thought can never observe Precinct B, then yoga and many more techniques that exist nowadays, with postures and exercises, don't get out of Precinct C.

RFG: Of duality. To be brave you have to... "if you are afraid you have to be brave, think about being brave, if you are afraid think about being brave," the duality of the self, the duality of thinking is reborn with Patanjali, I mean the techniques that are known today. The original yoga was lost with Patanjali.

And third question, which is also very common. You have said the epistemological definition of Unitary Perception: what sees is all there is; the neurological definition: that the posterior brain receives at the same time all the energy of the cosmos; the psychological definition: to perceive everything perceptible at the same time; but there is a lady there who says to you: "But Dr., how do you do Unitary Perception?"

Student: Well, Unitary Perception in its definition is: perceiving everything that is perceptible at the same time, without effort, without any expectation, right now.

RFG: Ah, it means that you have already told me how to do it when you defined it (laughter) but they will not say it like that... they will never say it to you like this...

Student: And you take the opportunity to tell her to read everything.

RFG: Of course, in the definition is how it is done, but it is inevitable that you will be asked at the end, right at the end, how it is done, because the definition slipped from them, and the fact that the definition is how it is done. Another very common question: “Are there three zones then in the brain?”

Student: Well, in Holokinetic Psychology we talk about three precincts, but it does not mean that the brain has been divided. This is only a... way of speaking to facilitate it, but it does not mean that the brain is divided into three parts. It is just a way to simplify it so that you can understand what Unitary Perception is.

RFG: And the brain functions holographically, and there are three holographic ways to function. **Besides, when we say precincts we are talking about sets of functions.** That is very important; we are not talking about a function but a set of functions that follow laws. And a precinct is a set of functions that follow certain laws: Precinct C has its laws, Precinct B its own. Another very common question: “And what does a technique of taking a photograph have to do with psychology?”

Student: The technique of photography shows us the correspondence between the photographed object and the explicit image, the photo. And well, that's in time and space, but in the hologram we see that in every point of the holographic negative is every part of the photographed person, then what is the relation? Well, that reality is undivided and that in Precinct C, what we know, there is always a time, a self...

RFG: Fragmentation.

Student: Fragmentation...

RFG: Because perception is fragmentary, as if everything were billiard balls, instead with that photographic technique, the hologram, we understand that if reality is undivided and there is an implicit order, not all of reality can be seen as if all things were divided, like billiard balls.

Well, then.... “Doesn’t the teacher have more hierarchy than the student, doctor?”

Student: Well, the teacher tries to accompany the student 100% to understand, hand in hand, there is no hierarchy. I think that when we know that reality is undivided and that we are human beings, the student is freed from being afraid to learn, and the teacher also ceases to be something superior, an idea of being something more than any person.

RFG: Of course, and when meetings are held, it is recommended that they be held periodically, even if they are not weekly at least once a month, or once every fifteen days, that these meetings are fraternal, meetings of fraternal exploration, without hierarchies. And seventh question, very common: “Can you smoke in a fraternal dialogue meeting of Unitary Perception?” (laughter)

Student: Well, to begin with, the dialogue meetings are for those who read, who have already been to a seminar, who are taking the Diploma [Course] and that they already have in their daily life, taken Unitary Perception by the hand. And Unitary Perception itself makes you see what things you don’t need, and one of them is smoking. So all of us who are in the dialogue meeting want to take care of that meeting and not fill it as you fill a night club, as outside, in the world there are places of degeneration to the body. So it is not smart to smoke, let alone bring people who supposedly say they are interested in this but smoke, I suppose this person does not talk about Unitary Perception at all, he does not even read because he smokes, so we don’t want to have a social meeting where people smoke or drink; we are interested in a dialogue meeting to read, to attempt Unitary Perception.

RFG: Of course, and if there is a social gathering to laugh a while and share the bread, remember that we don’t want more people, what we want is that there are more good people. And... “But then if I have to try Unitary Perception constantly, Unitary Perception is a habit.”

Student: Unitary Perception is a brain functioning that you attempt every time you remember, but a habit comes from a repetition, a repetitive act that can be hypnotic, and that is not new, that is not real. And well, the habit is not going to come out of that Precinct C which can be cyclical...

RFG: Which can be cyclical or which is cyclical?

Student: Well, which *is* cyclical...

RFG: The law of Precinct C is that it is cyclical, and another law is that it is repetitive, so...

Student: And also comes from thought, Unitary Perception does not come from thought.

RFG: Sure, then it's a habit if it's hypnotic, repetitive and everything else, but in the precinct where those laws don't apply (B), it can't be a habit because it's not repetitive.

Student: Precinct B.

RFG: Unitary Perception is not repetitive; therefore it does not follow the laws of Precinct C. In Precinct C, anything can be transformed into a habit, even thought itself is a habit, it is hard to abandon, to think unnecessarily, but instead Unitary Perception is not a habit, why? Because it is always fresh, it does not follow the hypnotic repetition laws of Precinct C.

Well then ... Any question you want to ask Lénica, all of you here?

Audience: Well, a comment, the question of whether you can smoke in a dialogue meeting. I think the important thing is... to try to get them to actually attempt Unitary Perception, then they will realize that the table is not separate from them and the one who is talking to you is not separated from you, so smoking is an act of aggression, because besides hurting you, you're not separated from them...

RFG: It is an act of aggression; it is very easy to see that it is an act of aggression, of course.

Audience: And if there is violence, there is no love.

RFG: Very good. Any of you? Blanca, Karina?

Audience: A comment on the subject that was exposed, of sleep. That in sleep we can believe that we rest, that there is no thought, we can believe. However, it is not like that, the thought continues. When I'm sleeping I think...

RFG: Sure. The dreams of sleeping, of REM sleep.

Audience: I think there are heart attacks, when one is sleeping...

RFG: Of course, in response to a nightmare there may be a cardiac infarction, there may be a duodenal perforation, a duodenal ulcer, etc., which can be fatal if there is a hemorrhage.

Audience: Yes, and the deprivation of D sleep, by depriving these subjects of D sleep, the irritability and emotional lability appeared. What is lability?

RFG: Labile means very changeable. Lability means a lot of emotional change, which occurs mostly in depression, can occur in psychosis and means that you go from irritability to kindness. And in the irritability, maybe you're talking to Javier in a very friendly way and suddenly you tell him to go to hell, why? Because you get irritable out of nowhere and abruptly. That happens very often in menopause. My grandfather used to say... my grandfather José, who was a doctor in Aragón, he said: "Menopause is a normal phenomenon of women, but in the husband it can be a deadly disease" (laughter).

Audience: And he said it very seriously...

RFG: Yes, I tried to keep the seriousness, because he said it in all seriousness. It's normal in women but in the husband it can be a deadly disease (laughs). Why is that? Because there is a lot of emotional lability, the mood changes a lot, suddenly you are kind and suddenly you get irritable and don't know why.

Audience: Yes, what I'm trying to say with this comment is the importance of sleeping eight or nine hours, that's why I make this comment.

RFG: The importance of sleeping eight or nine hours is better understood if we understand what sleep is. Right? There are four sheets of the book *The New Paradigm in Psychology*, where sleep is very simply explained. There we understand why we need to sleep eight or nine hours.

Audience: Very good presentation, but I think the only thing I'm not sure you mentioned, I think not, about D sleep, why it is not called deep sleep.

Student: Oh yes, I did not say it. It is wrongly called... well indeed both, the S sleep and the D sleep...

RFG: Could you repeat the question?

Audience: Yes. Ceci says that I did not talk about D sleep, which is also wrongly called deep, also S sleep is wrongly called deep because the waves are very slow and it is said to be deep, and the D sleep...

RFG: Why is D sleep said to be deep?

Audience: Because it is more difficult to awaken the person who is sleeping...

RFG: And there's also a relaxation of the digastric muscle.

Audience: Yes, a greater relaxation...

RFG: So that's why it's considered deeper, because this muscle, or the pretibial muscle, are more relaxed; so both are called deep, but for different reasons. Conclusion: don't call either of them deep.

[Cut due to technical problems; presentation on sleep ends.]

Audience: Yes, thank you very much; it improves a lot when the connection is resumed. The sound was all choppy.

RFG: Well then ... Eduardo is missing and he had to talk about the three functional precincts, Yolanda was going to speak about memory, *mermeros*, genes, homeostasis, birth and epigenesis in the human mind, and the universal mind and why it is said that the electron has a mind. Those were Yolanda's topics, and why these topics? Because she is a biologist, so she is well involved in biological sciences. Unfortunately, her father died last night and she is now at the funeral or burial. I don't know if you prefer that we make a dialogue now, with questions and comments, a summary of Yolanda's topics that you want.

Mermeros and memory. *Mermeros*, in Greek, means anxiety, but it is not the word for memory. It is the word memory, in English, which meant anxiety, but the Greeks called memory *mnemonos*, which is only in English in the word "mnemonic technique." In other words: what a curious coincidence. Carl Jung would be happy to know, I suppose he knew, that *mermeros* is anxiety and is the origin -in Greek- of the word memory in Spanish, English and other European languages, that is, memory and anxiety are not separate. There is an audio of Krishnamurti that is called "Thought breeds fear." I don't know if you can find it in Spanish, but in English it means: thought breeds fear. It was the first thing I heard in audio by JK. Thought breeds fear, and of course *mermeros* in Greek means anxiety, but for us it is the word memory, the origin of the word memory.

Audience: Feeding the fear?

RFG: Did I say fear? Yes, it breeds fear; thought breeds fear.

Audience: Here I have a phrase from him [JK], which I really like, he says: "Illusion will always exist, so long as the urge for the continuation of pleasure and the avoidance of pain exists."

RFG: The illusion will continue as long as there is the urge to avoid...

Audience: Pleasure and pain.

Audience: No...

RFG: To continue pleasure and avoid pain.

Audience: Aha, to continue pleasure and avoid pain, the urge to continue...

RFG: Then illusion will continue. Tremendous, because true life does not make the difference between what happens to you now, which can be painful, and what happens to you tomorrow, which can be joyful. That is, why do we have to prefer, have predilections? Life is what it is, true life, not imaginary.

Yes, and I had brought things to share but I prefer there to be dialogue of questions and comments.

Audience: In Buenos Aires have you followed the homework of making clinical cases?

RFG: Well, they're going to have to do it like we did here, there in presence.

Audience: They want to make a comment.

RFG: Yes, go ahead with the comment, Buenos Aires.

Audience: About what you are saying that real life does not choose, but lives whatever there is, I had just returned from Disney [world,] where I got used to waiting in queue for an hour, and the next day I had to go to the bank, I had to stay in queue for an hour, and at one point I said... wait a minute! And I put myself in Unitary Perception, saying, if I saw this from the place where I'm queuing... because the bank was already starting to bother me... I saw myself there... well...

RFG: (laughter) But when you were queuing up to enter the Pirates of the Caribbean ride, you did not make a problem (laughter). Yes, what they have in Disneyland or Disneyworld is that atmosphere that seems... it is certainly not reality, but it is a reality that seems fantastically happy, where everyone seems to have been predisposed to be happy and everyone is happy, then there is a very nice atmosphere there. The

interesting thing is that Disney had the intention to make us see the relationship between life and death, and there death is present everywhere. There is a place called the haunted mansion that you get there and the floor starts dropping, the walls go up, and the walls have different motifs, but there is always some ghost there, and some little thing to make us aware of the relationship between life and death, even the little train. There is a little train that is supposed to be for children, but it is full of grown-up people, and skeletons and ghosts hang everywhere, it's something from Disney, paradoxical with the atmosphere of joy that exists, and that death is present in all or almost all games, if not all. That's what you noticed, Georgina, right?

Yes, another thing is our relationship with death, as JK said, we always put it in the future. I am going to die within 10 years, within 10 days or within 10 months, but, JK said, let's bring death here, let's bring it here where we are –why? To be able to live life with the intensity that lifedeserves. Because if I feel that I am mortal, I will enjoy life and I will live it in greater depth, with greater intensity.

Any question or comment?

Audience: In S4 stage that is akin to the Unitary Perception of sleeping, I don't know if I understand it well, but Unitary Perception is always conscious, is it not? So obviously Unitary Perception of sleep, it sounds to me like it is not, I mean, it is akin, but how to say that the Unitary Perception of sleep is stage S4... I mean it can be confusing... and to hear it said like that because there is a difference...

RFG: Of course, from unconscious to conscious, nothing less. Yes, however, S4 has all the characteristics of Unitary Perception: absence of thought, a very great peace, a tremendous liberation of energy by the brain, there is segregated, at that moment, the GH, growth hormone that makes one grow up during 21 years and then makes one relate better to others, from age 21 onwards (the GH hormone), that is, they are all elements related to Unitary Perception, regeneration, energy, energy release, absence of thought. One

has to start saying, gee, how similar it is to Unitary Perception, but during sleep. But everything else seems to be Unitary Perception.

Audience: Unconscious contact with Holokinesis.

RFG: Of course, an unconscious contact with Holokinesis that causes energy to be released, even in the electrodermal streams, the skin is full of galvanic energy, measurable with a galvanometer. It is interesting to see how that happens in a moment of sleep; it is 16% of sleep. In case of exercising one can reach a 25 % of the entire night's sleep, if the person exercises. That is why we have associated it with Unitary Perception, because it resembles its features, its attributes. I think it helps to understand Unitary Perception in wakefulness, to know all these attributes that synchronized sleep, stage 4 has, because then we can see its elements, analyze the elements that are in that sleep, and how they are present in the Unitary Perception of wakefulness. I think it could help to understand what Unitary Perception is in wakefulness.

Audience: Yes, because I relate it a little more with the fact that the brain ceases to put a barrier and opens to contact with Precinct B... well then it is the same...

RFG: Sure, then we're talking about the same thing. It is as if the censorship was loosening, Freud would say –of course for him censorship had another meaning; it was the censorship that separates us from the unconscious of Precinct C, in our language. But just as censorship is loosened, according to Freud, so that the unconscious becomes accessible to us, in the act of sleeping, in the same way obviously a lot of tensions fall, especially those created by the self, so that it becomes possible, at least in a moment of sleep, the S4, with great energy release, and with absence of thought, with absence of dreams, absence of nightmares, regeneration (the opposite of what can happen in dreams), which is Precinct B.

Audience: However, I dare say that if I didn't know Unitary Perception, and they talked about the S sleep and the D sleep, I think I would understand it cognitively but I would not give it

the importance it has, because I don't know Unitary Perception, because when I say that in the S sleep regeneration occurs, and that if I don't drink and that if I exercise, valuable things happen... and if I don't know Unitary Perception, it is just another piece of information I could read in the newspaper.

RFG: Yes, and it happens among Krishnamurti's readers that they believe that, because they are vegetarians, they are going to make contact with God. I spoke with JK, I say: "Well, what is the importance, for Unitary Perception, of having a vegetarian diet?" He says: "None!" Then, when I ask him why he is a vegetarian, he says: "Pity", out of pity, but it is not because it favors Unitary Perception.

I don't know if you want us to end here.

Audience: Well, I don't know if there is any other presentation, but I had a presentation today, but we can leave it for the next day, it's too late.

RFG: Wait... I skipped you... stress. Go ahead! Forgive me, I skipped you.

Sure, because I went from Javier to Yolanda, and I skipped Natzio. Forgive me.

Student: The theme is Stress and Unitary Perception. Stress was defined by Hans Selye, in the thirties, as an adaptive response of the organism to stressors, or agents that are perceived as difficulty, as aggression, then, medically it was a remarkable fact because it was the definition of a syndrome; disease ceased to be linked to a single cause, because many diseases could have the same substrate, then the agents that generate stress range from cold, heat, radiation, and then the psychological, as mourning or moving. Then Unitary Perception is the only way to make contact with stress, that is, with the body when it is stressed. So, what happens when a person attempts Unitary Perception, and has a very high level of stress? They can have palpitations, they can feel tingling, drowsiness. What is happening is that they come into contact with stress beyond the word stress. What happens

immediately? Well, some sleepiness becomes evident and it is because you need rest, which is what heals stress. Then Unitary Perception makes contact with reality, stress, and with its remedy, which is rest. So I wanted to highlight the aspect that stress is generated when an external or internal agent is perceived as a strain or a difficulty, so it is curious that the adaptive reaction to what is perceived as danger is the beginning of flight. Krishnamurti said: “see what is, and don’t run away”, don’t run away. So what happens? That not only Unitary Perception allows one to come into contact with stress when stress has accumulated and that not resting will have dire medical consequences, such as gastritis, arthritis, high blood pressure, low immunity, and, in the long term, suicidal and homicidal ideas...

RFG: And the metabolic syndrome...

Audience: ...and the metabolic syndrome; but also that stress, when it is generated, it is because a situation is perceived as difficult, and who perceives it? Obviously in Precinct C it is the I who perceives it, it is memory which perceives it, so it is curious that stress is common to so many situations because, I suggest (this is... off the record) that what happens is that stress is the mechanism by which the self, i.e., memory, imagination, can take control of the body and the life of the individual, I mean, it is the principle of the mechanism of flight, and flight consists of what? Of not perceiving; it is to flee from what is, then that mechanism that originally prepared the human being to escape from a real danger has been used to prepare the human being to flee from what the I perceives as danger, which is evidently its lack of continuity, the self seeks security, then everything that threatens its security will be perceived by it as an aggression, then the stress mechanism will allow it to do that constant control of the situation, and what Unitary Perception is going to do is the evidence of... coming into contact with that stressful situation, and that is the end of flight. When coming into contact with stress, self-control ends, because without that mechanism of escape, imaginary life can’t take control of the life of the human being. This I say *off the record*, because it seems relevant in my own life, what happens

when attempting Unitary Perception is that I get in touch with what is called stress, with that tension, with the fatigue that underlies one's life. So that coming into contact is only possible by suspending the word, by trying to perceive everything that is perceptible at the same time, right now.

RFG: Yes, that association that you have made between flight and what we do to avoid being in Unitary Perception is good. We flee instead of being here.

Any comment on what Natzio just said?

Audience: You mentioned Hans Selye, right?

Audience: Yes, at the beginning.

Audience: And then the mechanism of stress, of the hormone...

RFG: ACTH, adrenaline. Adrenocorticotrophin, in the pituitary gland, is released and adrenaline and cortisol are released in the adrenal. Suprarenal or Adrenal. And then the organism fills with heart-stimulating substances, what for? For fight or flight. This is what Selye describes.

Audience: So they always say that after the adrenaline comes the noradrenalin?

RFG: Well, they are two similar substances...

Audience: Or rather, that first comes this reaction to fight or flee but then there is a feeling of discomfort produced by those substances. So it seems very good to mention that they are the repetition or non-functionality of the META process, perhaps the number one cause of stress...

RFG: The absence of Unitary Perception, which causes stress.

Audience: Number one cause of stress. For this reason I keep working so hard that I don't even realize that it is unhealthy.

Audience: What I was referring to is that there is the basis of the mechanism of living... fleeing. That it is precisely this

natural mechanism of fleeing from a real danger that is being absorbed or used by the META process to make it permanent and monopolize the flight of the individual, so that mechanism is used to keep the human being in constant flight.

Audience: Because of fear.

RFG: And that's what Javier said, that one ends up wanting to relate what was, Ruben, to what is, and *what isis* no longer dangerous but *whatwas* is still escaping from what he considered dangerous.

Audience: It is pure fear, sustained fear.

RFG: Sure. And all these issues, we begin to see the relationships that exist between horizontal conflict, stress, flight from here, escape from being here, the essence of the lack of Unitary Perception in life, and that we live a completely fragmented and absurd life. It becomes absurd because even relationships become imaginary, something which has become acceptable, and it has become the norm that even relationships themselves become imaginary. Then we are out of relationship, we are alone.

Well, then, any comments or questions? In Buenos Aires?

Audience: No, thank you very much.

RFG: Any comments? [*Dublin*]

So, well, we leave it here and see you on Sunday at 10 in the morning.

Audience: Homework?

RFG: Homework. What do you think, shall we make contact with the imaginary patient, played by me, and you have to know what the patient's problem is?

Audience: That would be sweet.

RFG: What do you think?

Audience: Of what?

RFG: That I play the patient in a theatrical way, say, a depressed patient, and that you have to discover that he is depressed. What do you think about the idea?

Audience: Very good.

RFG: Well, then let's do that. Homework? I propose that you continue reading, I don't know if you have any special topic, topics we have not seen that you could read about: Eduardo's, the three functional precincts, Yolanda's, memory, homeostasis, epigenesis, universal mind, the mind of the electron, for example, right? They are topics that can be read because they have not been reviewed today, as we planned. What do you think?

Then we'll see each other next Sunday at 10. Thank you very much.

TOPICS - CLASS 12

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 12 (752)
- REVIEW OF FUNDAMENTAL TOPICS (752)
- INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN EXEGESIS (758)
- READING: «LÁZARUS» (JESUS OF THE DESERT) (763)
- THREE KINDS OF EXEGESIS: HOLOKINETIC, HISTORICAL AND CANONICAL (771)
- READING: «EPISTEMOLOGY OF LANGUAGE» (THE PASSION FOR SILENCE) (772)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ABOUT «EPISTEMOLOGY OF LANGUAGE» (775)
- ABOUT THE RESURRECTION BODY (780)
- DIFFICULTY WHEN TRANSPOSING WORDS IN EXEGESIS (784)
- READING: «DESIRE» (788)
- ABOUT *PALINGENESIA* (787, 791)
- READING: «DIALOGUE WITH AN INTELLIGENT SUICIDAL PERSON» (792)
- COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT THE READINGS - CLASS 12 (800)
- THE «IDENTITY OF THE SELF» AS PART OF «THE STREAM» (802)
- SILENCE AND QUESTIONS THAT ARISE FROM THE UNKNOWN (808)

- THE EXIT IS NOT INSTINCTIVE, INTELLECTUAL, EMOTIONAL OR BEHAVIORAL (811)
- THE SACRAMENTS (812)

CLASS 12

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, October 24th, 2010.

RFG: Hello! October 24, 2010, in Mexicali, Mexico. We are going to do a quick review, but first we have to say that without Unitary Perception, whatever we do, in any human discipline, will produce more disaster, more disunity than what already exists. Without Unitary Perception, disaster will increase.

Having said that, let's ask Javier –what do you think Javier? A quick review of the fundamental things we've seen before going into exegesis which is a topic that many people say we must approach. Why is Unitary Perception not a technique?

Audience: Well, Unitary Perception is not a technique because it is not a process that occurs in time and is not a process as such. Therefore, since it is a neurological and psychological fact, there is no technique to make it happen. It happens or does not happen if we are here trying to feel the weight of the body at the same time that we are listening to the sound.

RFG: Sure, so in the same way, we have to listen to all the sound at the same time and there is no technique for listening, right?

Audience: Exactly, or method.

RFG: There is no method or technique for listening, and Unitary Perception –based on that– is not a technique either, of course. Why is Unitary Perception not philosophy, Javier?

Audience: Well, philosophy is a product of thought.

RFG: Nothing more, nothing more. And if you use it or you overuse it, you never get out of thought; you never get out of

thought. And why is Unitary Perception not metaphysics, Javier?

Audience: Well, because metaphysics is a “squared” product of thought (laughter).

RFG: Exactly! It is another product of thought. And you do not get out of thought with metaphysics either. And why do we say that Unitary Perception does not unify reality or the universe? Why doesn't Unitary Perception unify reality?

Audience: Well, because what feels divided is the observer in fragmented, fragmentary perception. Actually we are one, and it is about realizing this fact.

RFG: Of course, and that everything in the universe is already united, as it is well demonstrated mathematically and in another way by David Bohm, and therefore, what is united does not need the “I” to unify it. Is any position of the body needed for Unitary Perception?

Audience: No, none.

RFG: No. In yoga there are *asanas* or positions but in Unitary Perception a particular position is not needed, because what is needed is only to be comfortable, and when one is in Unitary Perception the body gets comfortable looking for the center of gravity, and once you find it you are completely comfortable without there being a formula for the position. And when is it not advisable to teach Unitary Perception, Javier?

Audience: One shouldn't teach Unitary Perception when there is a diagnosis of mental retardation; well, in this case the person does benefit with the attempt of Unitary Perception, but of their relatives, of the people who live with them...

RFG: Of course.

Audience: The same is true for the diagnosis of schizophrenia, and with depression you can, but only when the person is medicated and has recovered rest and has the energy to attempt Unitary Perception. Then, in the case of attention deficit...

RFG: The adult needs medication.

Audience: as long as they are on the medication... [*you can teach them Unitary Perception*]

RFG: And today in children too, but also in children there is another factor that makes it difficult for them to understand Unitary Perception. Do you remember what it is?

Audience: Well, it is their structure of thought, of the concrete operations, until they reach the formal operations [stage], which more or less is at age twelve...

RFG: ...also called abstract thinking.

Audience: Abstract thinking.

RFG: Of course, since he cannot use abstract thinking he will not learn Unitary Perception in this way that we are doing it here.

We leave the rest of the questions for Yolanda, as we had planned.

What happens when a person has not slept much, and has worked a lot, has not slept well and has worked too much, or has spent a lot of time in night clubs and drinking, and is, of course, in stress? We want to attempt Unitary Perception with that person, what are we going to find in that person?

Audience: Well, they will not be able to do it because they start to feel, because of said stress, sleep, fatigue, and therefore they cannot make the attempt because they need to have rested...

RFG: Exactly, drowsiness. The person who has stress and attempts Unitary Perception will feel drowsy... what else? There are three more things...

Audience: Tingling, I think it's...

RFG: Tingling,

Audience: ...and headache.

RFG: headache... and...? Palpitations. Very good. Do you remember what the complications of stress are, in an almost chronological and almost exact way? Starting with gastritis, which is the first thing you see.

Audience: Yes, it is gastritis, then... the heart rate, right? ...high pressure, loss of immunity...

RFG: Loss of immunity...

Audience: arthritis,

RFG: arthritis...

Audience: ...ah, and metabolic syndrome.

RFG: Metabolic syndrome, yes, you're seeing it in the one who speaks. And also, ultimately, suicidal and murderous ideas. Yes, complications of stress. And how would you treat stress? What would you say to that person who does not feel the benefits, first of all peace, of Unitary Perception? What would you tell them that they need to do?

Audience: Work less and sleep more.

RFG: And sleep more. How many hours per day?

Audience: About nine hours.

RFG: Exactly. At least 8 and if possible 9 hours per day. When in general, people today are sleeping between 4 and 6 hours per night, at best. Why do we say, Yolanda, that we must read all the written work and, if possible, repeatedly? Why do we say it, is it a whim?

Audience: No, in order to not only understand the text better but to polish the language a bit.

RFG: And what is the use of polishing the language?

Audience: To be able to later teach it and transmit it to others without creating confusion.

RFG: Sure, fundamental! And polishing the language also means that our own attempt does not get out of hand –as they say here in northern Mexico– so that our attempt is not ruined by unpolished language. Like, for example, by saying “achieve Unitary Perception,” which is to put Unitary Perception in the future when it is only in the now. And also because people from Buenos Aires tell us, here we have people from Buenos Aires connected ...are they also in Ireland? Yes!

People from Buenos Aires tell us that they have been cured by reading the written work of Unitary Perception, which was written in Unitary Perception, and apparently heals. In the last workshop we did in Buenos Aires, Laura gave a testimony that she has been cured of cataracts as a sequel that her treatment against arthritis with corticosteroids produced. And there are other people who were cured of other things, reading, without knowing the author.

And another thing that is beneficial, of reading the written work completely, is that the writings are based on several human disciplines, from physics and mathematics to epistemology and other disciplines. That is to say, Unitary Perception in the written work is seen from many points of view. And why... are there two ways... No, not why, but rather, can you tell me, Yolanda, what we have said about the release of energy by the brain, that there is a harmonic way, in which the brain releases energy, and a way that is not harmonic? Can you give me examples of one way or another in which energy is released by the brain, through the cerebral cortex? Harmonic release of energy and non-harmonic release of energy. Don't you remember?

Audience: No, I really don't.

RFG: Well, the harmonic release of energy is given by Unitary Perception. All the cerebral cortex releasing energy harmonically and energizing and regenerating the organism. The example of non-harmonic release is a small lesion in the

cerebral cortex that can give a Grand Mal –great epileptic malady, where we see the enormous amount of energy released by a small lesion of the brain and it gives us an idea of how much energy the entire cortex of the brain can release in Unitary Perception. Much more energy than what can be seen in an epileptic attack that is an apparently infinite amount of energy. And what would you say if someone tells you, Yolanda, that music is sacred? (laughter)

Audience: I'd tell them "that's not true."

RFG: And why do you think that music is not as sacred as they say?

Audience: Because it is still very hypnotic, and besides it transmits the emotions of the author or the performer, and is still part of Precinct C.

RFG: Of course. Another product of thought; music.

Very good. We know that there is fear of living, of dying, fear of speaking, that there are many teachers who do not teach for fear of speaking, fear of being sick, fear of being alone, fear of poverty. If you see a person who complains about any of these fears, do you think there is a different way for each of these fears, to solve these fears that I mention? That is, are there different ways in therapy to treat these different fears, fear of living, fear of dying, fear of speaking, fear of getting sick, fear of loneliness, fear of poverty?

Audience: No, because at the end of the day it's all fear and the only way you can get rid of all that is through Unitary Perception.

RFG: Right. There is only one way out for all fears, which is Unitary Perception, and the exit is not to leave, or go shopping, the exit is Unitary Perception.

So... can we go back to Javier? If you can refer, Javier, to this topic that we have also talked about, that the I is synonymous with time and that it is synonymous with absolute time, and

then, first of all, why the I is synonymous with absolute time, and what happens with the self without the absolute time?

Audience: Well, the self without absolute time dissolves in the act of observation, in Unitary Perception.

RFG: But why is it said, repeatedly by David Bohm and by JK, that the self is synonymous with absolute time? Sometimes they do not say absolute, sometimes they say the self (since the only time that is spoken of is the absolute). They have said many times that the self is synonymous with time. Why did they say that?

Audience: Because the self is made up of precisely that cluster of images with which thought has identified, and that is a process that occurs within time, and what happened is not what is happening here at this moment, and if it does happen, it is only happening as a form of what the META process is, as an image form.

RFG: Exactly.

Audience: And the self is there, identified in time.

RFG: Yes. And if you ask a person to tell you about them: “I was born in Chaco on such a day and such a year...” the self is immediately identified with time.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Very good. So, now we can leave this. And they have written me several emails telling me that we have to dedicate some time to exegesis. That is, to the interpretation of what is called sacred, theological or Christian literature. Actually what I have said in writing, and also in the workshops many times, is that there is a Christianity up to David Bohm and another after David Bohm. And I make the difference between JesuKristos with a *K* and Jesus Christ with a *C*, and the only one we know is Jesus Christ with a *C*. But we do not know the JesuKristos with a *K*, which is the original. First of all, because of unintentional translation mistakes, the original Jesus Christ was transmitted very badly.

For example, we have spoken of the word *metanoia*, which is not necessarily repentance or conversion, but rather means going beyond thought... go beyond thought or –even further– go beyond everything we know.

And in John, chapter 3, there is talk of being born of the air... born of the air. Because the book of John is divided into: the book of signs and the book of glory. First he talks (in the Gospel of John) about the signs Jesus did and then about the glory, which is when he dies, he is buried in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, and he resurrects. That is the gospel of John, the so-called book of glory. But the book of signs is the first part. And already in chapter 2 John begins to speak of JesuKristos, in chapter 1 John is the only evangelist who speaks of JesuKristos before being a human being; all the others speak of JesuKristos when he is already a human being, when he was already born among the humans. The first thing John says is that “in the beginning was the *Logos*,” meaning that Jesus was creation itself in the name of *Logos*, and that his name was *Logos* before he was born (the Creation), the first-born son of God, that is, Creation itself. And that had a name that was *Logos*, or also, some say, Michael. And in chapter 2 the signs begin, the wedding at Cana where Jesus transforms water into wine. Water is the teaching and wine is what transforms the mind. The one who drinks the water of the teaching will be transformed, thanks to the fact that water is transformed into wine, because it transforms the mind, and that is what the Christian teaching attempts to do. Water, why water? Because of the custom of baptism that the Jews had, at the age of thirty they submerged themselves in the river, like a ritual that makes the adult life start. Back then the baptism of the newborns was not done, but of the adults, and true life began, it was supposed, a life without lies and a life of generosity and compassion.

Now, baptism means: you immerse yourself in the teaching from now on and you live it. That is the meaning of baptism, and the teaching is water. And he also says in chapter 2, before chapter 3 (when he talks to Nicodemus and tells him that he has to be born from the air): he kicks the merchants out of the temple, and what did JesuKristos say about the temple? What

was the only and most sacred temple? The human body. And kicking the merchants out of the temple, what can it mean? To throw away the merchant that we have within, always looking for profit and money, and thinking only of survival, which is necessary, but that becomes an obsession that makes us forget the sacred, forget friendship, family and true life.

Then, kicking the merchants out of the temple is a piece of advice given by John in his gospel very early, immediately after the first sign, which is to turn water into wine. To transform teaching into something that transforms. We have also seen that there is a difference between *kosmon* and *ouranon*. *Kosmon* is translated as world into European languages, which reduces its meaning. In English, the word *kosmon* becomes world, but in reality *kosmon* means cosmos, it means the universe in order. Just as chaos means the universe in disorder. *Kosmon* and *Ouranon*, right? The Cosmos and the Heavens. They are the divisions that the original Christianity makes of reality and that in each place of the universe is *kosmon* and *ouranon*, and that each one of us has to choose to live in *kosmon* (badly translated as “the world”) or in *ouranon* (in heaven). And when Jesus recommends “be fruitful and multiply,” of course it means that we grow up and that we reproduce in *ouranon*, which is in heaven, it is not in *kosmon*, it is not in the world. It doesn’t have to be in a material way, but in a spiritual way, that is, that the teaching is spread. And there is also a king of *Kosmon* who is Satan and a king of *Ouranon* who is JesuKristos. And then those two words, sadly mistranslated, are fundamental to understanding the original Christian teaching.

And there is then a resurrection in *kosmon* that is *metanoia*, going beyond everything we know, and a resurrection in *ouranon* that JesuKristos calls *anastasis*, a noun that means “to be above.” It is not a verb, but a noun: to be above.

Now, when Jesus dies, he resurrects, it becomes a verb then, but only in that case. And he leaves us *anastasis*, which is resurrection, which is a noun, for all the rest of human beings. And therefore it is not a thing that can be done by a human being but it is going to happen when the human being has

established an affinity with the fact of being above the human condition. *Anastasis* means to be above the human condition, and that fact will happen if an affinity has been established with the fact of being above the human condition during life, why? Because that person has lived in *metanoia*, that is, beyond all the known, and then establishes in that way the affinity in *kosmon*, *metanoia*, to be beyond everything known in *kosmon*, in the known universe, and then in a natural way when dying, passively, without their doing anything, the *anastasis* (noun to say being above the human condition) will happen, something that Jesus did, as I said, actively. *Anastenai* in Greek: he resurrected; but for the ordinary human being it is not *anastenai* –to resurrect– but *anastasis* –the resurrection–, a passive fact, a noun.

One very interesting thing that Paul says is that the creation groans since its inception. How is it that the creation groans since its beginning? And speaking with Bohm, Bohm says: “Well, the creation groans since its beginning because it is losing energy since it began, in something that is known in physics with the name of entropy, and then, the Sun is dying down and that's why it's yellow. It is not a new star, therefore it is not white, and this shows us, among other things, that there is an entropy, that is, a loss of energy in the universe.” This has nothing to do with the increase in energy that the person feels when attempting Unitary Perception, because they are making contact with Holokinesis, which is the contact with the one energy that is in Holokinesis.

Then we have seen that there are words that take on another meaning. Baptism means immersing oneself in the teaching, in the Christian teaching, of course, and in this way transforming consciousness. Which can even... among the things that can happen, a gift from God to alleviate human life that is called *fotizo*, which is enlightenment, also badly translated into Spanish, and the words obedience and discipline are used, words that originally meant: “obedience,” openness to life and “discipline” means to be a disciple of life. If I do not open myself to life I cannot learn from life, then I need obedience, which is openness to life, and in that way I will learn from life:

discipline. Obedience and discipline have nothing to do with following a person or following one's own tasks or plans that a person forges for him or herself.

There is talk of love and respect for the teacher of the teaching but in a brotherly way, and in Romans 12, which is a summary of Christianity that Paul makes, in his letter to the Romans, chapter 12, he says: "Honor each other," meaning that friends do not invalidate one another but honor one another. And of course, all this is related to achieving, managing and controlling Unitary Perception, which are errors because we have to return to the essence of the teaching, which is always in the right now, as repeated so many times by John, in chapter 2 : "The one who sows with the one who harvests rejoices." So, it means that it's not something that is achieved, that is managed or controlled, but something that happens in the act of sowing. The one who sows with the one who reaps enjoy at the same time. We can read... Lazarus, from an exegetical booklet that I wrote, and it is called "Jesus of the Desert." It has a chapter called Lazarus, which was the one that gave me the most work, a little book that must have... how many pages does it have? It has 45 pages, it was written in five years because before each one spoke, I read everything that person had written. For example, before Peter spoke, I read everything Peter had written and before John spoke, everything John wrote, and so on.

And Lazarus' chapter is worth reading because it is exegetically related to Unitary Perception, like everything exegetical, and Jesus of the Desert is about, precisely, that Jesus has already raised Lazarus upon the request of Marta and Mary, who were Lazarus' sisters; he raises Lazarus so that they could believe, and he weeps before doing it.

For the first time in the gospel Jesus cries, because he has to bring his friend Lazarus again to the life that ends in death. And once he brings him to life there is a banquet, called in Greek *agape*, which is also synonymous with love, social love while *eros* is the love of man and woman and *philos* is the love of parents and children. There is an *agape*, that is, a social love, and in that *agape* Marta serves, with the name of *diakoin* –

hence the word deacon, the one who serves— and serves the meal while Mary anoints the feet of Jesus with a spikenard ointment, which was very aromatic and extremely expensive, because it was imported from India. Even Judas complains: why spend so much on spikenard ointment, when there are so many people suffering, that we could give money to the poor. And Mary anoints Jesus' feet, why does she anoint Jesus' feet? Because after Jesus revives Lazarus, everyone understands that Jesus is condemned to death, why? Because everyone understood that the Roman imperial governors (the prefect in Palestine was Pilate) were going to interpret the rebirth to the life of death, which is not the resurrection, the revival of Lazarus to the life of death that Jesus does... —the Romans would interpret it as being able to build an army of the dead, with revived, not resurrected but revived men, who return to the life of death to fight against the Roman empire that occupied Palestine. And when Mary anoints JesuKristos' feet, she is implying to all those present in that *agape* that Jesus was going to die for having raised Lazarus. And why is that interpretation so? Because the only ones whose feet were smeared with spikenard ointment, or any other cheaper ointment, were dead men before being buried.

So what Mary does is to tell the audience: this is what Jesus did. And it is precisely the last sign that John tells of Jesus, the revival of Lazarus. And Mary, I insist, suggests that it will be the last, because when she smears the ointment on his feet, she is doing the same thing you do with a dead person. “From here you go to the grave.”

And many people do not know all these subtleties, these things are not talked about in the churches. And we are going to see the holokinetic exegesis of Lazarus (in the voice of Cecilia), in the book “Jesus of the Desert”, which took me five years to write, 45 pages:

[Reading begins]

“L A Z A R U S”

The thirteen friends lived together for more than two years, very humbly. They shared their bread and for that reason Jesus called them “companions” [Spanish: pan = bread; compañeros = companion] and not “disciples”.

They also shared the hunger and thirst of the good, which is to continue being good.

They had dialogues everyday about what “being good” meant.

Jesus acted as one more among them, without showing any authority.

Without his friends understanding, he asked them not to call him “good.”

They meditated alone on how to live a life full of goodness, without thinking about those who practiced evil.

They also sought silence, where the spoken word does not exist, nor the word that is thought, which is where God transforms the consciousness into Adamic and Christic consciousness, when, even if only for some instants, the human consciousness ends in one.

Jesus told them, “My bread is the super-substantial bread of God. That is, I want the will of God to be done in me, not my own will.”

One day the family of Lazarus of Bethany begged Jesus to bring his beloved John Lazarus back to the life of human flesh, after he had been buried three days before.

Jesus told the family members to love God first and then Lazarus.

He lovingly explained to them that his mission was not to restore the dead to human life, but to help the living to awaken consciousness so that they could return to the Garden of Eden, (OURANON) where death does not exist.

He begged the loving family of Lazarus to wonder if they wanted Lazarus to be condemned to death again, in human life, so that they could be satisfied.

“If you make the blind see and the paralytics walk, then you can condemn Lazarus again.”

Jesus wept, but no one understood the reason for his weeping, nor did they understand his mission or his teaching.

Jesus brought again Lazarus to the life of the flesh, in the name of the love of the relatives, in the hope that the relatives would thus love God and the eternal life of the Resurrection more.

He told them that the Resurrection begins with the awakening of consciousness, without delay, which the Greeks call “metanoia” and which is a very narrow door, which very few want to pass through, since it is about living in the attentive and vibrant silence (without selfishness) of the one who renounces the human life he knows.

The return of Lazarus caused great commotion in Jerusalem, since Bethany was in Judea, very close to the great sacred city.

When the king and the High Priest Caiaphas heard that the dead came back to life and that they could reinforce the guerrilla army of the Zealots, who put their own power in constant danger, they gave the order to arrest Jesus and his friends.

They also warned the whole population that those who knew about these dangerous thirteen should report them to the constituted authorities, at the service of the Roman Empire.

Caiaphas said it was preferable for Jesus to die and not for all of Israel to disappear at the hands of the Romans, provoked by guerrilla zealots returning from the dead.

During the second week of the forty days of the Lenten fasting, the thirteen hid in the house of one of their sympathizers, in the town of Ephraim, on the border with Samaria, in the desert that began north of Jerusalem, beyond Bethel.

Jesus, always without fear, with his whole consciousness awake, went alone to the desert, seeking silence, knowing that his days in the flesh were numbered.

The twelve friends remained in the house in Ephraim.

They were together, but in vibrant silence, in the deep communion beyond thought and words.

They only drank water and ate nothing in those few days, to facilitate the formation of the body of resurrection, the body that is not born of the vagina, but of the Holy Spirit, of the Complete Energy, of living constantly in the Truth.

Lazarus had promised to tell them about his experience of death.

Thomas said: “I come to die voluntarily with Lazarus and I find Lazarus made flesh again. All of this is very sad.”

Bartholomew Nathanael affirmed: “Lazarus could now be in the most glorious light of joy and in the truest peace, but will instead have to eat again to live, work to eat and see only dots of light in the night sky. He could be in the bosom of the total love of God, but will now have to deal with the grudging and needy love of his sisters and his mother. Now it will be much harder for him to live in the flesh and it will be much easier for him to die again.”

Each one saw Lazarus based on his own past experiences. They still had not seen him with a clean mind, without the smears of many yesterdays.

Matthew said: “Lazarus will now have to endure the envious hatred of his neighbors, the constant persecution of the army and priests, the repeated questions of those who never decide to understand, the abandonment of his former friends, fearful and too moved to renew the old relationship, and the seduction of the well fed girls, who want to give birth to a messiah with Lazarus and will tell him that they love him until they have his son. He will have to pay the high price of being alive in our human flesh: hunger and thirst, fear, rage, jealousy and

sorrows, wars, losses and grief, murderous and suicidal obsessions, the necessity of desiring the unnecessary, blood, hard work, scorn, gossip, vain efforts, sickness, feces and urine.”

Thomas Didymus, identified and enchanted as he was with Matthew’s words, only added: “He is a slave and a prisoner of his body once again.”

James the Lesser Alphaeus said: “And he will once again be a slave of each thing that he says and that they tell him, a slave of money, a pilgrim in the swamps of despondency, a person surprised by the impact of old age, a beggar of God.”

His brother Judas Thaddeus added: “And possibly a son of God, if his sleeping consciousness awakens and abandons the human life that we know.”

Judas Iscariot, excited with joy, shouted: “He will be like a god. He will have the power to revive the dead, to fight for the liberation of the Roman oppressor.”

Judas Iscariot listened to Jesus every day, but he translated the teaching into the rigid structures of memories created by his own thought.

Kephas, the chief who was the only one of the twelve to be married, and who had not seen the Holy Spirit in himself, but only in Jesus, added: “Perhaps he could have a Prophet son with an obedient girl, who transforms him into a Lord and who helps him to be God, one with God.”

His brother Andrew clarified for everyone: “Simon Kephas, you are the only one who has known what it is to live with such a woman, among us twelve. But Jesus, who is now absent, in the wilderness, does not need a good woman to help him be God.”

Philip, whom the good master had left free to do nothing, said serenely:

“I am now setting off for Bethany. In two days I will return with Lazarus, who wants to talk to us.”

They all remained silent, once Philip had left.

The silence of the desert joined with the profound silence of communion of true friends, who helped one another mutually to listen to all of the sounds of silence, all together at the same time.

The deep and multiplied silence was the good way that the good ones had, to wait for Lazarus and listen to him well, in silence.

As he had announced, Philip returned with Lazarus after two days.

After a two-day walk, both were still rested, their bodies light, after twenty-five days of maintaining themselves only with pure water.

They all drank a ladle of water and sat in a circle on the floor.

Lazarus remained standing. He waited for everyone to find the complete immobility of a well-seated body.

Lazarus said with immense calm: “Little brothers: cease to be right now.

Discover the living faith that comes when you let yourself be and when you cease to be, right now, without delay.

Do not be sad again for any reason, for I bring with me the perfume of nothingness.

There is nothing to do for everything to go well.

When you remember that death comes without being invited, forget that death comes without being invited.

If you want to listen well, do not think while you listen.

Free yourself completely from the past. Free yourself from nationalism, belief, sacrifice, from aesthetic rites. Free yourself from the enormous value that has been given to words and symbols.

Some of my consciousness was in the depths that have never been known.

But it seems as though I had never moved from right here.

Remember that time is a useful invention of human consciousness, but it does not exist in unknown depths.

Immense abundance and abundance of immensity are in the unknown.

The unknown is what does not get corrupted. It has no beginning and always changes, although it remains the unknown.

Love and beauty come from here. But the unknown of here cannot be discussed, imagined, or feigned.

From the unknown one can speak or be silent, as does our friend Jesus, who is now absent.

Now I live without money, without defenses and without the desire to have my future assured. It does not matter to me if I am in the house in Bethany, in Sacred Jerusalem or in corrupt Rome.

Suddenly, when there are no needs or necessities, the unknown arises, that consciousness which Adam had, enjoying the Garden of Eden. That consciousness remains asleep if we do not abandon the human life that we know.

I am in the freedom and the ecstasy of not thinking.

I listen to all the sound, without having anything else to do.

I am listening to the total sound of the cosmos. We forget to do this since we are children, because it is heard from the very moment of being born.

This total listening is the peace we need in this mortal life, in order to enter the true immortal life.

Now I can speak or be silent, having nothing in particular to say.

The past cannot find the sacred, which is unknown.

It is possible to be without being.

Peace fills one's being, fills this house and the entire cosmos, if one can be completely here.

Peace is here. Do not look for it there.

Peace is here now. Do not wait for it later.”

[reading ends]

RFG: Chapter named “Lazarus” from the book “Jesus of the Desert.”

So, creation groans from the beginning, baptism is to be immersed in the teaching. If there is luck, that gift of God that is *fortizo*, enlightenment, described by Theognostos as peace, energy, content for nothing; and obedience to life means openness to life to learn from it, which is discipline.

And love and respect for the teacher of teaching is not obligatory, it is something that is born when one knows what that teaching is. And then the book of signs of John; the Gospel of John is divided into the book of signs, which is the first part, which ends when Mary anoints JesuKristos' feet with the spikenard ointment, very expensive, imported from India, announcing that he was already a dead man, that he was already condemned to death for having brought Lazarus to life.

And then we see that there is a Holokinetic exegesis that is born, of course, with the concept of Holokinesis in science. It is not that it was born with the intention of having a Holokinetic exegesis but rather that the concept of Holokinesis, due to its depth, its caliber, inexorably determines the birth of a holokinetic exegesis, which is not only a historical exegesis, i.e., what something means at the time it was written, I mean, [for example] obedience meant, at the time it was written, openness to life, it did not mean following someone. And there is a canonical exegesis: what it means for those who congregate to study the written words, and a rational exegesis which is Holokinetic exegesis, i.e., what something that was written, for example in the Gospels, in the first century of the Christian era, means today. That is to say, holokinetic rational exegesis is for today's man, it is for today's generation, because otherwise it would not have any value at all. What good is it that the gospel, or the gospels or the New Testament have been written for people two thousand years ago, which is not the case? It has its value today. And what is its value today? That is what we have to discover with a rational exegesis, not with a formulated exegesis, a philosophical exegesis or a metaphysical exegesis; those are mere products of thought.

And then... how interesting that Matthew and Luke begin their gospel with the birth of JesuKristos. When we say JesuKristos we say it with a K and with a final S, which is the original name of him, in the flesh, when he is born as a human being. And Matthew and Luke start their gospels with the birth of JesuKristos, but Mark starts his gospel with the baptism of JesuKristos, at the age of 30 years, more or less. Because it seems that JesuKristos was born when the Roman census was taken in the year 4 before the Christian era. It is something that we know from history, not from the New Testament. At what time was the census carried out? In the year 4 before the Christian era.

And Mark begins his gospel at the time of baptism, so Jesus would be between 30 and 34 years old. And John, curiously, begins his gospel when the creation begins, when the *Logos*, which is the name of Jesus Christ previous to his life as a

human being, begins. That is to say that JesuKristos is called *Logos*, according to John, before he was born to human life. So JesuKristos is synonymous with *Logos*, synonymous with Creation. The firstborn son is the Creation, where everything goes and where everything comes from. It means that the word *Kristos* acquires a cosmic meaning, not of *kosmon*, but a meaning for the whole universe from the point of view of *ouranon*, from the spiritual point of view. And it also seems that JesuKristos had been called Michael, before his birth.

We have here something about language, which would also be good to see: it is “The Epistemology of Language”, which is very short and that is in... [read] down to where it says “Interlocutor;” it is a page in “The Passion for Silence”, which is the second part of the book “The mind is also Unitary Perception,” dialogue with a medical colleague.

EPISTEMOLOGY OF LANGUAGE

Dr. Rubén Feldman González: I always ask of those of you who participate in dialogues with me to always be consistent with terminology, in order to reach an epistemological precision in definitions, explanations and descriptions referring to Unitary Perception.

Without doing that, the deep dialogue that we need on Unitary Perception will not be possible.

The first paradox is formulating, clearly, from verbal memory, a mental fact (Unitary Perception) which is not of memory.

The mind is more than mere memory. It is also Unitary Perception.

The mind is the interface between matter (memory and thought) and energy (Unitary Perception).

Unitary Perception can be only reified in memory, in thought and in knowledge and for this reason this has to be lived

factually. Thinking about Unitary Perception is not living in Unitary Perception.

There is a natural longing for the silent peace of Unitary Perception which is expressed physically as yawning, in the orgasm and in laughter, because of the enormous tension created in the muscular system, by a life that is merely lived in the fragmentary perception of memory-thought.

That tension ceases in Unitary Perception, or it is only transitorily relieved in the yawn, the orgasm, in laughter, which constitute the non-verbal “boundary zone” which announces, generally unsuccessfully, the first silence of Unitary Perception.

This first silence is the suspension of language when it is not necessary.

Since there is no information or education in our culture about the most important fact of the mind (Unitary Perception), the bodily forms of muscular relaxation very rarely introduce us into the psychological Eden of Unitary Perception.

Very often we feel isolated and lonely in the psychological exile which is merely surviving in the precinct of memory and thought, knowledge, language and imagination.

In that precinct of fragmentary perception we move like sleepwalking automatons.

The home of the mind is Unitary Perception.

Humanity, many centuries ago, out of a fascination with the acquisition of language, left the psychological home of Unitary Perception. It left Eden.

In that way it condemned itself to the sad destiny of automatic and conditioned action. Hypnotic action.

The destiny of the vulgar and miserable vibration which comes with fear, anger and sadness. It is in this egoistic, egotistic or tribal precinct of mere survival, that enemies and wars are

invented, wars which have not stopped in the last five thousand years of written history.

We stimulate one another mutually to sustain (for millennia) this fragmentary perception.

Conflict and isolation are the inexorable products of memory and thought. Peace and communion, as well as spontaneous action, only last in Unitary Perception.

Attempting Unitary Perception constantly will lead to humanity regenerating and returning to its natural psychological home.

This is through a triple mechanism: the constant individual attempt of Unitary Perception, Holokinesis, and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Experiment (EPR).

It was because of a coherent set of inferences, after my first experience of “That”, in 1978, and then thanks to the dialogues that I held with David Bohm and Jiddu Krishnamurti, that I started to use the words “Unitary Perception.”

It seems to me to be the epistemologically most correct way to refer to the fact (not the idea) of the most significant peace of the human mind.

In the beginning, in the book “The New Paradigm in Psychology” (in Spanish), I called Unitary Perception “Triangular Consciousness”, because it implies transcending horizontal conflict, the duality which is the foundation of all conflict, which is the belief or assumption that the observer is separate from the observed.

“Triangular Consciousness” is the observation which includes the observer and the observed at the same time. It is necessary to emphasize this: AT THE SAME TIME (NOW).

We have to speak about the beautiful ocean of Unitary Perception from the solid ground of a coherent language. In the beginning I used the name “Spherical or Circular Consciousness” for what I now call The Second Silence or That.

That (the ineffable), is the enlightened and peaceful contingency of Unitary Perception. I believe that Spherical Consciousness or the Second Silence or That, is true life, something that goes very far beyond our mere conflictive, separatist, fearful, greedy, lonely and degenerative survival.

[Readings ends]

RFG: Do you have any questions or comments to make on all this?

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* Hello Rubén, I am Georgina.

RFG: Georgina, hello Georgina.

Audience: When you said that Jesus was called Michael, was it because of the archangel Michael?

RFG: It seems so. It seems that, at least many theologians say, they are the same person, because they were born with Creation. Like the first-born Son of God, who is supposed to be Jesus. Jesus in the earthly life but *Logos* in the life before being born. And some say that he is also Michael, but all this is theology, let's not forget. That is, different interpretations of the words. Michael, on the other hand, what does he do? He takes care of the sick, that is, takes care of health. Now the word health [*Spanish: salud*], where does it come from? It comes from salvation, what does Michael do? To save, to save from disease, what disease? The human condition, and in that aspect he is identified with Jesus. And, what is his task? "*Soter.*" *Soter*, in Greek, means salvation, but in Latin, which is closer to Spanish, it is said that salvation [*salvare*] will be given to humanity, that is, the highest health is salvation, the resurrection that is the freedom of the human condition. I do not know if I'm answering you, Georgina.

Audience: Yes, thank you.

RFG: Yes, all this is theology, but it is interesting to see it because it is necessary that words have life. Otherwise the words die if we do not give them their meaning and we do not dialogue on them. I do not know if I answered you, Georgina.

Audience: Yes, thank you.

RFG: Thanks... then... here was Natzio with ...I don't know if a question or a comment.

Audience: Yes, I had two questions. One is about entropy. Entropy is understood in absolute time, so the question is: how is entropy understood in irrelevant time? That is, I have a difficulty in that, it is similar to the theory of evolution; how do we understand that irrelevant time? Because they matter to some degree, since entropy is a fact, so that it is correctly understood. And then, the other question is about *anastenai* and *anastasis*, the difference between the verb and the noun, what is its meaning for life, or what is the difference for human life?

RFG: Yes. In the first place *anastenai* is what Jesus did, and it is in the New Testament, it is not mine. Jesus *anastenai*, that is, resurrects, and returns later, 40 days after the resurrection. Now, he even appears to 500 people, etc., after the resurrection he did. Because what is used in Greek, when one reads it in Greek, not when one reads it in European languages, any of them, where the word is always resurrection, but in Greek: "Jesus *anastenai*", means that he did his own resurrection because he is the son of God, and he is one with God in the trinity. And then he returns to what he always was, the Creation, but we are only creatures, that is, we are passive, we have been created, therefore we cannot exercise the resurrection, *anastenai*, but for us resurrection, as the New Testament also says, is *anastasis*, it is not *anastenai*. The human being has *anastasis* as promise, the pro-mission. What is the mission? Live a life in *metanoia*, because there is a promise [promise]. Before the mission is the promise of *anastasis*, which is what? Leave the human condition. Stop reincarnating, the ancients would say.

Now, that's *anastasis* and *anastenai*, more or less easy to understand. But it is not because it has ever been clarified in the Spanish languages, but because it is only understood by someone who reads the New Testament in Greek. But this is not very clear for, let's say that, an ego that goes to a church on the corner; this is never clarified as far as I know.

And regarding entropy, it's a drama. Why? When I talked about entropy with Bohm, he said that entropy was another convenient concept, just like the big bang. The big bang, he said, is very famous because a pope said it was a good explanation of creation. Sure, because there is a beginning. However, he who understands a bit of theology knows that eternity has no beginning and has no end. The only thing that has a beginning is thought, and that also has an end, that is why thought would not be considered within the sacred, because it is not in eternity; thought is in time, just like the self, and Eternity passes through it here, here, here, always here. But eternity can never be anything other than something that happens only here.

And then when we talked about entropy with Bohm, he said it was something like the big bang, a convenient thing for knowledge... which suits religious organizations. And he said that there were examples in *kosmon* itself, in this current cosmos, of situations in which entropy didn't seem to be a law, shall we say, a general law for everything that happens in the universe. It seems that there are situations in which the universe itself is re-created, things are being re-created, stars appear, and stars are still appearing. So, it means that entropy can be questioned. Although I asked Bohm, (one of my first questions was about entropy), "Ah, yes, yes," I told him in a telegram that I sent him, what I experienced in Frankfurt, when I arrived in the United States, I sent him a telegram, I said: "I lived something in Frankfurt that I think was overcoming entropy", because of the great energy that I felt. He tells me: "That's good news, but do not worry about the entropy; it remains the same." (laughs)

I mean, of course, he talked like a physicist... but that's where I told you things about situations where there are new things, and

they seem to be anti-entropic because if a star appears... then how? Is the energy being lost? Then, why does a new star appear? These are things that I really do not fully understand, and I believe that no one fully understands them, but to speak of entropy means getting in deep trouble in physics. But in theology, the relation between “creation has been groaning since its beginning,” something Paul says amazingly... and well, if it is groaning from its beginning, I think that’s in Romans, if I am not mistaken –if it is groaning from its beginning, maybe that is entropy.

Audience: It would be like a paradox equivalent to that of the human being, who at this moment is living his age and is heading towards inexorable death...

RFG: Sure.

Audience: ...but at the same time that is not the case.

RFG: Sure! Of course, Unitary Perception, no matter how old the person is, always feels subjectively, well, subjectively is a word I try to avoid because it would be contradictory with everything we say. Let's say, one feels that when one attempts Unitary Perception the energy increases, and it is something “objective.”

Audience: And consensual.

RFG: It is consensual and objective, therefore... better to say consensual than objective. It is something that others can also see. That is, we have seen it with Cecilia, how energy increased, something that surprised both of us. I was very surprised and I suppose that she was too. And that's all I can answer about this question.

Audience: Thanks.

Well, then, something that you liked, and that I think is worthwhile to read, is about desire, right?

Audience: I wanted to ask you before... for example this text from... I wanted to ask about the writing of Jesus of the Desert,

is it a new type of exegesis, that had never been done, or had it been done, I don't know, putting yourself in the place of...

RFG: Jesus of the Desert.

Audience: Yes, to put yourself in the shoes of... in this case of some of the twelve friends who were there, is it exegesis...?

RFG: No, they are all there!

Audience: Yes, but I do not know if they all spoke...

RFG: Eh, no.

Audience: At that moment I think not,

RFG: No, not all of them speak.

Audience: but everyone speaks throughout the book. That is, it is a new type of exegesis... because if the definition of exegesis is the interpretation of the words and you said another word a while ago, something referring to the language...

RFG: Well, what we said about exegesis is that it can be historical, canonical or rational-holokinetic. That is, historical: let's see, what did they mean when they wrote this; at that moment the words had another meaning and another use. For example: *eli eli lmana sabactani*, mistranslated as "God, God, why have you forsaken me?" is actually something that is used today –differently than two thousand years ago or in the same way but it was mistranslated? For example, "I am going to get married on Friday," "aah, *lmana sabactani*," in Palestine it is used like that, in modern Aramaic, "are you going to get married on Friday? For this you were born. *lmana sabactani*." It means that the words of Jesus would not be: God, God, why have you forsaken me, *eli, eli, lmana sabactani*, but "God, God, I was born for this." Very different. Very different. So, we are talking about an exegesis that presents us with a different, very different JesuKristos. That is why I say that there is an exegesis up to Bohm and another after Bohm. Starting from Holokinesis because it allows us and obliges us, it almost forces us, to think in a more current way, to update

the interpretation of what is written. And in Lazarus, I knew that Lazarus had to be reinterpreted, as I did in this chapter, but it is nothing that is not in the New Testament, simply reinterpreted. That was your question, was not it?

Audience: Yes, yes, I am saying it because if someone... I put myself in the place of someone who wants to debunk... and I can say that that was never said anywhere... words are being put where there was not.

RFG: Well, that is what any exegete does; Bultmann who is one of the best known, and any other, yes, they use other words to explain the words he is explaining, because we cannot explain the word comb by saying comb. You have to say it is an instrument used by the bald to fight over the Falklands (laughter). That's what someone said during the Falklands war: "two bald guys fighting for a comb" No... "Two bald guys fighting over a comb" (Argentina and England).

So... that's what JK said, of course. And... to define a comb, well, an instrument to untangle your hair, right? An instrument for arranging your hair. You have to use other words to explain, to define, and the exegesis is that, the use of other words to understand words. Now, in that sense, the paragraph of Lazarus is exegetical because it fits completely into the context of the New Testament, there is nothing misplaced there.

Audience: Here is a question, in Buenos Aires.

RFG: Go ahead, Buenos Aires.

Audience: Hello Rubén, I'm Tomás.

RFG: Hello, Tomás!

Audience: Hello. My question was about the resurrection body, which was mentioned in the chapter of Lazarus, and it is related to fasting, isn't it?

RFG: Yes, they prepared themselves with fasting to have more affinity for going beyond everything known, including eating,

and they did forty-day fasts, you know well, before Easter. What is called in English *lent*, which is to slow down the acceleration of life, and is also called in Spanish *Cuaresma*, which really, originally, people took very seriously and spent forty days fasting, drinking only water. It was said that in that way they were better prepared, not only for the beginning of summer, because they had overloaded, during the winter, with food, and now summer was coming and they did not need so much weight and had to be unloaded, then a fast of forty days was very beneficial to the body, but also, it had a spiritual meaning, to be ready beyond the known to await the resurrection, to wait for Easter. Easter means resurrection, let's not forget. Easter Sunday means Sunday of resurrection. And everything before that was fasting at some point. I do not know if I'm answering you, Tomás.

Audience: Yes, except for the definition of the resurrection body. What would the resurrection body be?

RFG: Well, there is a whole chapter by Paul, which is the chapter [15] if I'm not mistaken, of Corinthians 1, that if you want to hear, I have it in English here. We can look at it, if you want. Are you interested?

Audience: Yes, yes.

RFG: Do you think it is necessary, Tomás, that we look at what Pablo said?

Audience: We are interested, we are interested!

RFG: I have it in English so I'll translate it... it's First Corinthians, Chapter 15 that speaks of the resurrection, I think it's [1 Corinthians] 15... Here it is: "But if it is preached that Christ has been raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? If there is no resurrection from the dead, then Christ has not risen (that is, has not left the human condition), and if Christ has not risen, then preaching is something empty and all faith is something empty. Yes, and we find false witnesses of God because they have testified of God that he has risen, that God raised up

Christ (he raised himself up), because if the dead do not rise then Christ has not been raised, and if Christ has not been raised your faith is futile, insignificant and you are still in the human condition. Then all those who have fallen asleep have perished” (that is, those who have died have ceased to exist). There is a word that is *gehenna*, which in Hebrew is *Sheol*, that refers not to hell but to a place where those who have died before dying go. People who feel dead before they die and stop living life before they die physically, go not to hell but to a place called Gehenna, which was a valley that was near Jerusalem, and they are there. What for? To be completely destroyed, that is, they stop being alive in hell or in heaven, but they disappear completely as entities. It is a third word that many people do not know about Christianity. There is heaven, there is hell and there is *gehenna*, which is the place where those who are going to be completely destroyed go. I think this is what he is referring to here... and then... all those who have fallen asleep have perished, have disappeared, those who have fallen asleep do not go to heaven or to hell, those who have died before dying, something which is known with the word zombie too.

Audience: Rubén, isn't that purgatory, aren't you talking about purgatory?

RFG: No, no, it is not the purgatory, which is the preparation for heaven, nor is it hell or heaven, but *gehenna*, a word that has not been talked about in Christianity much and therefore, it is a fact you can find in the bible, in the New Testament, but it is not explained that they are beings that because they are not alive, because they died before dying, they do not go to hell or to purgatory or to heaven. But what Paul is saying, which seems to me a bit funny –I do not know if he jokes or not–, but he explains it in this way and says: “God gives bodies as he wants, and each seed its own body. All flesh is not the same flesh but there is one kind of flesh that is of human beings, another kind of flesh that is of animals, another of fish and another of birds.” (Different flesh, right? Different bodies. This seems like a joke or a didactic form of Paul to talk about the resurrection body.) “And there are also celestial bodies and

terrestrial bodies but the light or glory of the celestials is one and the glory of the terrestrials is another. There is a glory that is that of the sun and another glory that is that of the moon.” Glory means light. “And another glory of the stars, because a star differs from another star in its glory, in its light.” And he also says, speaking of the resurrection body, he says: “There is also the resurrection of the dead, and the body is sown in corruption but rises in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, (that is, we enter the dishonor of the human condition, which is pure suffering, the valley of tears) but it rises in glory (that is, in light). It is sown in weakness and rises in energy.” He is referring to *anastasis*, to the resurrection, that is, he rises in the energy, which is that of Unitary Perception, the *metanoia* in life, which becomes the energy of resurrection in death, and is sown in the natural body and rises in the spiritual body. “There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body, and so it is written, the first man, Adam, became a living being and the last Adam (who would be JesuKristos) became a spirit that gives life.” That is, Adam became a living being but the last Adam, who is JesuKristos, became a being who gives life, who allows a return to heaven, say, or *anastasis*. “However, the spiritual is not the first thing, but the natural and then the spiritual. The first man was of the earth, made of dust, the second man is of the Lord of heaven.” The first man is Adam, and the second man, i.e., JesuKristos, is the Lord of the Heavens.

Audience: The first made of the earth and the second made of the heavens.

RFG: The first is made of dust and the second is made of the heavens, *ouranon*. *Ouranon* also means distant and unsociable, in Spanish language [*huraño*]. So, holy is he who becomes a little distant to *kosmon*, to the world. It is another interpretation of the saint, which departs from the world, why? Because he wants to enter *ouranon*. That is where the word comes from, that you want to approach heaven, therefore you become distant from what is worldly, whatever the world is, with *kosmon*. And just as the man of dust was, so are those who are made of dust, and the man of heaven is thus made, with heaven.

So, this is more or less what Paul is saying about resurrection, that it is really another body, isn't it? What he is trying to imply is that it is something that is not of the human condition, it is the freedom from the human condition, and therefore it is not the human body that the human will get, but a celestial body, a body... seeing this with Bohm, if what sees is all there is, we become *what sees*, which is all there is. We become the universe, because we never cease to be the universe; our own body is the universe already, if we understand Holokinesis well, if we understand the implicit order well. We are all one in the implicit order, so we all are the entire universe as well. Why? Because of the EPR, for all the demonstrations we have seen in physics, we are the universe even in body, both in life and in death, then we would become the *ouranon* universe, which sees everything, **which is what sees**. I don't know if I'm answering you, Tomás.

Audience: Yes, thank you.

RFG: Thank you, Tomás.

Audience: Yes, I have a question. Does resurrection have something to do with getting out of the explicit order, or something like that, that is, it has to do with coming out of creation?

RFG: No, no, it is to enter into creation. That is, we are in one aspect of creation, using the word aspect badly, which is... let's call it *kosmon*, and what you are saying with the word resurrection, which is *anastasis*, is to be above *kosmon*, in the same place but in another aspect that is *ouranon*, which is heavenly. And both are of creation, both *kosmon* and *ouranon* are part of creation. That is to say...

Audience: Both are explicit order.

RFG: ...and the problem is in transposing... what you are trying to do is to transpose the Bohmian language to the Christian language, and transposing words from one worldview to another is the most difficult thing in exegesis; it is very difficult to make a passage of words. For example, in

Buddhism there is the word *sunya*, which is for me possibly one of the most important words in Buddhism, as well as *upaya* which means a stratagem for you to wake up; and *sunya* that gives rise to the Spanish word *sueño* (dream), has been translated as void, but in reality, for me, the more I read of *sunya* the more I realize that he is talking about Unitary Perception. It means that the best translation of *sunya* would be Unitary Perception, in my view. And so, it becomes difficult to transpose words. That's why I think what Bohm gives us is a new way of speaking, that's why I say, let's polish the language because it gives us a language that will make it easier for us to understand the sacred in a new way, without needing to make transpositions of languages. Is the implicit order *ouranon* and the explicit order *kosmon*? That would be a possible transposition of languages, from the original Christian language with K, to the language of Bohm. [To see] if it is legitimate, we would have to open a very serious, very deep dialogue to see if it is possible to do that transposition in that way. One feels tempted to do that transposition because in the implicit order is all the energy and there is only one energy and from there everything comes and everything goes there, which is as described by John in his first chapter, the word *Logos*, "in the beginning was the *Logos*", this is how the Gospel of John begins, which is the only Gospel that begins with eternity, with Jesus before being born as a human being. All the other gospels begin when Jesus is already a human being, either because they begin when he is being baptized or they begin when he is being born. But John is the only one, which is why it is the most exceptional of the Gospels, that takes Jesus to the beginning of Jesus, when his name was *Logos*, the Creation. I do not know if I'm answering...

Audience: Yes, thank you very much Rubén. Could it be that there is an inference in temporality? That is to say, the implicit order is supposed to be timeless and creation is supposed to be temporary, right?

RFG: Sure, sure.

Audience: So... if *ouranon* also belongs to creation, then it could not be equated with the words implicit order.

RFG: What did you say? If the light...?

Audience: If *ouranon* is the creation, it could not be equated with the implicit order...

RFG: Oh no. No, Gabriel, *ouranon* is not creation. The creation comprises *ouranon* and *kosmon*. First verse of the whole Bible.

Audience: Sure, sure, that's what I mean. If *ouranon* is also part of the creation, it could not be the implicit order, because the creation is temporary and the implicit order is timeless.

RFG: Exactly, exactly. I would even keep in mind that the word "ground" that JK uses and that can be translated as creation, there is a moment when JK says: "and there is still something beyond the 'ground'." That is to say... there is room for more dialogue on all this. What I just said is in the book: "The Ending of Time," mistranslated [to Spanish] as "Beyond Time," which is the dialogue between JK and David Bohm.

So, we have to be careful with transposing and that's what many exegetes do, and they get confused and confuse others, it is transposing languages. Even comparisons that I have seen between Buddhism and Christianity, which are poorly made. You can make a good comparison between Buddhism and Christianity in terms of their similarities, but we have to give up and see that they are teachings with some differences, even though they have tremendous similarities. Transposing, say, the Christian language into the Buddhist language is something that some have dared to do, but they have received tremendously severe criticism. And that criticism was well founded. I was also tempted to make a comparison between the two, and there is in the written work a comparison between Buddhism and Christianity (in the work written by me), but I take care not to make transpositions from one to another, because obviously they could cause confusion. For example, the word *upaya* does not exist in Christianity, it means that which wakes you up, the stratagem that God makes for you to wake up. And if the word *sunya* exists, it would have to be the word *metanoia*. I translate *Sunya* as Unitary Perception, and

metanoia, in Christianity, I also translate it as Unitary Perception, because it seems to me the most logical way, epistemologically. But transposing is always dangerous, transposing languages.

Audience: Thank you very much.

RFG: On the contrary. Well, then we would read “Dialogue with an intelligent suicidal person”, recommended by Juan Carlos, from Temuco, Chile. Because we've already read “Lazarus” from Jesus of the Desert...

Audience: And what about desire? Will we not read about desire?

RFG: We read “Desire” and we go to the break, what do you think?

Audience:[From Buenos Aires] Rubén, what is *palingenesia*?
[Inaudible in the video]

Audience: There is a question ...

Audience: It was about the text that we have read, that sometimes in Paul's text there are comments that seem irrelevant but the deepest understanding, when he says the difference between light from one star and another.

RFG: Yes! Well, the funny thing is that Paul is using these comparisons only to talk about the resurrection body, and he does it in a poetic way and to my understanding even humorous and intelligent. I believe that Paul is a great writer, very intelligent.

I would leave Georgina's question about *palingenesia* for the second part. And if you don't mind, we would read, since we started a little later, “Desire” which is nothing more than a page, before the break.

This was read in Chile and they also liked it, read the comment you make about this...

Audience: From the top?

RFG: Yes.

DESIRE

Audience: It says: “I had not read this letter of yours about desire. It is “a pearl”, as we say of something valuable. It would be great as first thing you read in one of your books, as an introduction or on the lapel. J. Krishnamurti was right when calling desire “the jewel.” In the understanding, in Unitary Perception, of its movement, the limitation, narrowness and stupidity that the mind provokes is the essence of religion, of energy, of the religion of truth. A hug.”

And he says, speaking of desire... he says:

Desire can have a vehemence that draws us in a zoological way, or it can be an obsession that cooks us inside. And when we want to dominate it, it flings us from its back, like a wild horse.

And thought, with its law of hypnotic duality, classifies desire in “good and bad.”

This just complicates things, for the understanding of desire.

We almost agonize, in the pleasure and suffering of wanting something.

We pray, we meditate, we use a thousand techniques for controlling desire, after having lost money, energy, time, loved ones, etc, because of desire.

The animal impulse becomes lukewarm obsession, but both are “desire.”

It is urgent not to express desire and to see it in Unitary Perception, see it while we perceive all of the perceptible (sound, color, form, gravity, at the same time).

In that way desire ceases immediately.

But thought loves desire, and its imagining brings about the return of desire as obsession.

Intelligence brings about the return of Unitary Perception with its immediate peace, the immediate end of desire.

If we have made Unitary Perception our only desire, we will attempt UP again and peace without desire returns.

The immense energy of desire is now the energy of UP.

Then it is possible to live more and more time in UP, without wasting our energy in desire.

The joy without cause which the energy of UP brings is the way to confirm that it is possible to live without desire (and to one's advantage).

If we seek that advantage, desire returns.

UP does not seek anything, does not desire anything. Its energy cures desire, ends desire. There is no freedom for desire to act.

There is freedom without origin or objective. That freedom is enormous energy.

The joy of that new freedom exceeds all pleasure that is known by memory or imagined by it.

UP is attention without motive, which does not focus on anything in particular.

This mind can be visited by Universal Consciousness.

That consciousness is incompatible with the desire for fame, profit, power or pleasure.

That consciousness does not know enemies and does not participate in wars.

RFG: Any comments or questions? Desire, the "jewel," as JK called it, because if we can do what he proposed, a tremendous energy is actually produced. I have tried and it is a tremendous energy that occurs when one can see the desire, without expressing it and without repressing it. It's like burning... it's like burning, and after that it either reappears, if it had

disappeared, or a great energy continues. I think that's why JK calls it the "jewel." Well seen, it is a huge source of energy. "Well seen" means seeing [desire] without expressing it and without repressing it. That is what JK proposes, which is difficult to understand because if I do not express it, then I repress it... No, no, no! I neither express it nor repress it. That is, see it, without denying it and without condemning it but neither expressing it, then... one burns, and in that burning comes a very great energy that without a doubt has its origin in holokinesis, of course. A great energy.

And well, we leave it here, with the idea of returning in about fifteen or twenty minutes.

Audience: Ruben, when you say to observe the desire... at the beginning it often happens that you feel a physically awful discomfort, don't you?

RFG: Absolutely, absolutely.

Audience: Ah, well... (laughs)

RFG: That's why I say it's like burning... "I want, I want" ...and seeing it without giving it expression is literally like burning, like burning.

Audience: And it appears every ten seconds.

RFG: Yes, but if one sees it, the desire really disappears and gives rise to a tremendous peaceful energy. Tremendous... which can be... –which *IS* what gives you the next day – because I have done this at night– and gives you the next day a wonderful energy that improves relationships. That is what energy does, it improves everything that one does; it is something very beautiful, very beautiful. I think that's why JK calls desire "the jewel," because seeing it is not easy, right? Seeing it in that way that he proposes. But it definitely brings a tremendous energy, if one can do it –as you can– that energy, that energy. Yes.

Well, we take a break.

[15 minute break]

RFG: Well, we started the second part of the class of October 24, 2010, here in Mexicali, communicated with Buenos Aires and with Ireland. And there is a question from Buenos Aires that refers to *palingenesia*, and it is a word that has given and, of course, continues to give, theologians and exegetes much to talk about, because there is an interpretation that we can call... a Catholic exegesis, let's say, in which Jesus tells his friends: "you who have followed me in regeneration" (*palingenesia*: regeneration) –that is a way of seeing it. That means that he regenerates, JesuKristos, and the friends who try to regenerate have followed him in regeneration. But there are also other exegetical interpretations, where it is said that *pali* means old and *genesia* means genesis, it means birth. Therefore that old birth is equal to reincarnation, then it could be interpreted that Jesus is saying "you who have followed me in reincarnation," and that it is not the first time that they are together as friends, investigating the truth, investigating life. So there we have two exegetical interpretations. I do not know if I'm answering, I think it was Georgina who asked the question, right?

Audience: Of course, it caught my attention because I understood reincarnation, and it did not... it upset me... of Jesus talking about I don't understand...

RFG: Yes, but, more in context, it would be: "you have followed me in regeneration" rather than in reincarnation, although when JesuKristos speaks with Nicodemus, in John chapter 3, he is not denying reincarnation but is saying that it's not necessary. What he is saying to Nicodemus is that it is not necessary to reincarnate or be born from below, but that what is necessary is to be born from above, and then he says "to be born from the air," *pneuma*, which was translated as spirit, *pneuma*. But in reality *pneuma* in Greek means air. So what he is recommending, in chapter 3 of John, JesuKristos to Nicodemus at midnight, with John as the only witness, is that he be born again of the air, or rather, he does not say again; he tells him to be born of the air, and it was translated as "you have to be born of the spirit." But he is not saying that reincarnation does not exist. That's why *palingenesia* is

translated by some as “you who have followed me in reincarnation,” as if to stop pestering with that issue and now be regenerated and therefore you won’t have to reincarnate. That is what is implicit in “you who have followed me in *palingenesia*.” And then you can interpret that regeneration is not incompatible with reincarnation.

Audience: Rubén, but it does not mean that he is claiming it or approving it as such. Rather, that belief of reincarnation, as it was conceived, was widespread and known at that time by all and in that sense I think Jesus was saying it, but not because he assured that it really exists, as it is understood, right?

RFG: Yes. Nowhere does he say he approves or disapproves, but what he says to Nicodemus is that reincarnation is not necessary. That's what he says...

Audience: that was his belief [of Nicodemus].

RFG: ...yes, we can wake up and we can be free from the human condition and we can begin to be related to the resurrection. That is what Jesus Christ is saying to Nicodemus, in chapter 3 of John, which I believe is the summit of the Bible.

And now there is a friend in Temuco, Chile, who started to meet there and they read the paragraph that we are going to read now, which is the “Dialogue with an intelligent suicidal person.” It is in the book “Unitary Perception,” which was the second book that came out, chronologically after “The New Paradigm in Psychology” and I do not know if you want to read it... we are going to read the “Dialogue with an intelligent suicidal person.”

DIALOGUE WITH AN INTELLIGENT SUICIDAL PERSON
Dialogue n° 18 of the book “Unitary Perception.

Interlocutor (I): What is the relationship between synchronicity and the implicate order? I see that it has its origin there, but I would like to understand it better.

Rubén Feldman González (RFG) : Do not understand it better. Understand it well. Synchronicity is the reflection of Holokinesis in the explicit order. Perhaps it is better to say that it is the manifestation of what is involved. Oh words! The known reality has its foundation and its sustenance in Holokinesis. Do you see it?

I .: Yes, of course, after listening to your talk at the Ateneo de Caracas and having a one-to-one conversation with you that lasted about two hours, I see that synchronicity is expressed symbolically in the explained order of the phenomena.

RFG: Why symbolically? Have you not seen how it manifests itself in the facts? Holokinesis, which is inferable from the facts, plays a basic role in the drama of all existence, including wars, revolutions, repression, hunger, confusion, deforestation, environmental pollution, lack of real education and the global collapse of industrial civilization. That is why Unitary Perception is so important, which is the psychological contact with Holokinesis or if you want to put it another way: Unitary Perception is consciousness in Holokinesis.

I .: But the family and the daily work, the routine causes Unitary Perception and the contact with the sustenance of life and creativity to be lost.

RFG: That is the same as saying that truth and responsibility are outside of myself.

I .: But it is true that one is trapped in laws, habits, customs, judgments, ideas, obsessions, beliefs, emotional reactions, behaviors and predilections, right?

RFG: Yes, but all that arises from the explicit order of the mind not perceived unitarily, but fragmentarily. Unitary Perception is the end of the trap, the end of the corral; I mean the corral of obsession, reaction, predilection, etc. You and your girlfriend are going to break up when you don't see the paradox in your relationship, when fear, anger and sadness, not seen together in Unitary Perception, devour sex and love in the couple (to give you an example).

I .: Sure, we are not creative and we believe that there is only one way to communicate.

RFG: They know it.

I .: We know it.

RFG: And is there another?

I .: I guess so, but...

RFG: Those are fairy tales. In the facts, is there a unitary, friendly, fresh, peaceful, joyful and spontaneous way of communicating without the reactions of fear, anger, suspicion and sadness?

I .: You said that synchronicity reflects the internal in the external and vice versa.

RFG: No, the internal and the external in your consciousness are both part of the explicit order. Synchronicity is the reflection of the implicate order in the explicate order, in that constant movement between the two, which Bohm calls "Holokinesis."

I .: Let's talk more about the evidence of that.

RFG: Do you know that a teacher spoke about evidence two thousand years ago, in such a clear way that it cannot be improved?

I .: Jesus?

RFG: That's right, according to the Gospel of John (Chapter 20), in that chapter we are told that there is:

1. Insufficient evidence.
2. Sufficient evidence.
3. Unnecessary evidence.

John relates that Mary Magdalene saw Jesus after his tomb was empty and does not recognize him. The evidence is insufficient.

Thomas the twin, one of the twelve apostles, a week later, considers that the evidence is sufficient, only when he puts his fingers in the holes of the wounds of the hands of Jesus. Jesus tells him: "Even if there is no evidence, it is enough." The evidence is not necessary.

You heard me relate my conversation with Jiddu Krishnamurti and Bohm, where Bohm states that 90% of the phenomena of matter and energy are invisible.

Holokinesis is invisible but it is only experienced in Unitary Perception, in you, right now, without future. Perhaps there is no evidence of the most important thing in existence, except the very evidence of the facts in Unitary Perception.

I .: And you say that this is the end of conflict, the end of sadness and that is why I ask you to explore this topic further.

RFG: You can explore with words as far as words can. Then we must observe the facts in Unitary Perception at every moment.

For how long are we going to squeeze the lemon of words?

I .: I have contemplated suicide. Everything seems insignificant to me. Everything seems degraded, mediocre and corrupt.

RFG: And what do you want to see? Do you want to see the invisible or not?

I .: My consciousness reduces everything to what is explicate.

RFG: And to the explicable. Is there something implicate?

I .: When you talk about a new psychological paradigm, you try to explain what is implicated. Doing so creates difficulties in language comprehension because you use words with a new

meaning and change the meaning of old words, as in any revolution, in this case a revolution of broad psychological understanding. Paradoxically, then, our communication is fragmented, when I understand the old way (or I do not want to understand the new one).

RFG: Let's go then beyond communication. Let's enter into communion, into Unitary Perception, listening to everything now, for a moment without words. If there is that communion we will both "touch" so to speak, the implicate at the same time, and then we will put, as Bohm says, "new wine in old bottles."

In Unitary Perception, order is generated, a non-sequential, non-gradual order. The spatial sequences and the gradualness in time become irrelevant in that generative order of Unitary Perception.

I .: You are repeating, in other words, that order can exist, RIGHT NOW, but I choose disorder with my fragmentary perception.

RFG: It is not that order can exist now.

Order already exists. You have disconnected from that order by entering time (the gradual or the sequential) in your observation. You know, your methods, techniques, comparisons, etc. The generative order exists in nature, mind and society, but we introduce disorder by fragmenting or dividing that generative order.

Intelligence reacts to corruption and social collapse for example, and the desire to escape overcomes the highest form of intelligence, which is the contact with the implicate order that still exists in disorder and apparent chaos. When the anguish emerges, the desire to kill others or kill oneself prevents the Unitary Perception of the peace that already exists, of the order that already exists. The implicate, timeless, unitary, generative order is expressed in the explicit, temporal, gradual, sequential or fragmentary order. It is this

fragmentary order that sees suicide or war as a solution. Is it not clear?

I .: Or one can survive in that fragmentary order, believing that this is “all there is” and if you tell me that there is a different order, implicate and unitary, that ends conflict, I do not want to get out of what little I know.

RFG: That's right. It is not enough to survive; it is possible to live well.

I .: That living well would be what you call “a celebration of silence.”

RFG: Partly, yes. A party of silence where everyone in a social or family group can be heard because everyone understands that everything important may come from the mouth of everyone in that group and that everyone has something important to contribute. This received the name of communion, a word today “discredited.” Those who want to be teachers, those who want power or gain discredit the word communion... they invalidate it.

I .: It gets invalidated because communion was corralled in religious, political or scientific organizations, instead of being pure and true communion. We fall into preaching peace instead of peace, instead of being really at peace.

RFG: That's right. Bohm says that you have to “melt the heart and release the intelligence.” What good is the intellectual clarity of ideas if we remain in the rigidity of our multiple divisions and separations?

Krishnamurti has told me that Unitary Perception is only the necessary beginning of the real contact of the mind with the transcendent, with that which cannot be thought or explained. That is so and now I remember it.

I .: Perhaps my reptilian brain can no longer change its generative structures of predilections, violence, hatred, fear, suspicion, condemnation, anguish, anxiety, sadness and escapes.

RFG: Mind and brain are two explicit aspects of Holokinesis, which is generating molecular matter and quantum energy several times at the same time and in the same place.

If you understand this, how can you say that the brain structures where violence and sadness arise cannot change? They are changing several times in every second! The question then is: What gives continuity to violence, which in turn arises from something that is in constant and rapid change?

I .: It's what you told me before; the whirlpool continues in the river until it becomes one with the river.

RFG: That's right, but that's a beautiful metaphor. The reality is violence and sadness that make you think about killing others and killing yourself, isn't it? It is incidental that this violence turns towards others or towards oneself. What is relevant is how that violence is perceived or felt. Do you feel it in Unitary or fragmentary Perception?

I .: Before I know how to differentiate between them and decide to live in Unitary Perception, as you say, I have to feel alive.

RFG: To stop being a zombie?

I .: To stop being a zombie, that's right. I cannot know what life means if I do not know what it is to be alive first.

RFG: It is being in Unitary Perception, resting from your ideas and beliefs, taking "vacations" from your anger and sadness, leaving your work, your tobacco, your television, your alcohol and your phone for a few days at least. Let yourself rest in the void for a few days. See what it is to live in Unitary Perception. See what it is to live.

I .: You say that when I avoid the void I become a zombie, that I fragment my energy, which is my life, that I spend it in the office, on telephone calls that hide despair, or that I seek shelter in television ...

RFG: Or getting angry with someone or saddened by something to believe that you are alive. But that anger and sadness show you your zombie status, full of the past. The past has already died and you are full of that. There is no empty space in you so that you can experience every new moment of real life, that is, every moment of the unknown.

I .: I live assuring the future with my beliefs and ideologies, looking for prestige, power or profit, to ensure the future I lose my present life. By securing the future in this way I do not have time to exist now.

RFG: A zombie.

I .: Will Unitary Perception save my soul as a zombie?

RFG: A zombie is soulless, a soulless and lifeless being. The word soul came from the Hindu word atman, but then it was translated badly as a psyche, which in Greek means “mind” and which in Hindu is manas. You see how words confuse us.

Forget your soul, the atman and psyche, if you want to save your soul. Rest, rest in emptiness. Rest in the instinctive, intellectual, emotional and behavioral void for a few days.

I .: I must not look for meaning in my life.

RFG: No. Live the meaning (the Logos). Do not look for it.

I .: It is not a matter of looking for life, but to live it. Simply.

RFG: Simply. Forget even your name. Your name is more useful to me (if I had to call you) than to yourself.

I .: And to forget my name I enter Unitary Perception, is not it?

RFG: By forgetting the name of each thing you are alive and in contact with everything that is happening inside and outside of you.

I .: And the ultimate meaning of everything will be perceived in great peace. *[Reading ends]*

RFG: Well, I don't know if you want a dialogue about this dialogue, which has many things... among others, that "I have thought about suicide," he says. The final solution, that is, when in Central Europe they talk about the final solution of all European problems, and that the final solution begins with war, that is, it is as if there were nothing other than suicide as a final solution, right? And it seems that it was a habit of the human mind, the mind of the collective consciousness, final solutions, and not the solutions that come from dialogue, that come from intelligence or from peace. I say that if there is no peace of Unitary Perception, I said it at the beginning, whatever we do is not going to be more than disaster, greater disaster than there is. And I see that more and more clearly. Then the final solutions, the first thing that has to be eliminated, the habit of our thinking, the final solution of the couple has to be divorce because if you tell me something I do not like, it's over. And so, all the final solutions are precisely that, ways of solving things in an extreme way and not in a rational, dialogued, peaceful way. That is one of the things, we can say, central to this dialogue. And the final solution is mentioned as a habit of thought, that "we are going to finally solve this." That is to say... in the Austrian Empire the final solution begins to be used with gypsies. "So, do they steal children?" The final solution: "kill all the gypsies." Then the Austrian empress gives to the gypsies, so as not to fall into that genocidal final solution, she gives each gypsy a house, and the gypsies, as they also have a habit of thinking and living, put the cows in the houses and they live outside. (laughter) It's in the history of Europe, something that surprises me very much...

Audience: That shows the high concept they have of the people living in the houses.

RFG: Exactly, but I think the gypsies did it as an act of dignity. "You give us a house as if to say that we ...that we do not know how to live in houses, and no, it is that we have chosen to live an itinerant life, as a way of life." Then they get back [at the empress] that way, putting the cows in the houses. It was an act of ethnic dignity against the Empress. But in

European history it's like a stain on gypsies. Now... I do not know if there will be another comment on this dialogue... question or comment.

What this SPC [*Course*] has, compared to the previous one, is that there have been fewer questions, that's why we have gone faster and completed the program more quickly.

Audience: During the break, the difference between the *Gehenna* Valley, which would be the zombies, which are also spoken of in this dialogue, and hell came up.

RFG: Yes. *Gehenna* means the complete destruction of the entity. That is to say, you no longer live in hell, or in purgatory, or in heaven, but you disappear as an entity in creation. That is the place of *Gehenna* in Christian teaching, which is not much discussed and often interpreted as hell, but in reality it is something else, it is like a fourth post-mortem state. It means total extinction. It is not necessarily hell, where the entity continues... the being continues to live in hell, shall we say.

Audience: Is total extinction possible?

RFG: Of course, that is what is implied in the word *gehenna*. Which was precisely... the word comes from the geography of Palestine of the year zero, which is a place south of Jerusalem that is called like that, something like Gehenna... Hinnom, the land of Hinnom where they put garbage, things that no longer were used, even bodies that they burned, but not completely, and ended up getting eaten by worms. And then the *gehenna* will be referred to in the New Testament as a place where nothing will be left of that entity, of that being. It is not hell, purgatory or heaven. The funny thing is that this is not much talked about in the churches or in the dialogues about Christianity, so in reality what they do is to identify *gehenna* with hell, something that is theologically inadequate.

Audience: Yes, because in addition, let's say, without Unitary Perception there is no termination.

RFG: Of course! Continuity! Continuity of what? Of that which I call “me,” which is, let's say, the distillation of the collective consciousness that JK called “The Stream.” The collective consciousness is distilled in Ruben, say, in each one of us, and that is what continues. And it seems that continues, according to *The Stream* even after death, in the form of a ghost, and perhaps even continues, according to many theologians, in the form of reincarnation. It means that continuity is, let's say, like the punishment of not understanding the word *metanoia*, which is, in my opinion, translatable as Unitary Perception, which Jesus himself seems to mention in Greek, koine Greek, and which means: “Let us go beyond everything known.” If we do not do it in life, we do not establish an affinity with *anastasis*, which is resurrection, and therefore we continue, we continue as a ghost or as a reincarnation. That is what is implied for many theologians, despite what we have already discussed with Cecilia here a moment ago about reincarnation in the time of Jesus, which was a belief, of course, deeply rooted in all the peoples of the East, beginning with the Jews and the Arabs, let alone the Hindus and the other peoples of the East. That is, it existed as a belief and still exists, no doubt. Then “I” acquires an obscure exegetical dimension because it would be the distillation of the stream, the distillation of everything that humanity has thought of in the last two million years, and hence, of that collective consciousness that is almost two million years old, a Ruben is distilled.

Audience: Distilled means... it comes out a little.

RFG: It is distilled, that is, filtered out. Out of those two million years of thinking comes a bundle of thought that is Ruben. That would be an exegetical interpretation of the ego, although the ego, from the psychological point of view, is something that appears at two years of age, but simply because before he may not be able to structure and express it, because he does not yet have the apparatus of complete phonation or the complete nervous system, but as soon as he has it, the ego appears. It takes a year and a half or two to express the word I do but he does, because cultural pressure is tremendous and

possibly, as JK says, that cultural pressure is predetermined by something much deeper, much more widespread, that humanity, which is everything that humanity has thought in two million years. And that is distilled and that, let's say, takes shape in this I when the little boy says: "I want water," and now it becomes Ruben that says "I want water." And he is only two years old or less, then we can get confused believing, and as Krishnamurti insinuates, we can get confused believing that the "I" appear at two years of age, and actually it is much older, it is as old as the stream of humanity, that is, the Stream in the language of JK is all that flow of thought, that continuity in the thought of humanity since humanity appears. That is why there are phylogenetic things in each of us... Carl Jung speaks about it from the psychological point of view, the phylogenetic in us, but there are some who speak of the phylogenetic in us even in behavior, in instinct or drive.

Audience: Things that would not come from the genes, but from the collective consciousness.

RFG: Right. Which is older than the genes... and which Krishnamurti calls the stream, and which appears in the form of John. How? John was the man who had the pipe and who had a bouquet of flowers for a girl and a letter for another girl, and it seems that those three things were enough for John to continue and he could not continue the journey (by death), so he came back as a ghost?

Audience: Yes, but where would the collective unconscious reside? Would it reside molecularly... is it cerebral?

RFG: No, that's in Holokinesis, that... it's a sub-quantum thing. It is undoubtedly sub-quantum; it cannot be molecularly because the self was already gone molecularly, it decomposed –say– but still John reappears like John, in the article "The Stream," which I translated as "The Torrent" to correct the bad translation in Spanish called "La Corriente" [*The Current*]. Is it like this or not, that all humanity continues in us when we say "I"?

Audience: It's an aspect of the explicit order, is not it?

RFG: Of course, it is still in the explicit order, that stream that is also of the explicit order, but collective. It belongs to ... or rather, it does not belong to humanity, but humanity has produced it unintentionally and intentionally.

Audience: And keeps feeding it.

RFG: And continues to feed it every time an individual is born and says "I". It continues there.

Audience: But it is interesting that it is generated by the collective consciousness of humanity but it conceives itself as a separate individual, that is, the very nature of the self is that "I am a separate individual," when its true nature, now that we spoke of where it resides, it resides in the fragmentary perception of each individual but it resides knowing itself as separate and that is the nature that unites it to all the I's that have existed, which is that contradiction of being conceived as separate when in reality they are the collective consciousness of humanity.

RFG: And that's why we call it horizontal conflict, a psychological entity, that belief that it is separate, when in fact it comes from the collective consciousness.

What we are saying is that in The stream another thing that seems to be much deeper is insinuated, that goes beyond the molecular, the neuronal and the psychosocial, because John died, John Field died, and reappears. His brother Sidney sees him, is terrified and goes to talk to Krishnamurti. It was not recorded but it is recorded afterwards in a somewhat artificial way, but something remained of that. And what Krishnamurti is implying is that there is something far beyond the psychosocial, and far beyond the molecular in that reappearance of John. I would say even beyond the energetic, because there is no longer anything like that of John, but rather something that continues possibly at the quantum and sub-quantum aspects.

Audience: Maybe it's related to the morphogenetic, I mean, in that sense...

RFG: In the implicit order.

Audience: Yes, that is, it is functional in some sense, maybe all the species have it –the stream– so they can continue doing what they do... their behavior...

RFG: But it seems that the Wistar rats have it, according to the experiments of Mc Dougall, Crew and Agar in Australia. Obviously, almost at the beginning of the twentieth century these three researchers are investigating the Wistar rats, one in Harvard, United States, another in Scotland and another in Australia, and they discover that the rats have the same knowledge, that is, Wistar rats are one; they never had genetic contact between them. So obviously there is a connection in the implicit order, which was not the intention of the researchers to find... but someone investigates this research much to his surprise, thinks “how interesting,” someone investigates this research in the light of Bohm, because Bohm brings a lot of light! –and as Thomas Kuhn said, when something new appears, we are not only going to see new things but we are going to see all the old things in a different way, like what we are doing with exegesis. Obviously that is another JesuKristos that we are getting to know, with holokinetic exegesis, and I find this JesuKristos that I met with Holokinesis much lighter, much more comical, much friendlier, than the one I was taught about when I was a boy, when I thought of Jesus Christ as a punisher. And it seems it's something else.

And in the case of the John that continues, the ghost that continues, it seems that... if it comes from the stream, that stream has to be far beyond the psychosocial, far beyond the molecular, and far beyond the energetic, in much more subtle aspects of reality. Because it does not have any of those qualities, the phantom John has none of those aspects, neither psychosocial, nor molecular or energetic.

Audience: It has a resemblance to what they called the akashic records, right?

RFG: Well, yes, yes, of course. Where all knowledge of humanity is preserved. But of course, all of these are possibly good ideas that came out.

Audience: Yes, it could be...

RFG: And as Plato said, if thought is divine and ideas are divine, any idea is divine and true. But it turns out that now they tell us that if you tell the water that it is cute, you will have pretty crystals (laughter) and if you tell it is ugly you will have ugly crystals, and unfortunately it is not true. Even though it was a wonderfully beautiful idea. But it is not true, it is not demonstrable. Then, as an idea, wonderful, the same as the akashic records, wonderful idea.

But what we are seeing now with this analysis of the research done by three people, in “The Stream,” which are Mrs. Zimbalist, JK and Naude, who are investigating what happened with John, in the same way, when they analyze the investigation of Mc Dougall, Crew and Agar, new things appear in the old, that had nothing to do with the heritage of Lamarck or that of Darwin. The meaning of these experiments with Wistar rats was much deeper. It was that something was happening in the implicit order, something that could not have been imagined before the appearance of Bohm. Therefore, Bohm appears and not only new things are seen but also completely different things in the known. The known becomes different. So that's how beautiful Holokinesis is: it not only shows new things but everything old becomes new. Everything old becomes new and different from what we thought it was. Beautiful, beautiful.

I don't know if there will be questions or comments about this. Actually we are commenting on the identity of the ego and its relationship with the psychological, which apparently appears at the age of two, or as JK (implicitly) says, appears in the stream, in the collective consciousness that is possibly two million years old.

Do you want to intervene?

Audience: Yes. Sometimes when, for example, a question arises in me, in relation to Unitary Perception, sometimes it arises that in the depth of silence... I pose that question, then...

RFG: What question do you mean?

Audience: To a question.

RFG: A question.

Audience: And by perceiving that question... sometimes the answer comes. I don't know how you see that...

RFG: It's tremendous. What you are saying is tremendous because I have lived it with JK, that I invite him to walk... he invited me to walk with him; he was preparing to walk and he says: "we are going to walk in silence." (laughter) But... as if to say: do not think we're going to have a long conversation (laughter), that's implicit, right? Do not think we're going to have a long conversation. Of course, you did not need to talk much with Krishnamurti, three words were enough! And he ends the walk with a Krishnamurti-style conversation: "Dr. González, will you continue being one of the many or will you start being one of the few?" That is one of the questions that appear in the depth of silence. I mean, am I going to continue like this... or can something new start in myself? Something beautiful in me, something regenerated in me, something generous in me, something true? And that is the question that has no answer and that should be taken to death. That is, do not leave the question, because they are questions that have no answer... that is, until when will I be Rubén, right? It seems that until death. But that is not the worst. The worst thing is that one remains Rubén until death explicitly. So, if it were nothing more than a question, it would be a drama and an inner tragedy, but it becomes something explicit that makes people suffer a lot, the people who are close to one above all, and then this pain generator called Rubén, that is... until when will he continue to generate pain in himself and in others? These are questions that come in that silence of which you speak. That

you are in Unitary Perception, in silence, and a question like that arises... I ask it every day, that question, but I do not have an answer. Life itself will give you the answer according to how you are living. One almost chooses between living life in Unitary Perception, which is true, beautiful life, or living it as we were taught to live it, *a la bartola* [in a mindless, careless way] (laughter) Do you have that saying here?

Audience: No, but the meaning gets through.

RFG: Yes, like the B of Bartolo.

Audience: No responsibility.

RFG: Yes, without any responsibility...

Audience: Without any direction?

RFG: Well, without any direction would be the beautiful, to live in the unknown! But we always have a direction: we want to be rich, we want to win the lottery. That desire of being rich, of winning the lotto, the desire of having a fat bank account, and to keep it, which is worse because it is torture. All that is what we are and what we continue to be. Can that end? And that is the question that arises in silence. Can all this end, not when death comes to me but because I decide it before? That is the unanswerable question, except for each one and except in everyday events. The deepest questions are unanswerable, perhaps. At least they are not answerable in words but in facts. And it will be seen in the facts, I mean... my brother tells me one day: "I do not recognize you," my brother tells me, in Argentina. He invited me to eat and he says: "I do not know you." I tell him: why do you tell me that? "Because I see you in peace for the first time in my life," my brother tells me. And he had never seen me in peace, because he had not seen what had happened to me with JK, and then I go back, after many years, he invites me to eat and he says: "I do not know you." Well, it was one of the most beautiful things that I heard in my life, that my brother told me he did not know me because he saw me in peace. He had never seen me in peace, because I had never been at peace.

And then I think that's how the question is answered. Because someone tells you that you are at peace or because you see that you are doing something that is beautiful, without having planned it. Then you are seeing that there is a transformation. But I do not think it has an answer in words, but... deep questions have no answer in words. Are we going to continue being what we always were, like most people or are we going to start being something completely different as very few people have been? As a Jesus, as a Buddha, as a JK. I mean, that question is answered in the facts of your life, in the facts of your life. I do not know if there is another question or comment.

Audience: Right now it occurs to me how the exit is not going out, it is Unitary Perception, then we bring more children and we continue with this idea with the children and continue with the stream giving continuity to all this. And as we recalled a few days ago, we don't need more people, what we need is Unitary Perception...

RFG: And good people... not more people.

Audience: ...good people, not more people... and well, we also have to remind ourselves that, that is not the birth from the vagina. It has to do with everything we've seen, everything Jesus said...

RFG: Undoubtedly.

Audience: if the grass is right now... I do not remember the quote...

RFG: Well, when Jesus is carrying the cross... on the *via crucis*?

Audience: That's right.

RFG: Yes, women are crying. Maybe you remember it better than me [*addressing the Audience*].

Audience: “Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, weep for yourselves and for your children.”

RFG: “Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, weep for yourselves and for your children, because the day will come when they will say blessed are the breasts that never nursed and the wombs that never bore.” Luke, chapter 23.

Audience: It’s the urgency of... enough!

Audience: And enough with thought, which is what gives continuity to the collective consciousness.

RFG: Feeds it.

Audience: Feeds it.

RFG: Yes. Was it yesterday that I drank too much *mate cocido*? (laughter) When I drink a lot of *mate cocido* [*boiled mate –an infusion*], it happens to me, it happened to me at Alba's house, it happened to me last night –I think I had drunk at least four cups of mate, and I had some difficulty in sleeping, in falling asleep. And I was seeing the agitation of thought before I fell asleep, until I realized, and I say, well, this has to end, all this thought, this “thought-ball” has to end. And when I see that, then thought quiets down and I just fall asleep. But it is good to see it, when you are thinking a lot, to end it, do not let it continue a lot because it is very self-destructive.

Audience: To end it implies Unitary Perception, right? Because you cannot voluntarily end thought.

RFG: Unitary Perception!

Audience: It would be the last intelligent act...

Audience: Exactly.

RFG: The last intelligent act of thought, that is: enough is enough!

Audience: To start listening now.

RFG: But what we have is, shall we say, in culture, there have been fragmentary intuitions of this, not the immense caliber

teaching of both JK's –say– but fragmentary intuitions that tell you: “you have to control your instinct” (laughter). In other words, stop looking for so many girls out there (laughter) and live a sanctified life. No, but they are things that happen, in culture! Then, myself, at the age of twenty, I was still struggling for sanctity and the idea of sanctity, while the miniskirt was born and the girls were in miniskirts. And then... yes, there was the goal of “transformation” and it was instinct, something we do not even know if it exists, because Freud himself did not use the word instinct, he used the word *drive*, impulse, badly translated as instinct. He used the word *drive* which means impulse.

So it is not impulse control or instinct control that we have to do. Neither is it about controlling emotions or controlling your emotions because they are out of control. And if you're out of control, your affinity with chaos is tremendous. Well, there is a movie called “Out of control” where these words are said, exactly the same, “you are out of control and have an affinity with chaos.” And it's not that, it's not that there is an affinity with chaos only, and it's not that we have to control the emotions but to see them. It is not about controlling instinct but seeing desire. And then, there is the greatest number of suggestions for “transformation” and they are at the intellectual level: “you have to start thinking differently, you cannot keep thinking as always.”

Audience: In spiral...

RFG: Well, the French Revolution speaks of freedom, equality and fraternity, but it was very intellectual, very intellectual. And they talked about economic equality and everything... but it was so intellectual that it ended up in what was called “the reign of terror,” where heads fell, even the head of Robespierre, who was the soul of the French Revolution, fell. He was 34-35 years old and was decapitated. So it was an intellectual revolution, it did not come down from there, it did not come down from the psychosocial aspect, it did not even enter the molecular aspect. Unfortunately, right? Because they wanted economic equality, they wanted fraternity, they wanted the freedom of the human being, but it was nothing but an

intellectual thing. And then, there is the desire to change things only with thought. No, that's not it. Or the most common: "try to change your behavior." "Let's see if you stop behaving like that." "It's 6:30, dear; at what time do you leave work?" At five. (laughter) "It's 6:30, what have you done from 5 to 6:30? When are you going to change your behavior?" (laughs) It's familiar, is not it? It is familiar because we see it in the human couple. That is, mutual control, of what? Of behavior. That we believe that by controlling our behavior or the behavior of the others, especially the most beloved, all is solved. Uh, what a terrible mistake! The exit is not going out, and it is neither instinctive nor emotional, intellectual, or behavioral. It is Unitary Perception. The exit is not going out, the exit is Unitary Perception.

Audience: They have a question in Buenos Aires.

RFG: Go ahead, Buenos Aires.

Audience: The sacraments... what place do they have?

RFG: Well, the sacraments are born with the Catholic Church, but by the year 500 or 600 after Jesus Christ. Six centuries had already passed, and then many theologians find it difficult to relate the original teaching of Kristos with a K with the sacraments. For example, the sacrament of baptism, which is the rite of pouring holy water on the child, was actually very different in the time of Jesus and it was only for the adults, and it meant that you were immersing yourself in the teaching. That was a sacred thing, to immerse yourself in the study of the teaching to transform your mind, as in the wedding of Cana, with that wine that you had to make of water, that your inner Kristos had to make from water; baptism, which is the teaching, to transform you. And that's what the sacrament of baptism means. And what does the sacrament of matrimony mean? Matrimony is an institution that appears in the year 1200. What happened in the previous twelve centuries regarding marriage? The church still did not have the influence it has on society today, and people just got together. And they got together because the families were arranged. "We are going to join lil' Pete who is 5 years old with lil' Martha who is 4,"

and that is how marriages were arranged. And when we talk about marriage as we know it now, it is something alien to what happened in year zero, where marriages were all arranged by parents or by intermediaries, and as still happens in India. This is still happening in India. Then the sacrament of matrimony, what is it? Is it sacred to be a mother? Matri-mony. Is it sacred to be a mother? And what does it mean to be a mother? That is to say: Mother of something that is being produced in *ouranon* or mother of something that is being produced in *kosmon*? Mother of something sacred or mother of something that will bring corruption and death? Mother of something that is new in the life of human beings or mother of something that is condemned to die? So, if we talk about the sacraments deeply, we see that there is a theology, as I said before, a historical theology, what it meant in the time of Jesus, and another holokinetic theology: what it means for us. And it seems that they are two very different theologies. I do not know if I'm answering.

Audience: Yes... I wanted to go a little deeper on that subject...

RFG: Yes, go ahead.

Audience: No, no, seen from what you say, from Holokinesis, how one stands in front of this...

RFG: Well, marriage... without a doubt for me, what matrimony means is to protect the *mater*, the material, to protect that woman I marry, whom I free from work since the day I met her until today, because work is the first punishment of God, so I free her from work, I give her a house that is in her name, not mine, and what do I do with marriage? I sanctify it, but in the way I believe it. I do not make her a mother, I do not enslave her. We agreed not to have children in the flesh, we agreed to work for the teaching, so that we reproduce in what we have to reproduce, which is in *ouranon*, which is in truth, in Unitary Perception. So, for me, and I think also for Cecilia, matrimony has a completely different meaning from what our parents told us. Our parents kept... pardon my French, bugging us into having children, long after we were married and long after we had already decided with Cecilia not to have children.

You can tell me: “but you, Ruben, you had children,” as everyone tells me, but I also answer to everyone: I stopped having children after meeting JK. I do not know if I answered... Cecilia seems to want to say something.

Audience: ...it seems to me that –it is Georgina who is asking the question, I think, right? She asks what the sacraments look like in light of what we understand about Unitary Perception and what religion looks like in general. Right? We make, let's say, that association when we understand Holokinetic Psychology, which is not separated from anything in life, or from religion or anything, and I feel that her question is how we approach... and I believe that the discovery is individual too. Each one can express how he or she is understanding, and living... and life is ordering itself. In each case one according to the beliefs, which are rather yielding...

RFG: Yes, but that's very romantic. I believe that if you do not see it...

Audience: Yes, it's very romantic (laughter).

RFG: If you do not see it at the beginning, what you have to see, you will never see it. I mean, this is a piece of paper, if you tell me it's an elephant, I'll say no. And, how much time does it take to see that this is paper? About a quarter of a second. That is, you see what you have to do or you do not see it.

Audience: Sure, but maybe the person who sees it is because they see it and the ones who don't see it is because they don't see it, and they cannot be forced...

RFG: Yes, the one who does not see it is the one who is in deeper trouble...

Audience: Exactly.

Audience: But I would say... sorry, the sacraments as implemented, at least, by the church in our culture, are an usurpation, because in reality it is to make intermediaries determine when and how things are sacred. Then, when those intermediaries have already been rebuked by society, it turns

out that this usurpation continues, because people perform the fundamental acts of life, such as joining a man with a woman, for example, without any sense of the sacred, because it was usurped and stolen by them and they ignore that it is an individual responsibility. And it is not taught anywhere, not even in school, that the transcendent aspect of life is in every human being. So, we are still in an age where we have suffered the deprecation of responsibility, of the transcendent in our lives, which is doing terrible damage to society, and which is probably one of the greatest impediments to the teaching of Unitary Perception to penetrate humanity, because people are ashamed to even talk about the transcendent.

RFG: Without a doubt, and avoid it. But speaking, for example, of marriage, that is, you can have a romantic approach, everyone has to do what they want in marriage, or one can have a Kristian approach, with a K, that is, according to an understanding of the original teaching of JesuKristos, where it is not about procreation in *kosmon* but in *ouranon*. And where it is not about maintaining the slavery of the woman but about her being liberated.

Audience: Oh no, I was not talking about marriage; I was talking... she talks about how the sacraments are seen...

RFG: No, no, but the last question was about matrimony.

Audience: Oh no, no, but I was referring (because you started talking about matrimony when she spoke about the sacraments), I was referring to what I think she is talking about the sacraments in general.

RFG: At first it was in general and that's why I talked about baptism, but the last question was about marriage.

Audience: Well, I want to clarify that when I spoke [about the question of] Georgina, I was referring to Georgina talking about how the sacraments are seen in general... and like the sacraments, I think there are many distortions within the churches and what has been transmitted from the Christian religion. So I believe that all those false things are being

discarded... and the sacraments, let's say, are being rescued in a more original and genuine way, as you mention about marriage or other types of sacraments. Baptism itself, which is not a ritual merely, has a truly transcendent and profound meaning, and that has to be done in each individual.

RFG: The last question was about matrimony and the first one was in general. In the last I was referring to matrimony, I interpret it as: it's not to reproduce in the flesh but in the spirit and it is not to bind one another but to liberate each other, which does not mean that one becomes a sexually promiscuous person. And it also means that I will make your life less painful, less difficult, therefore I free you from work, and that is the way I interpret marriage as sacred. And another will interpret it in another way, alright, but then I don't know if it's sacred.

Audience: Let's say that we are going to interpret it in the light of Holokinetic Psychology. In the light of Holokinetic Psychology, marriage is: hitting each other with the axe so that the egos cease... (laughter) ...and help each other with de-conditioning, from what each one is carrying and that makes the relationship and the communion in the couple difficult. And that's why I think it's the main value of marriage, when two people agree, and I witness this because I get hit a lot with the axe (laughter).

RFG: I think I do everything I can...

Audience: Mutually, then, mutually (laughter).

RFG: I think I do everything I can to make your life really hard (laughter).

Audience: In the relationship normally... the romanticism you mentioned, rather it refers to people who think that they have to pamper their egos to be happy with each other, and I think it has a great value, that conspiracy of the couple to axe each other –as Rubén says– but that means helping each other see the conditioning that each one shares, which hinders the relationship many times.

RFG: Yes, especially the manifestation of the ego in the relationship.

Audience: Yes, that's it, right?

RFG: Yes. What most damages the relationship, I think, in the couple and in friendship and everywhere is the expression of the ego, which comes with fear, anger and sadness. That damages the relationship, so every time I see the appearance of fear, anger and sadness in marriage I axe the woman who makes the marriage with me (laughter).

Audience: From the first day, with a good, sharp axe (laughter).

RFG: I'm very advanced in that, I can teach (laughter), I think Cecilia could teach, she's very good too (laughter).

Audience: This... to say that what we are talking about it in the light of Unitary Perception, of Holokinetic Psychology, so that there are no interpretations of thought, but in the experience of Unitary Perception... from the mental precinct B.

RFG: Yes... which is most of the time without words.

Audience: Yes, and returning to the question that the self has a nature of collective consciousness of humanity, it is when a man and a woman offer themselves to help that conflict be reproduced in them and be liberated for all.

RFG: Of course, when the conflict ceases in one or in the couple, it is the greatest contribution, that is, when there is peace in one or in the couple, it is the best contribution we can make to society. It is above the contribution of the political party, or going inside a church, any other. Be at peace and help the person who is with you to be at peace, in this case the spouse, do everything possible, as we say with Cecilia, everything possible, impossible and brutal so that we are at peace. But yes, there are things that we have to know, such as the premenstrual syndrome of women, such as menopause, as things that are part of the life of a couple, which can affect the couple badly if they do not know. The emotional instability that

exists in PMS or menopause can be so extreme that it can affect marriage to the point of divorce, and then it is important that we know what PMS is, what the menopause is, and once we know, that doesn't mean it becomes easier but we simply have to see it in Unitary Perception. And I'm just giving two examples. I do not know if there are more questions or comments.

Audience: The one who was asking there in Argentina... Georgina.

RFG: Yes, in my experience, every time I wanted to talk about the subject of marriage, it has not been very pleasant. The deepest attempt was in Caracas where it was called "sexual education course," or something similar, or "the understanding of sex," or something like that, and it was not a pleasant experience for me, or for anyone that participated, I think. That is, there are people who are not ready to listen to things as they are.

Audience: Listening, as Krishnamurti says, is not only from the known to compare what is known to you...

RFG: Of course, to listen calmly and peacefully, to listen to each other, but it did not happen like that; the things that were said were taken with offense. Then one says why, if we are talking about this being white and it is a piece of paper and you tell me: "no; it's an elephant." Then our inability to listen and dialogue makes it difficult to enter into this topic, the sacrament of marriage is a difficult subject.

Audience: How does Buddhism deal with it? Does it approach it?

RFG: Buddhism is not very different from Christianity. In India, for example, which is above all Brahmanical, men at 40 years of age are supposed to have the means to leave the house and be completely free, and to become a pilgrim. And I met several in Chennai, that is, in Madras, now called Chennai, who had done it, they had left the married house and they were living after 45 years old... by the way, in India, retirement is at

age 45, for the envy of Europeans and Americans (laughter) because I think... where was it? In France, the retirement age was raised to 62, and there is, of course, a slight concern in French society, I think there are some strikes and a series of things, terrible...

Audience: Here it is at age 65.

RFG: In the United States it is at 65, and the French complain because it is at 62. In India at age 45 there is retirement. Then, after that age, many men decide to leave the house, because it is so established, that he is first the owner of the house and then he is a vagabond, in a good way. Wandering to learn. Anyway, customs...

Audience: Which can also be... the difficulty of the dialogue you talked about matrimony, that we have gone from a traditionalist culture where the rules of marriage were imposed and defined by the religious, political, parental authorities, and then it was very clear how it should be. And we have moved to a culture where the “how it should be” is rejected, as if there were no rules, but there are terrible, unspoken rules, for example you cannot talk about not having children, you cannot talk about the man and the woman being man and woman, that letting them love and respect each other does not mean making them equal, because immediately you enter into a political inequality, and that is a taboo subject. Then the intervention of the powers is allowed, I always put the example that abortion was accepted like a clinical practice after the study that one of the Rockefellers did in the 50’s on the demographic explosion in the world, and one of its conclusions is that to stop this phenomenon, we should make abortion be considered not a crime but practically a medical practice. Then people with terrible interests are allowed to fish in that water of “no rules,” like separating man and woman, so we are in a culture that has a terrible problem there, but is not able to talk about it, because the rules are no longer explicit as they were before, and as they are imposed for example in India. In India it is the families that choose... but at least it is clear. And then this situation is dramatic: how one of the biggest problems of society cannot even be talked about, not even between men and women.

RFG: Sure. Yes, there are many subtleties in this topic. I don't know if we are answering or there are more questions or comments in Buenos Aires.

Audience: No, they do not say anything.

RFG: As we started a little earlier today, we can do one more question or comment, or end it here.

The next class is going to be the last one, because we've seen the whole program and I think that was because the interventions were smaller in number, and we can devote the next class to role reversal, with diagnosis and criticism from the audience...

I'm under the impression that the essence of the workshop, or rather of the Presential Course, was assimilated. And that we can, then, dedicate the next class, which would be the last, to role reversal. I would present patients, not to make a clinical history, but to go directly to holokinetic therapy. Do you like that program? This was how it was done in the previous Presential Course.

Well, then, thank you very much, see you next Sunday, good luck.

Audience: Hello Rubén.

RFG: Hello.

Audience: Everyone here is astonished with this about there being no more classes...

RFG: The next one would be the last one with the exchange of roles, the truth is that we have seen the whole program faster than last time; I think there are two less classes. Because, comparing the previous SPC [*Course*] with this one, there was less intervention from the Audience, fewer questions and comments and that led us to finish earlier. Unless you have ...if you have proposals, I would adjust to the proposal.

Audience: Here [*in Buenos Aires*] we are thinking or proposing one more class with questions prepared by all the students or as you propose.

RFG: Sure, sure, of course. So, for the next class, the task is to prepare questions from, remember, the modules. First module is diagnosis, to see who are those who do not benefit; second module is scientific, what Holokinesis is, what the hologram is; third module is miscellaneous; but above all the language, the polished and adequate language to teach Unitary Perception; and the fourth module is exegesis, which we have dealt with today, I think with some delicacy, but I don't think it was too heavy, was it? Was the exegesis heavy or not? Very well, you are committed to the task of bringing questions from the students about the four modules, what do you think?

Audience: Sure, and we could also emphasize exegesis, to continue a bit more with today's topic, right?

RFG: Yes, if you bring questions or just propose topics, we can see them too, in the light of Holokinetic exegesis.

Audience: Of any of the writings... Sanctity...

Audience: You have not addressed the *Sutta Pitaka* or the *Tao Te King*.

RFG: No, no, we got nearly stuffed with Christianity (laughter).

Audience: But it could be another class with the *Sutta Pitaka* and the *Tao Te King*...

RFG: If you agree...

Audience: Yees! (laughter)

RFG: Well, well, alright. So, don't forget, homework: questions about the four modules, we'll see a little more of exegesis, and after that, the role reversals. Any question or comment?

No questions from there?

Audience: No, nothing.

RFG: Well, then we leave it here, a hug. We'll continue on Sunday at 10.

TOPICS - CLASS 13

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 13 (825)
- EXEGETICAL REVIEW OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN (825)
- JEWISH GROUPS AND NATIONS DURING THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY (827)
- DOCETISM AND EBIONISM (829)
- *KOSMON* AND *OURANON* ACCORDING TO JOHN ZEBEDEEE (829)
- THE DISSEMINATION OF GREEK AS THE LANGUAGE OF CHRISTIANITY (830)
- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL (832)
- READING AND COMMENTS: PSALM 82 (833)
- BEING A SON OF GOD (JOHN 1) BEING BORN OF THE AIR (JOHN 3) (836)
- KRISTIC, ADAMIC AND HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS (837)
- THE SIGNS OR MIRACLES AND RESURRECTION (838)
- DIALOGUE ON THE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN (844)
- MANICHAISM AND CHRISTIANITY (SUBSTANTIAL DIFFERENCES) (846)
- THE FUNCTIONAL SELF AND UNITARY PERCEPTION (848)
- THE SELF-DENIAL OF GOD IN JESUS (852)
- DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT THE MANIFESTATIONS OF JESUS (856)

- SOME VIEWS OF CHRISTIANITY WITHIN CHRISTIANITY (861)
- HUMANITY AS AN ORGANISM (867)
- DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FAITH AND BELIEF (868)
- THE WORSHIP OF SUFFERING AS A MEANS OF SALVATION (875)
- JESUS'S WORDS ON THE WAY OF THE CROSS (876)
- MIDRASH (JEWISH TRADITION) IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS (883)
- RECONSTRUCTION OF THE RESURRECTION BODY (887)
- THE *ANTHROPOS* OF THE GEEKS (889)
- ARCHANGEL MICHAEL - ANGELS (EXEGETICAL INTERPRETATIONS) (892)

CLASS 13

Centro de Psiquiatría y Psicología Holokinética,
Mexicali, Baja California, 31 de octubre de 2010.

RFG: Good morning. October 31, 2010. Let's talk a little about exegesis and remember that without Unitary Perception, everything we do multiplies the problems of the human being, and we have arrived at this situation of horror, despair and confusion in humanity because of our lack of Unitary Perception, and if we continue living without Unitary Perception, the problems of humanity will increase geometrically.

Today we are going to deal with exegesis, which is a word that means "interpretation of sacred scripture." To make it all scientific, let's start with a joke by an atheist named George Carlin, who says that in a Sunday school class, the priest was teaching that the ten commandments are things to reject or accept and live according to them, and that if we make mistakes and do not fulfill them, God will punish us with Hell and eternal fire, and we will suffer the pains of everlasting fire to the point that we will grind our teeth. But God loves you. (Laughter) "Please, little sister, now pass the collection plate." That is a joke by an atheist so that no one feels left out.

And when we speak of exegesis, it is tempting to speak, of course, of the Gospel of John because it is exceptional. Then, exegesis has of course been written for the believers, and the Gospel of John is written in the simplest Greek and is the most multifaceted and profound message of the Bible. It is written in a clear, concise and concrete way. It was written by John, *Johan Bar Zebedeus*, John son of Zebedee and of Salome, who was a sister... it seems that she was the sister of Jesus' mother. Do not confuse with John the Baptist, who is *Johan Bar Zechariah*, son also of Elizabeth. There are two, John the

Baptist and John Zebedee, also called “son of Thunder” by JesuKristos. John [Zebedee], according to the Catholic Church, is the sole author of the Fourth Gospel or Gospel of John. But the new theologians claim that John had students, because it was written in the year 90 of our era –John would have to have been very old–, and John supervised a group of students who actually wrote this Gospel, and it is called the Johannine school. I insist that the Catholic Church claims that only John was the author.

Where was this written? Where was the Gospel of John written? It was written in the city of Ephesus, which is now in Turkey but at that time, two thousand years ago, it was part of Greece. Why was it written there? Because Ephesus was the city where the School of Heraclitus was and Heraclitus was the scientist, to put it some way, the only or most important scientist of the time. Heraclitus said that everything is in flux and that, for example, fish were born by spontaneous generation and not by sex, because nobody had seen the sex of fish, since they were underwater. Now we know that fish also have sex, but at that time, fish became the symbol of Christianity, because they spoke of the spontaneous generation and life that exists in the water. And we know that water means “teaching” and that therefore fish represent the life that is born through teaching.

Then in that Johannine school there was at least one John Zebedee who was a scientist. Scientist according to Heraclitus. Heraclitus had said: “*Panta rhea*,” in Greek: “Everything is in flux.” He had also said that everything is one. So we have a scientific John [of his time] that goes back to Heraclitus when writing the Gospel of John. But there is also a political John, because, when is the Gospel of John written, either by John or by the Johannine school? In the year 90 approximately, but not much before and not much later. Which means what? It means that... We must not forget that there were Jewish groups and Jewish nations. That is, the Jewish groups were fewer at that time than the Jews of today. Because Judaism today is more divided than in the year zero, but there were three Jewish nations: to the south was Judea, in the center was Samaria and

to the north was Galilee, where Nazareth is. This is why Jesus is sometimes known as “Jesus of Galilee,” although he was born in Bethlehem, in Judea, south of Jerusalem.

The political John, according to some, is the John who wants to unite all Jewish groups and all Jewish nations, at what time? In the year 90, when there is no longer any Jewish group or Jewish nation because the Roman Empire had completely destroyed all that in the year 70, which is known as the year of the destruction of the Jewish temple by the Roman Empire, carried out by Caesar [Titus], even though Jesus was born under Caesar [Augustus]. All this in Rome, of course. Caesar was in Rome, while in Jerusalem... yes, in Jerusalem there was a Roman delegate, who was Pilate at the time of Jesus.

So, the political John seems to want to unite all the groups and all the Jewish nations with his Gospel. And even further, he seeks the union of all mankind. It is stated clearly [in Galatians 3:28]: “There is neither Greek nor Roman or Jew; neither man nor woman; neither slave nor lord.” Why would they say this? Because the nations and the Jewish groups had already disappeared under the great Roman invasion that took place in the year 70; this is written, I repeat, in the year 90; but also because within Judaism there existed an old Judaism, to which Jesus put an end. For example, Exodus 21:1 tells us about slavery, and there are rules for slavery. For example, if the slave had children and a woman while he was a slave to his owner –his master, his lord– if he wanted to leave after six years, he could do it, but he had to leave his family, wife and children under the subjection of his lord. This is what John is referring to, that all this has to end. That is, the slavery that existed among the Jews before Jesus.

Who were those Jewish groups? They were the Sadducees, which was the upper class that was, say, on the side of Rome and had no conflict with the Romans; the Pharisees, who had a spiritual conflict, because the Romans had many gods and the Jews had only one, and the Pharisees emphasized that, so they were always in conflict with the Romans; the Zealots who were like the Latin-American guerrillas of the sixties, seeking a

liberation from the emperor and the empire in an armed way... the Zealots. And there were two Zealots among the twelve friends of Jesus, known as apostles, and they were Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot. Why were they attracted? Because Jesus commits a violent act against the merchants of the temple, which we are going to see in Chapter 2 of John. That's why the Zealots were attracted to Jesus –due to the violence of Jesus against the merchants of the temple.

But there were also the Essenes in the Qumran, who left behind literature that was discovered in 1948, who were those who had completely departed from everything and did not want to have any contact with the slave-owning Jews or with the Roman Empire. The Essenes.

Then there are, as I said, the Jewish nations: Judea to the South, where Jerusalem and Bethlehem are –Bethlehem is the city where King David was born and where the Messiah, or Jesus, had to be born according to prophecy; to the north is Samaria, where Jesus speaks with the Samaritan woman, in the well of Jacob, and further to the north is Galilee, where Nazareth is, Capernaum, where Peter lived. Sometimes Jesus is known as “Jesus of Galilee,” when in reality he was Jesus of Judea. “Jesus of Galilee” because he had to go with his family during the Roman census to be registered, and that was in Nazareth, which was the house of Jesus' stepfather, Joseph. Nazareth is in Galilee, so that is why Jesus is also known as Jesus of Nazareth or Jesus of Galilee when, I insist, he was born in Bethlehem, in Judea, south of Jerusalem, the city of David.

But Rome destroys the temple and all these groups and nations, in the year 70 of our era. The emperor [Titus].

And today, for us to have an idea, there are four Catholic churches, seventeen Orthodox churches and more than five thousand Protestant, also called Evangelical, churches. But after the destruction of the temple, there was great confusion about what it was to be a Jew and what it was to be a Nazarene –because Christianity at first was not called “Christianity” but “the Nazarenes.”

So, there was great confusion. There were also two exegetical schools. One in Alexandria, from which the heretical ideas come, heretics for the Catholic Church: that Jesus was only God, and that he seemed to be a human being.

Dokeon in Greek means “seems to me.” *Doketism* or *Docetism* means that [Jesus] seemed to be a human being, but that he was really a God. That is the exegetical school of Alexandria. And they had a kind of opposite, just as in thought there is duality, thought created another exegetical duality at that time, and there was also the school of Antioch in Turkey, if I am not mistaken in the city of Smyrna, which said that [Jesus] was simply a human prophet, which is what the Islamists of today say, for example. That Jesus is a human prophet. And these were called “the Ebionites.” So we have:

- The school of Alexandria, Docetism: Jesus was God and he looked like a human being, he took the form of a human being.
- In Antioch, Jesus was a prophet only, and they were called “the Ebionites,” which means “the poor.”

They [the Ebionites] were very much attacked by the Catholic Church when the Catholic Church becomes imperial, in the year 321, when it is adopted by the Roman Emperor Constantine. The Ebionites were harshly persecuted and it is said that they disappeared.

Later, John emphasizes that the body is “the temple of the spirit.” He had to emphasize this because there was no temple. The temple had been destroyed twenty years before, in the year 70, and John or the Johannine school are writing in the year 90. Then John emphasizes, as Jesus had done, that the human body is the temple of the spirit. He also emphasizes that the creation is divided into *Kosmon* and *Ouranon*, (Genesis 1:1) or the Darkness and Light, but they were in the same place. That is to say: all of us carry within us the Light and the Darkness, and we have to help each other to eliminate the Darkness.

Kosmon is the matter of the entire universe, but it was mistranslated into Spanish as “earth.” Then, to separate oneself from the earth in the original would be “to depart from *Kosmon*”, for what? To be in *Ouranon*, which is Heaven, where JesuKristos rules. On the other hand, *Kosmon*, which is the world –poorly translated as “earth”– is ruled by Satan, by the King of Darkness. And JesuKristos would be the King of Light.

It is emphasized that it is not necessary to condemn those who are in the Darkness, but to teach them to leave; it is emphasized that we must grow and reproduce in the kingdom of Light, in the kingdom of Jesus, which is *Ouranon*; it does not refer to growing and reproducing in *Kosmon*, the world, which is the Darkness. And both Jesus and the twelve friends had no children, except Peter, who had had children before he met Jesus.

There is also something about history that must be emphasized in exegesis. That Rome was –say– consolidated by the triumph of General Aemilius Paulus of Rome over Perseus of Macedonia in the year 163 BC. There begins the emergence of the Roman Empire, 163 years before JesuKristos, and of course, by the time Jesus was born, Caesar Augustus was consolidated throughout the world, and being a citizen of Rome was to be a citizen of the *urbe*, as it was said in Roman Latin. It was the same as saying, today, “a citizen of the world.” *Urbe* became *orbe* in Spanish, which means “the whole world.” “The entire world,” “the whole world,” because Rome was in the whole world, at least the whole known world. So what Rome did was that, for example, when it reached Palestine, those who were born in Judea, Samaria and Galilee were all Roman citizens until the moment when the temple was destroyed in the year 70 of our era.

Now, why is it important to say this? Because Perseus of Macedonia, who lost his own empire, the Macedonian empire, to Rome, was a distant heir of Alexander the Great; Alexander the Great, who lived there three hundred years before

JesuKristos, conquered the known world from Spain to China. And he entered India, but he did not have the time to enter China because his generals killed him after Alexander said that his Macedonian generals had to marry Persian women, so that all human beings were equal. The generals did not accept this because they came from the Aristotelian school, which held the idea that the Greeks were superior to all human beings.

So Macedonia, which belonged to Greece for a while, until it dominated Greece with Alexander the Great, carried the Greek language from Spain to China and northern India. Precisely that was what made all Christianity spread from Spain to China and northern India, including Egypt, because in Egypt there was a general of Alexander named Ptolemy, who began the Ptolemaic Dynasty, which ends, as we all know, with Cleopatra. The most important thing of the Macedonian Empire was precisely the dissemination of Greek as the language of Christianity.

Those who are writing the Fourth Gospel, whether it be John Zebedee or a Johannine school, are writing in Greek, because Greek was the international language. How would JesuKristos communicate with the Roman centurion who asks him to heal a relative? It must have been in Greek, because the centurion could not know the language of Jesus, which was Aramaic, and Jesus could not know the Latin language, so they both communicated in Greek. And what language did Jesus speak with Pilate? Pilate did not know Aramaic and Jesus did not know Latin, therefore they had to speak Greek, and that is the language in which John writes his Fourth Gospel. And it is, as I said before, the simplest Greek in the entire Bible.

Do not confuse *orbe*, which is the city of Rome (at least at the moment we are talking about now, which was the time when the Gospel of John or Fourth Gospel was written), the great city of Rome, *orbe*, which in Spanish becomes “the world” (because Rome was the world) with the Greek *oikoumenes* or ecumenical, which is “the inhabited world.”

There was recently an ecumenical council in history –and from

time to time, ecumenical councils of the Catholic Church are held, which refer to a council of the whole inhabited world. Ecumenical. There is also an ecumenical movement that aims to unite all Christian churches, and a deeper ecumenical movement that aims to unite all religions. *Ecumenical* means “of the entire inhabited world.” Do not confuse with *orbe*, which is the Latin word in Spanish that refers to the city of Rome.

The synoptic gospels: Matthew, Mark and Luke. *Synoptic* means “those who see in the same way,” “those who perceive Jesus in the same way.” They are very different from John, why? Because the synoptic gospels make Jesus be born in a manger, in Bethlehem... which is the city where David was born according to the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah.

Well, already in another topic, which is the genealogy –not only the place where Jesus was born and the three evangelists that I mentioned, which was Bethlehem– there was also a genealogy, that is, Jesus’ father, grandfather, and so on, up to David. But the first evangelist to say that this is not the case and make the genealogy reach not only Abraham but also Adam is Luke.

It means, then, that Luke makes Jesus, for the first time, belong to humanity and not only to the Jews, because Judaism begins with Abraham. The genealogies of Matthew and Mark take Jesus to Abraham, but Luke and John... Luke takes him to Adam, making him belong to all human beings, but John goes even further. John makes him equal to the creation, because he says: “In the beginning was the *Logos*.” The *Logos* was created by God before the creation, therefore *Logos* and *Kristos* are synonymous words that mean “the cosmic Christ,” which is creation, that from where everything comes and that to which everything goes.

John is the first to take Jesus so far, he takes him to a moment before the creation itself, because he identifies him with God himself, and from there springs the seed of the concept of the Trinity: that God is not only God the Father, but also Son and

also Holy Spirit. But in John we only have two sacraments; not seven sacraments, but two: baptism and mass. The other sacraments appear much later.

And what is the *Logos*? It is a word that gave a lot to talk about. A word that gave a lot to talk about. *Logos* means “creation;” it means that, as the prophet Mani (who was born in the year 200 or so, after JesuKristos) said that in the creation God separates Darkness from Light, and there is the idea that Light is separated from Darkness, something that is also said throughout the New Testament, speaking of Light and Darkness. But it is written that Jesus said Light shines in the Darkness, but the Darkness did not comprehend the Light; but that does not mean that the Light and the Darkness were separated, because where the Light is, there is no Darkness.

So, there is in the original Kristianity, not in the Christianity of today... when we say original Kristianity, let's say we can write it with a *K*, as the name of Jesus Christ was written, Kristos with a *K* in the Greek language, to differentiate it from Christianity with a *C*, where there is still talk that Light and Darkness are separated, which is a Manichean concept from a Persian prophet born two hundred years after Jesus. In contrast, in the original Kristianity of JesuKristos with *K*, *Kosmon* and *Ouranon*, the World and Heaven, are not separate; they are in the same place. The difference is that Satan reigns in *Kosmon* and JesuKristos reigns in *Ouranon*. And it is implied that both can be in each one of us. The mission of society, of the couple, of friendship is to help each other to leave the empire of Satan, which is *Kosmon*, and enter the empire of Light, the empire of Heaven, which is *Ouranon*, ruled by JesuKristos.

Psalm 82 ... Well, let's read Psalm 82, I'm translating from English:

¹God stands in the congregation of the mighty; he judges among the gods.

²How long will you judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked?

³Defend the poor and fatherless: do justice to the afflicted and needy.

⁴Deliver the poor and needy: rid them out of the hand of the wicked.

⁵They know not, neither will they understand; they walk on in darkness: all the foundations of the earth are out of course.

⁶I have said, You are gods; and all of you are children of the most High.

⁷But you shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes.

⁸Arise, O God, judge the earth: for you shall inherit all nations.

This psalm, of course, alludes to that, obviously, those who wanted to live well without killing had difficulties. It also states that “all men are like gods”... Sorry, they *are* gods, not “like gods.” “They are like gods” is what the serpent said at the beginning of the Bible. Here in this psalm it is said that we *are* gods. That is the difference between *Kosmon* and *Ouranon*. In *Kosmon*, Satan says that human beings are *like* gods, and in *Ouranon*, a subtlety, it is said in Psalm 82, that men *are* gods.

We have already said that the Pharisees carried the genealogy of Jesus, as if he were only a Jew, up to Abraham. That's what the Pharisees did. The Zealots, up to David, who was the warrior king, because they wanted the liberation of Judea, Samaria and Galilee from the Romans. Luke takes the genealogy of Jesus up to Adam, and makes him part of all humanity. But John takes the genealogy of Jesus up to God and makes him one with God.

We have already said that there are only two sacraments: baptism and mass.

And when we speak of Light and Darkness, Psalm 82 makes this very clear. It is about existing to survive, *Kosmon*, the world or living the true, not imaginary, a life that would be *Ouranon*, Heaven. But curiously in Greek we have the word *Basileia*, which means “the Kingdom,” and three kingdoms are

mentioned: the *Basileia of Kosmon*, the Kingdom of the World, directed by Satan; *Basileia tou Ouranon*, which means “the Kingdom of Heaven” or “Heaven,” which is ruled by JesuKristos, but in other places they speak of *Basileia tou Theon*, which means “The Kingdom of God.” That is, in the Kingdom of God there are two kingdoms: *Kosmon* and *Ouranon*, the World and Heaven.

All this is very important if we want to understand anything about the Bible and especially the New Testament. For example, in the first chapter of John... those who defend the theory that it was a Johannine school who wrote the Gospel of John and not only John, they say that the first chapter of the Gospel of John was written by a group of authors or another author who was not John, because he has a different style. But that chapter talks about the children of God, of *Ouranon*, and John says, Chapter 1, that they are not of blood, that is, they are not of a certain race, such as Jews; they are *not of the flesh*, that is, it is not that because a child of any race is born in any place in the world and has human flesh then he is a child of God, nor is it –says the first chapter of John– from man, that is, man identified with thought and word. That is, just because a man says or thinks he is a child of God, that doesn’t make him a child of God.

This puts the fact of being a child of God as something very special. For example, one of the things that John says is that the lowest in the Kingdom of Heaven –or something like that– is above John the Baptist. This implies that John the Baptist, in spite of all his sanctity, despite having preceded JesuKristos in preaching, was not in Heaven. Peter himself is not in Heaven, but at the gates of Heaven. Why? Because he had had children. Where? In *Kosmon*.

So, being a child of God becomes something very fine in John, and it seems to be something that happens by affinity, not by blood or by flesh or because the person says or thinks so; it is something that comes from affinity with the spiritual, that is, with the supernatural, and something that comes through a sanctification, which means “contempt for the natural,” which

is the *Kosmon*, the world, the one that the human being has made, ruled by Satan.

In Chapter 3, which in my opinion –to Ruben's understanding– is the summit of the Bible, when Jesus talks to Nicodemus, he tells Nicodemus, who was a true Jewish priest, a rabbi; Jesus tells Nicodemus that he has to be born of *anoten* and *pneuma*. *Anoten* is something like “above” and *pneuma* is clearly “air.” That is, what Jesus is telling Nicodemus is that he does not have to reincarnate, but that he has to be born from above, from the air.

I do not know if it is convenient to read this phrase. What do you think about?

Audience: Sure, of course.

RFG: I think that because of its importance, even though it loses a lot of strength in Spanish, we should review Chapter 3 of John, when Nicodemus tells Jesus that he is old and that he cannot be born from a woman's womb, meaning that he no longer wants to reincarnate, that he is tired of reincarnation. Jesus says to him: *“Truly I tell you, if you are not born of water and spirit...”* Spirit is the translation of *pneuma*, which in Greek means “air.” In Greek it would say: *“If you are not born of water and air, you cannot enter the Kingdom of God (Ouranon). What is born of the flesh (repeats it as in Chapter 1) is flesh, and what is born of air is air. Do not be surprised that I told you it is necessary to be born again (in Spanish; in Greek it says “air” again).”* *“Do not be surprised that I told you it is necessary to be born from the air.”* Whether this is related to Unitary Perception or not... it seems to me that it is closely related, because in the air there is sound, light, and that is what you have to perceive to be in *metanoia*, beyond everything known or in Unitary Perception. That is Rubén’s interpretation (RFG).

Jesus says, almost ending the conversation with Nicodemus, who had come at midnight, knowing that Jesus was already convicted for having raised Lazarus... –the fear that both the

Romans and the Jewish rulers of the Sanhedrin had of a revolution by an army of dead men revived by Jesus, against the Romans, which would bring, according to Caiaphas and the Jewish religious leaders, a destruction of Judea, Samaria and Galilee by the Roman army, as it actually happened seventy years later.

And Jesus says, he tells Nicodemus, Chapter 3:8: “The wind blows where it wants and you hear its sound, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going. That’s how everyone who was born of the air is.” Nicodemus replies: “How can this be done?” And Jesus says: “You are a teacher of Israel and do not know this? Truly I tell you that what we know, we speak, and what we have seen [we testify], and in spite of everything you are not receiving our teaching, because if I tell you things that are of *Kosmon* and do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you things about *Ouranon*?”

Very nice, but if you do not understand what *Kosmon* and *Ouranon* are and do not read it in Greek, you will not understand anything. You will not understand anything.

Then we repeat that even in the New Testament it is implied that the Baptist and Peter are not in Heaven, because they did not establish total affinity with *Ouranon*. And it is also implied that there are three consciousnesses:

- Kristos, who is the conscience of *Ouranon*, who lives in *Ouranon*, in Heaven.
- There is another awareness –there are three–: that of Adam, which is the first human being in the biblical Genesis, to whom God gives a woman by removing a rib. The rib of course is below the arm as if to say that the man has to protect the woman. So God gives Adam a woman, but both are tempted by Satan in the form of a serpent and they lose Paradise, but they have an Adamic consciousness, what consciousness is that? The consciousness of remembering having been in Heaven, which is what can happen to a person who remembers what it is to live in Unitary

Perception, for example, and will never again want to stop living in Unitary Perception.

- Then there is the human consciousness, which is the consciousness of fear, anger and sadness.

The book of John is divided into two parts. First, the part of signs and miracles... Sorry, signs or miracles. John calls them “signs,” translated into Spanish as “miracles.” And a second part of glory, which is the part in which resurrection is spoken of, which in Greek is *anastasis*, and which is not *anastenai*. *Anastenai* in Greek means “to resurrect,” which only JesuKristos does. But human beings, if they establish affinity living in *metanoia*, beyond all known, with *anastasis*, which is to be above the human condition, they can receive the *anastasis*, which is a noun. But they cannot themselves do the resurrection, execute it as JesuKristos did. This subtlety is from the Greek, it is not perceived in Spanish or in any European language; but in Greek the word *anastenai*, which is the verb, is used for JesuKristos, and *anastasis*, which is a noun, for human beings.

And then, in the Gospel of John are the signs of Cana, or the miracles, if you will, of Cana. In Cana Jesus transforms water into wine, that is, the teaching into what transforms consciousness. We have to drink the teaching, it means to study it, and in our body it is transformed into wine, with luck, and it transforms our consciousness. That is the first sign of Jesus.

But immediately the second sign is that Jesus elaborates a tremendous whip with ropes, goes to the temple and drives the merchants out of the temple.

Audience: Did he hit them with the whip?

RFG: He hit them with the whip and threw the changers' coins, and he said: “This is not the place for you.” Merchants cannot be in the temple. But what is he trying to say? If he has just said that the temple of God is the human body, and if he,

JesuKristos nothing less, was the one who would tell Pilate himself: “You can kill me, but in three days I can make my body again.” That is, that which happens in the resurrection. “I can do that with this temple.” So, it is clearly written: “He was talking about the temple as the body,” his body. That is, if JesuKristos himself identifies the word temple with the human body, then the second sign of Jesus, who goes to the temple to drive away the merchants, is referring to the merchants who are within us, that is, the desire for money, when we want to make money, to save money, to feel safe with money, and in that way we forget about *Ouranon*, which is also implied in Psalm 82, which I just read.

Now, then comes Nicodemus, in the third chapter of John. After that comes what happens in Samaria next to Jacob's well with a Samaritan woman. Now, bear in mind that the Jews were separated in nations, not without a reason, it was because they had fought all their lives. They are still fighting in that same area that the Romans call Palestine, that they called Palestine. Now, the war today is for there to be a Palestinian nation and an Israeli nation. The Arabs say that this is not possible, that Israel shouldn't exist and that is why there's war in the Middle East. Here we are talking about two thousand years ago, and Jesus, who enters Samaria, was considered in the first place a man, secondly an enemy. Then it is an act of tremendous courage, a great courage to speak to a woman –a Samaritan woman–, and on top of that, to call her a “liar” (laughs). I mean, I believe that Jesus is risking his life there.

Audience: But what does he say?

RFG: At Jacob's well, he says, “Can you give me water?” to the Samaritan woman. She is surprised, first because “this *man*, a *Jew*, comes to ask *me*, a Samaritan, his enemy, for water.” Then she gives him water and he says, “Are you married?” She tells him, I think she tells him that she has no husband, and he says to her: “You say well, you don't have a husband, because the man who lives with you is not your husband.”

Audience: “Because you’ve had three husbands, but the one who lives with you is not your husband.”

RFG: I do not know if it was “more than three husbands you had.”

Audience: This is what he says.

RFG: And she is denying it, that is, he is calling her a liar, besides proving group mind (laughs). No doubt a quality he had, it seems that he had lived a long time in Unitary Perception.

Audience: Five, he says.

Audience: Oh, five. “Five husbands you have had and the one who lives with you...”

RFG: “Five husbands you’ve had.” I knew there were more than three (laughter). Well, in a word, he is calling her a liar.

Audience: “And the one you have now is not.”

RFG: “And the one you have now is not,” because she was living with a man she was not married to.

But all this implies many things. Historically, a man talking to an enemy... A man talking to a woman, which was not allowed, and a Jew talking to a Samaritan, who were enemies. So Jesus breaks two rules there, in addition to all the ones he had already broken, like healing on the Sabbath and... anyway. All the rules he broke. And to say that “there will be neither Greek nor Roman or Jew, neither slave nor lord.” Well, that’s breaking all the rules. But the darkness does not understand his teaching. That is insisted upon.

And the last sign or the last *miracle*, as translated into Spanish, is the fact that he revives Lazarus. Before doing so, he cries. Why cry? Is he crying because Lazarus was dead? Or is he crying because the sisters, Martha and Mary, are asking him to bring Lazarus back to the life of death? Undoubtedly, he cries because the sisters are asking him to bring Lazarus to life, and

he is crying because he is going to bring him to the life of death.

Audience: If he didn't want to, he would not bring him.

RFG: Of course, because JesuKristos brings him, according to the Gospel, so that everyone would believe in the message that he brought, which was to live life fully, in a completely different way, in another kingdom, which is that of *Ouranon*, which was inside of all of them, as Paul says later –perhaps before–, that “the mind of Kristos is in all of us.” (1 Cor. 2:16)

And many things happen there; the last sign: Jesus revives someone and then there is a great banquet, of merriment, of joy. The only one who is sad is Jesus, and Mary, one of the two sisters described by John, smears spikenard ointment imported from India, very expensive, on the feet of JesuKristos, which was something that was done only to the dead as a ritual, with which Mary is declaring that Jesus is already a dead man, why? Because he had revived Lazarus, and no one could be fooled into thinking they weren't going to fear Jesus building an army –which is what the Zealots wanted, an army of the dead– to fight against the Imperial occupier Rome. Then Jesus, in the eyes of Mary, is a corpse, and of course he is convicted by law.

I write the book *Jesus of the Desert* starting at this moment, which is when the preaching of Jesus, the public preaching, ends and they are hidden in Ephraim, a city that is between Judea and Samaria. Symbolic:

“Let us unite.” A city that is between Judea and Samaria. And in Ephraim Jesus goes to the desert and in my book *Jesus of the Desert*, I have all the friends of Jesus speak, including Lazarus. It is an exegetical book, a book that emphasizes the resurrection, because if you have read it, you know what JesuKristos says at the end: “Let's get up and leave this place.” And the signs cease when he resurrects Lazarus, and the John of glory begins. “Let's get up and leave this place,” that is, the Jesus of the resurrection begins. When John says –also Matthew, Mark and Luke– that Jesus is the Messiah of the Jews, the Messiah sent by God who the Jews were waiting for,

so that they were free from all enemies and could start two thousand years of glory in the so-called “New Jerusalem,” which was a red city in which everyone would live in economic equality and in a life of Heaven, not a life of *Kosmon*.

That Messiah, who is it? It is God who DENIES HIMSELF [*Spanish: se anonada*], who becomes like nothing, and is nothing less than Jesus.

But there is also another element that is the *parousia*, which is the second coming, the concept that Jesus has to return, and he has to return for two things: to correct the teaching and to re-emphasize that he is going to form a city, the New Jerusalem, with the children of God. And the children of God are, of course, a collective entity. And: is it also implied that this second coming is not of one person, but of all the children of God, who are now the *Kristos*? If the mind of *Kristos* is in all of us, as he says... and as John said before, Paul himself too, then the second coming can be interpreted very well as: now we are all going to be *Kristos*, and as *Kristos* himself said: “You will do bigger things than what I did,” that is, they will all go to *Ouranon*, in a psychological mutation that begins with *metanoia*, which means in Greek... –poorly translated into Spanish as “repentance” and “conversion”–, but in reality *metanoia* means: “Let us go beyond everything we know,” that is, beyond *Kosmon*, to be able to enter *Ouranon* and become related to *anastasis*, which is the resurrection.

This is a hasty [synthesized] exegesis of the Gospel of John, which has been done above all with the intention that we have a dialogue.

Of course it is an exegesis for believers (laughter), so I dared to make a joke by an atheist at the beginning, so that the atheist was not excluded either.

Audience: There is a part in the gospel... They say they were gathered by the sea eating fish.

RFG: In the end.

Audience: Yes, and that Jesus... appears with...

RFG: They do not recognize him.

Audience: They do not recognize him...

RFG: That's why the Docetians of the Alexandria school said that [Jesus] was only divine and that he seemed to be human, because when he comes back from Heaven and all twelve of them see him there, they do not recognize him. They are full of fear and he says: "*Eirene umin*," "be at peace." Later when they recognize him they say: "Ah, it is Jesus!" and they are happy. And Jesus, what does he say? "*Eirene umin*," "be at peace," he insists again, just returned from Heaven.

What you are saying is one of the apparitions, if I am not mistaken the third one, in which he appears on the beach and they do not recognize him either. That's why the Docetians, the exegetical school of Alexandria, insisted that God was only divine... Sorry, that Jesus was only divine, and therefore when he appeared, he simply seemed to be Jesus, but not even that, because they do not recognize him in this scene that you are... remembering.

Audience: But it seems... he appeared with another physical description.

RFG: Exactly. He appeared with another body.

Audience: But then...

RFG: Then, were the Docetians right that he was purely human...? Sorry, that he was purely divine? That he seemed to be human, but it seems that the body he formed was not always the same to manifest.

Instead, the school in Antioch said he was a human prophet, nothing more.

Audience: Rubén, just a question... that he appeared with a different body had nothing to do with reincarnation?

RFG: No, no, reincarnation is, after dying, being born in another woman's womb. These [things we are talking about] are the signs or apparitions of Jesus.

Audience: About the signs, right? The third one is not clear to me. What is the point with the Samaritan woman? That... we should go beyond the rules of the world? In the fourth sign, it is not very clear either. Well, it seems that you had to live in the world without touching it. And in the second there is something that is not very clear to me. That is, where does seeing the conflict fit there?

Audience: In expelling merchants...

Audience: Well... I don't know if expelling the merchants would be to see the conflict, and his tremendous attitude is very revealing, because I don't know if that would be violence, I would call it... I don't know, full energy.

RFG: Or it's something merely exegetical, something merely to be interpreted, something that has to be discovered in our body.

Audience: Aha. And in the third sign, what happens? Why go beyond the rules to discover...? Because I think that at the end of the dialogue with the Samaritan woman, what happens is that... the teaching reaches her, doesn't it? I believe.

Audience: She says that she "Went and told everyone that she found a man who told her everything about her life."

RFG: Yes, it reaches her, yes; [the teaching] reaches her.

Audience: Then, it is to go beyond the rules... I do not know how to interpret the third sign... and the fourth one, if it is to

live in the world or to die... or death, to die in life –or to die as in the death of the “I.”

RFG: Yes, “Take your cross... deny yourself, take your cross and follow me,” says JesuKristos. Start by “denying yourself,” that is, the self disappears. That’s what Jesus is saying...

Audience: The non-functional self.

RFG: ...at some point. At some point he says it. He says... Ah, to the rich boy, who approaches Jesus and he tells him: “Alright, deny yourself, take your cross and follow me,” and the boy says: “But my father has worked so many years.”

Audience: Sell everything ...

RFG: No, not like that. He says: “My father has worked all his life to leave me this field, I cannot sell it, I cannot...”

Audience: It is the one to whom he says: “Sell everything you have...”

Audience: But they are translated by many... They also say: “Deny yourself.”

RFG: Sure, it depends on the translator. But what I want to say is that...

Audience: Everything I have, everything known...

Audience: Micro [*use the microphone*].

RFG: Everything known in the body, among which are the merchants of the temple, which is our love of money and everything else, or our need for money to survive in *Kosmon*. Now, obviously, Jesus is talking about Light and Darkness, or at least John, sorry. At least John, because what Jesus wrote got burned very soon, it seems. It seems that he wrote a book called *Egoemes*, and it was burned, as the book of John was

burned, but luckily recovered. But the Romans burned everything.

Then it is clear that they are talking about the Light and the Darkness, and that both are in us, in each human being, in each one of us there is Light and Darkness, and that God put us together so that we can help each other bring out the Light and not to push each other into Darkness. That's why I read Psalm 82: "Help each other, help the poor, the orphan," etc. "Beware of the wicked, stop justifying the wicked," etc. It is very well said in Psalm 82, and it says that we are gods, not *like* gods, as the serpent said. There is much exegetical content in Psalm 82 related to all this of the Light and the Darkness; it seems that in Kristianity they are seen as one, that the Light and the Darkness occupy the same space in the body, in the temple.

But then Mani comes; two hundred years after Jesus comes Manichaeism, where... What is his name? Was it St. Augustine? The one who was Manichaean...

Audience: Yes, Saint Augustine.

RFG: Saint Augustine; he was a Manichaean and converted to Christianity back in the year [385 AD], I think. What does Mani do? He was a Persian prophet, or *Parthian*, as was said at that time. Mani, what does he do? To separate Light and Darkness, and from there the whole Gnostic school is born, claiming that the Darkness is over there and the Light is over here.

Audience: In what year?

RFG: That was after Mani, 200 AD.

Audience: Ah, what about St. Augustine?

RFG: St. Augustine came later, I don't know exactly in what year [354 AD], but St. Augustine was a Manichaean, that is, he had separated the Light from the Darkness, which was what Mani said, that they were separated, and that you had to make a

complete break with the world, said Mani. That is why exegesis is important, because: is that what Jesus is saying? No, it's not the same as what Mani is saying. It seems that Jesus, although he said that not everyone can be a child of God... –it cannot be because of flesh or blood or of man, he makes it difficult, and on top of that, he says that neither John the Baptist nor Peter are in Heaven, which means that then... what is left for us? (laughter)

Audience: That is, that nothing can be done to enter [Precinct] A...

RFG: Of course. And then, what John the Baptist was doing was, with much anger, condemning the king because he had married his brother's sister. I believe the implicit message is that by condemning evil, you will not enter Heaven. That's great, why? Because evil and good are in us, in all of us, so we have to help each other to be well, something that does not happen, something that does not happen. That's why I read Psalm 82, which does not happen, because the red city, which is the New Jerusalem, is a city where everyone helps everyone, where everyone is equal, where everyone is free and all are brothers.

But that city has not yet appeared.

Audience: Shamballa, right?

RFG: Well, within Christianity. Shamballa, yes, a very special place, right? That already exists in the Brahmanic tradition.

Audience: Oh, that already exists.

RFG: That already exists, yes. The New Jerusalem is the one that will exist. Now, where do we draw the line? How much do we have to break contact with the world? That is, how much of a saint do I have to be? Saint means “he who separates himself from the world.” Now, how much does a saint separate from the world? 90%? 50%? Who establishes the percentage? It's a very difficult thing, I've given a lot of thought to all this.

Because of the Catholic influence I have had, I gave this a lot, a lot of thought, and I have taken it very seriously in terms of thinking this out, but, to what percentage I have to leave the world? I still cannot find the percentage.

Audience: But there, the world would not only be the external, but the internal. For example, the Adamic consciousness seems –and this is a question– to be the same as the functional self. That is, is the functional self the one that helps take Unitary Perception seriously? Then, from the internal world there is a part of thought not only will help us to... Well, it can help us to survive in the world, but [also] as a springboard to get out of it. To have rationality, clarity...

RFG: What would the springboard be?

Audience: The question is... –It's the functional self. Is it the functional self that takes Unitary Perception seriously or is it the one that allows Unitary Perception to be taken seriously?

RFG: However, for example JK-2 says: “When This ceases, That begins.” He gets very radical there.

Audience: Yes, Rubén, good, but... That's... JK-2 says: “Sit on the edge of the river and let the waters... and watch the waters go by,” and that's the paradox, isn't it? In other words, seeking is not possible, and you have to decide to sit down and let the waters pass. One has to decide, leave the other and remain still. So the question is, is the functional self...?

RFG: Leaving is the issue. And what does it mean to leave? Because... is it internal? Is it internal and external? It is... what? Is it that I have to do as many Catholic monks and independent non-Catholic monks have done, that they have completely abandoned everything, money and everything...?

Audience: But, what about the internal?

RFG: And internally, how much did they leave? So the thing is difficult as to how much to leave, where to leave, etc.

Audience: What to leave... or what comes off.

RFG: What to leave, because in India there is the Brahmanic tradition that at age forty, man leaves his family and goes to live a purely spiritual life. I think this was done, if I'm not mistaken, by JK's nephew, who was...

Audience: Narayan? Wasn't it Narayan?

RFG: Narayan, who was JK's nephew, who was the one who asked him in Brockwood, when I was eating with JK: "Tell us... Tell us about reincarnation." And Krishnamurti, after chewing for a long while, then swallowing, answers: "What is it that continues?" And then he keeps eating (laughter). And that was all he said: "What is it that continues?"

So, it seems that what continues is what has to stop, and what is it that continues? The thought of Precinct C, with its dualities, repetitions, and that is what we have to leave. If that was the case, as it seems to be what JK is defining, it doesn't mean it will be easy, but it is a kind of measure for the human being. As exegesis is. Exegesis is a way of looking at sacred literature, and tomorrow perhaps there is a new discovery and there is a new exegesis. About this, we have not said many things about canonical exegesis. The Catholic Church thinks that there is only one John who wrote the gospel, and today the new theologians say that there were many students of John writing the gospel and the Apocalypse or Revelation, and that it was a group of men who wrote, supervised by John. It means that there is a canonical exegesis and a non-canonical exegesis, just as there is a historical exegesis, like: did all this appear because they had nothing left and they needed to have someone like Jesus, as a guide? Historical exegesis.

Then, exegesis can complicate the understanding of sacred literature, which according to many, has to be addressed individually and understood individually.

Audience: Rubén, thought comes from memory, and thought

produces that illusory entity that we call “me.” However, I believe that “the functional me” refers to what Bohm said about “the present me is the unknown,” which means that the entity does not become conscious, but emerges at the moment it is required; it is required for survival merely and in that sense the functional self does not disappear, what disappears is that entity of the self that is not functional, right? And that is the problem, because egocentricity and self-interest are intrinsic there; selfishness and the entire problem that makes us get lost in time and... Let’s say that it makes us create the awareness of time and time becomes relevant in that becoming in which the ego, the egocentrism is, constantly.

RFG: Well, JK says that self and time are the same.

Audience: Exactly. Yes, JK says that I and time are the same, but in the *Bohmian* sense, when he talks about the self, “the present me is the unknown,” it is implicit –it is a subtlety– that at the same time it is not interfering with something in which the self is not functional, but that in some way it also makes us have the instinct of survival, of the danger for survival. And in that sense the necessary side of the function of the self appears.

RFG: Yes, that is, showing your passport to cross the border.

Audience: Well, JK also says, and I remember, in a moment of the dialogues with Anderson, he says: “We work eight hours a day to go to the office for fifty years, but we do not work for...” –he does not say for the most important thing of life, but he means that. He says that we have to work and that it is also the most difficult job that exists, that is, it is the same skill that we use to fulfill a labor project that interests us.

RFG: This is what happens when the teaching of JK-2 lights you up, that there is a time when there is no longer a place in your life for many other things, and you are working all the time to spread this teaching. And then one can say: “Well, is this the way to devote ourselves or are we fooling ourselves?” But if you really understand what is being said and Unitary Perception has been lived, I do not think it can be left,

particularly I do not think it can be left. That's why it's something that is added to you, it's not something you look for. It is not something that you look for, but it is added to you: "Yes, I will work until my death or even my incapacity to promote Unitary Perception." That is a fact for me, that I have lived Unitary Perception and I say: "Ah, dear."

I say that when someone has started working on this and then left, that is because they did not live Unitary Perception. They do not know what it is, that's why they leave.

Audience: It is one thing to leave it and another to live it.

RFG: Sure, to leave the promotion (of the Teaching). If someone abandons the promotion, I think it's because they did not live it. Yes.

Audience: My doubt is only this: the functional self is not necessarily... Well, you need to plan the day to do that, so you can stay with the teaching and be here, being in the world without touching it.

RFG: Yes... *[To a student]* Anything?

Audience: I think it is pertinent to say or remember that Precinct B encompasses Precinct C, and that resistance to Precinct C is the problem. But if we see it naturally, the movement... As we say, thought emerges in the brain just like saliva does so in the mouth; our will has nothing to do with it. And if the brain is alive, psychologically, inevitably it will produce contents that, in the fact of Unitary Perception, we see that these contents have a less preponderant relevance, and they become merely closer to the functional than the non-functional, even if only for instants.

I believe therein lies the understanding this, of the importance of Unitary Perception and of making it our life with perseverance, to be able to realize the truth that thought does not emerge with its egocentric contents incessantly, and that it

is possible that at least at times we realize how this egocentric entity ceases. There it is, I believe, the core of the matter.

RFG: Yes, do not push. In a word, do not push; see how the Precinct C moves: duality, repetition, etc.

Audience: Well... We have already changed the subject, but we return... with your permission, to the resurrection of Jesus.

RFG: Well, the subject is really John or exegesis.

Audience: Yes, it's what we finished with. Then, where... Where does Jesus come down from? From where...?

RFG: The word used in Italy, which was what Raffaele Angelisanti told me, is that God is “*anonadado*” [*self-denied or self-emptied*] to be born in Mary. *Anonadar* means “to become like nothing” and not even nothing, “no-nothing”, and to become like nothing, he has to ultimately deny himself in order to be born of a human being. Then JesuKristos is also called, at least in Italy, “the *anonadamiento* [*self-denying*] of God.” God is self-denied as a human being, what for? To be able to make human beings return to Paradise and not to continue expelled. It is an act of God's love, the fact of denying himself as Jesus in order to allow humanity to return to Paradise, where he had left a sword guarding the entrance, with cherubs and angels there preventing the human being from entering Paradise again. But when Jesus comes, what does he bring? He brings the sword. What sword? The sword that Jesus [God] had placed at the entrance of Paradise to forbid humans the entrance.

Audience: That God had placed.

RFG: That God had placed, and that Jesus comes and says: “Here is the sword, now you can enter.” That is the sword of Jesus; it is not the sword of war. And he says to Peter, when he cuts off the soldier's ear... Sorry, Caiaphas's slave... –the slave named Malchus, who was the slave of Caiaphas, the head of the Sanhedrin. He cuts off that slave's ear, Malchus, and what does Jesus say? “Sheathe your sword, Peter,” as if to say that

there is a human sword to be sheathed-not used-, and a divine sword, which is what he has already brought, for what? So we can enter Paradise.

Those subtle differences are not made, as far as I know, in any church.

Audience: So Jesus Christ was a creation of God?

RFG: Sure.

Audience: But then everyone can be self-denied [*Spanish anonadarse*] or...?

RFG: No, no, the interpretation given to Jesus, at least in the Italian language, is that God is *anonadado*, he becomes like nothing, in order to become Jesus. But he does it out of love.

Audience: Jiddu Krishnamurti said: “Blessed is the man who is nothing.”

RFG: Who is nothing.

Audience: He said that, first, *what is* is conflict, but when conflict ceases, man is nothing. And that is the sword.

RFG: The conflict is over; you entered Paradise. Of course, that is why it is often said that if we do not enter Paradise now, we cannot enter after we die.

Audience: Well, I think things are in context, because if Cecilia disappears when the non-functional thought ceases and the only thing that remains is something that is not Cecilia, because Cecilia is only that egoic entity that appears when it is not functional, with her fears, her rages, her sorrows, her conflicts, then when that egoic entity disappears, that is where we are all one, one is one with all, where we are all in one body. So I think it's very much in context.

RFG: What thing?

Audience: What Natzio is saying about all this we are talking about the *anonadamiento*.

RFG: Oh, yes.

Audience: I deny myself, I become nothing now, Cecilia disappears, and what's left? Is it the unique or the ONE that remains? The ONE remains.

RFG: Is the *Kosmon* what remains in Ruben or is it the *Ouranon* in Ruben?

Audience: That's right. In the ONE we are all ONE and in the unique is Cecilia. If she denies herself, she becomes ONE, as we are all. Then I believe that self-denial, we all have the possibility of becoming nothing, like Jesus. Of course, Jesus said: "You will do works even greater than those I have done." Of course, therefore...

RFG: Possibly self-denial is the most difficult.

Audience: Is that the measure of the human being? Is it the measure of the human being to be... JesuKristos?

Audience: But then death is a will.

Audience: Sorry, wait until you get the microphone.

RFG: Then you speak...

Audience: And... what was I going to say? (laughter)

RFG: That the self-denial is something that not only Jesus did, but that we can do.

Audience: That's right. Well, you read earlier in Psalm 82 that: "You are gods, but as men you will die."

RFG: "And even as the last prince."

Audience: But then for JesuKristos his death was almost like a will, because if nothing is done...

RFG: What did he say to Judas Iscariot...? Judas wanted him to meet with the Sanhedrin so that everyone would know his teaching. What does Jesus say? “What you have to do, do it quickly.” He does not say “don’t do anything,” he does not say “be careful what you are going to do,” he says: “What you have to do –look at this–, what you have to do, do it quickly,” because it was partly so that all the prophecies about Jesus would be fulfilled, that it had to end like this.

Audience: Then that is doing the will of God. That is doing the will of God.

RFG: Accepting something as terrible as turning yourself in and dying, and that a friend of yours is the one who mediates that delivery. He is doing it with a lot of pain, it is supposed, but he is telling him to do it quickly.

Audience: The act of love.

RFG: Of course. Yes.

Audience: Regarding the interpretation that the second coming of Jesus Christ is that all those who are transformed are that second coming, and that they will do greater works, evidently there is only one greater work, that all humanity is transformed, that is, there is only one work. And JesuKristos had to refer to what had not been fulfilled with him, because humanity did not change, so what can happen is that humanity is transformed. Then there is only one now, and that gives great meaning to now.

RFG: Yes, that is why the school of Antioch appears, which said that Jesus was a human prophet and that he had even failed because no one had heard him. This was said by the Ebionites, who lived in a very poor way intentionally, and who were deemed heretics by the Church and disappeared. But that is

what the Ebionites proposed: that Jesus was a human prophet and failed, because nobody had heard his teaching.

All this is interesting, right? And how exegetical movements appear, that is, how I understand or how they, the Ebionites, understand. The same thing that in Alexandria was understood as Jesus being only God, who appeared as a human being whenever he wanted, and not always with the same human body, it seems, because friends sometimes did not recognize him.

So, is it that Docetism –which is a Catholic heresy; for Catholics Docetism is a heresy– that Jesus was only divine is a great mistake or were they right? Or, was he nothing more than a prophet, as the Ebionites said?

Real movements appear on earth, real churches, Docetians and Ebionites, who see all this that we are seeing in completely opposite ways.

Audience: Or “perfectly God and perfectly man.”

RFG: Of course, that is the Catholic vision, that Jesus is both God and man.

Audience: So when Jesus resuscitates, when he leaves his body, it is implied that he goes to the implicit, right?

RFG: Yes, he returns to his home, let's say. (*Do not make false correlations between the Biblical and the Holokinetic languages*)

Audience: He goes to the implicit order, because then he changes his body, and when he changes his body, he changes his mind.

RFG: It might be interpreted like that, of course. And the fact that he appears differently also gives much reason for exegesis.

Audience: But the fact of changing minds, is it because the

mind is universal mind? I'm talking about what he said, that a different body returns with a different mind, but in the end, mind is one: the universal mind.

RFG: Oh, sure, of course, but in his manifestation, he sometimes becomes different. Or it is, as the Ebionites said, that he was different because he got fatter or thinner. But the Docetians said no, they said: "What happens is that he is divine and he appears as he wants or as he can," the body that he will be, because he comes to have breakfast with his friends, I think it was the last time he came to have breakfast with friends, and from there comes the question of whether he was a vegetarian or not, because if he ate fish, he was not a vegetarian. Then let's go to what Jesus said: "What comes out of your mouth is more important than what comes into it," therefore whether JesuKristos is a vegetarian is a secondary issue. I asked JK-2, I said: "Do you need to be a vegetarian to live the teaching you propose?" He says: "Of course not." It is simply an act of compassion, but to live all that is being said, a life of *metanoia*, beyond the known, a life in Unitary Perception, one does not need to eat Yolanda's custard (laughter). Anything (laughter). No matter how good the thing is, it is not necessary. What we eat is secondary; that is what Jesus is saying when he says: "What comes out of your mouth is more important than what comes in," as if giving secondary importance to what we eat.

Audience: And going back to what you mentioned before "being born again," the summit of the Gospel of John.

RFG: The summit?

Audience: From the Gospel of John, where Nicodemus and Jesus talk, where [Jesus] says that in order to be born again it is necessary to be like the wind that "You hear the sound, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going. And so is he who is born of the air."

RFG: Translated as "*spirit*," air. But in reality he says "*pneuma*," right? "Air." So, it's about living in the unknown,

because if you do not know where you're coming from or where you're going, you're in the unknown.

Audience: Past-future.

RFG: Sure, without a past or a future, are you living like a vagabond? That is, what is the difference between a vagabond, who does not know what his tomorrow will be like, and a person who takes all this seriously?

Audience: But I mean that in context, how coherent is the Kristian teaching that we are reviewing now, with what Unitary Perception and Holokinetic Psychology manifest.

RFG: I do not see difference.

Audience: In that sense, because what Bohm says, that “the present me is the unknown...” If the consciousness of the past and the future ceases, what remains in consciousness? The movement of the present in flow, where time becomes irrelevant, and where the egoic entity of the self that is not functional, which is the problem, disappears.

RFG: Which does not mean that you become unpunctual.

Audience: No, precisely, memory becomes more precise and only what is merely necessary for survival emerges to consciousness, devoid of that self-centeredness, which is the problem of Precinct C.

RFG: For me it was very clear one day that I was in Ojai. I arrived at ten o'clock in the morning for the twelve o'clock conference, and I sat by a tree that is there to the right of the Oak Grove. Here JK spoke and I was there, on the right, by a very beautiful tree. I was there, very happy, waiting for him to speak, and when I see JK arrive, he was walking as if a hurricane was dragging him, and to top it all, looking at the clock. It was an image I had never had of JK: that he could hurry so much to arrive on time. Then I said: “Of course, being in irrelevant time does not mean being unpunctual.” And you

could see JK running to get to that chair at twelve, which is the exact time he arrived. In other words, to be in irrelevant time, you do not need to be unpunctual.

Audience: I'm with the same thing Cecilia said right now. A question nothing else: Jesus says to Nicodemus: "...born of water and air?"

RFG: That's also discussed because it does not say "*hydratos*," it says "*hidatos*." It looks like water.

Audience: But for example, when we talked about signs, we mentioned that perhaps water would be "teaching" or "knowledge."

RFG: Of course, it's the sacred teaching, the one Jesus is teaching.

Audience: And also, I ask now, when Jesus speaks with the Samaritan woman, he asks for water.

Audience: Ah, but he says: "I am going to give you the water that quenches your thirst."

Audience: Ah, right, right.

RFG: He says: "I have another water for you that will quench your thirst forever." The idea of *water* as "teaching" continues in the Samaritan.

Well, everywhere where the word *water* appears, it is linked to the idea of teaching, and the fish, what is it? Life in the water. And what happens, also in Samaria, when Jesus multiplies the fish? What is he trying to say? When he is talking to many people and saying it many times, multiplying what? The life of the teaching, which is him, and he goes to many places and talks to many people and nobody listens to him.

Audience: And fish die when you take them out of the water.

RFG: Huh?

Audience: And fish die when you take them out of the water.

RFG: Of course, if you take them out of the teaching, they die. So he is multiplying the life that is in the teaching, and that is what the multiplication of fish really means.

Now, in Chapter 9 of Luke –I think– if I’m not mistaken it is 9, it says: “And then Jesus spoke of the Kingdom of Heaven all day.” But it does not say anything. So he multiplies the fish, which is to give life to the teaching, and then he speaks of the Kingdom of Heaven, *Ouranon*, all day, and nothing more is said. The theologians say that someone put the scissors to what Jesus said about the Kingdom of Heaven, after multiplying the fish, in the Gospel of Luke. Because he “talked all day,” so you expect him to continue talking about it, and it’s only that. What did he say? He talked all day; tell me something he said (laughter). No, nothing, it does not say anything. It must have been something extremely revolutionary, extremely unacceptable to the one who saw it for the first time, and it got erased, cut off. A crime. Because let’s not forget, I don’t know how this phrase survived: “There will be neither Greek nor Roman or Jew, neither slave nor lord,” when he breaks with all the Old Testament, which allows slavery, and breaks with a lot of things. That phrase has remained, how curious. That is why I trust the gospel that has reached us, the New Testament that has reached us, that there was not so much ill will. There have been errors, although some theologians say that Chapter 9 of Luke, when he speaks of the Kingdom of Heaven, was cut off.

Audience: We have not yet given those in Argentina a chance to ask something.

RFG: I don’t know if you have any comments in Argentina.

Audience: *[From Buenos Aires]* No, there are no comments here Rubén. It’s all very interesting.

Audience: Questions?

RFG: Alright then, if you want, we can make a short break and continue after that.

[Fifteen minute break].

RFG: Hello. We continue with the second part of the class on exegesis, on October 31, 2010.

We were talking during the coffee break we took, that there are two, at least two ways of seeing Christianity within Christianity. Jesus, and possibly John, were very concise in the vision of the whole life. You had to leave *Kosmon* and be in *Ouranon*. It was simple: leave the world and be in Heaven, even on Earth. That was done with *metanoia*, which is to go beyond everything known, which was translated as repentance and conversion to Spanish and European languages, and there – say– in that *metanoia*, was the affinity with resurrection, which is to be above the pain of the human being, both on Earth and in Heaven.

It means that there is a concise vision of what Christianity is, in the very original sources of Christianity, for example Jesus and John. But Paul, who wrote before John, around the year 60 or 70 perhaps, sees Christianity in a little more detail in his summary of Christianity, which he makes in his Letter to the Romans, Chapter 12, which I am going to read so that it gives rise to dialogue. From a vision of concise Christianity, like that of John and Jesus, to a Pauline vision, of Paul, of what Christianity is. Here goes Paul's summary of Christianity. I insist, Romans Chapter 12:

¹I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. ²And be not conformed to this world: but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good, acceptable and perfect

will of God. ³For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God has dealt to every man the measure of faith. ⁴For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same function: ⁵So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. ⁶Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; ⁷Or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teaches, on teaching; ⁸Or he that exhorts, on exhortation: he that gives, let him do it in simplicity; he that rules, with diligence; he that shows mercy, with cheerfulness. ⁹Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor that which is evil; stay with that which is good. ¹⁰Be tender loving one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another; ¹¹Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; ¹²Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; constant in prayer; ¹³Distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality. ¹⁴Bless them who persecute you: bless, and curse not. ¹⁵Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. ¹⁶Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits. ¹⁷Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. ¹⁸If it be possible, as much as lies in you, live peacefully with all men. ¹⁹Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, says the Lord. ²⁰Therefore if your enemy hungers, feed him; if he thirsts, give him drink: for in so doing you shall heap coals of fire on his head. ²¹Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

Paul's summary of Kristianity, Romans 12. A little more extended and detailed than John, which says that from *Kosmon* you have to go to *Ouranon*, that the world is not to be touched and that you have to be in Heaven, the ruler of which is JesuKristos. On the other hand, Paul gives more details, as we have just seen. Little big things that we have to do.

Audience: More behavioral, maybe.

RFG: More behavioral, perhaps, because he says that the one who teaches should teach well; those who serve, to serve well; those who distribute, be generous, etc., etc. He is talking about behaviors, but that is possibly the fruit of Paul's meditations on the teaching of Jesus, no doubt.

Audience: Well, actually in *Mahayana* Buddhism and *Hinayana*... *Hinayana* is Buddhism lived by a person, and *Mahayana* is the Buddhism of all together. So what I see from that text is the extraordinary relevance that if there is a transformation, it has to be of all humanity. So... [*it's not a choice,*] it's an understanding. I believe that each one has a way in which it becomes relevant. He says it in the text: let each one do according to the measure of their faith, as they perceive it. So he does not compare. But I think it's a deep understanding.

RFG: Yes, I don't see him adding much from his own; to me it seems to be a profound meditation on the teaching of JesuKristos. Very deep and very loyal to JesuKristos, in the sense that he does not distort it. But anyway, if you see something that is not like that, say it so we can talk about it, because I have read that Paul is a misogynist, that is, someone who is against women. I ask myself, when did they see that Paul was against women? There is a Letter from Paul to the Corinthians in which he talks about marriage, and he is saying that the woman is no longer a slave, and that man becomes a slave just like her. So I do not see where the misogyny of Paul is. I'm still looking, trying to see where it is, I have not found it yet.

Audience:[*From Ireland*] Rubén.

RFG: Do you want to comment?

Audience: *[From Ireland. The student speaks basic Spanish with gender errors]* Somewhere Paul says that the husband, the husband, is the head of the house... [The man] has the responsibility for the woman, because if the woman is sacred, it is the responsibility of the husband.

RFG: Yes, but do not forget that he says: “The head of man is God; the head of the woman is man.”

Audience:*[From Ireland]* Yes, yes, that.

RFG: A drunkard cannot be the head of a woman; it has to be a man who is living according to true life.

Audience:*[From Ireland]* Yes, yes. That is the source.

RFG: Yes, that's where the word misogyny comes from, but no; it's very badly interpreted, because you have to put yourself in the shoes of Paul, who is writing this in the year 60, when the woman was completely a slave of man, completely. Women were not even registered, that is, the names of women wouldn't be recorded. Paul changes that completely and puts women at the same height as men. Even in Chapter 7 of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, he says that a good woman can save her bad husband. It is something tremendous, that is, he gives women a place higher than men, which is the first time in history that is done. So I do not understand why Paul can be paradoxically attacked by saying he was misogynistic.

Audience: And also, to the people who did not need sex, he also gives them a place. Never before had someone said something about those people who did not need a couple, and he does.

RFG: Exactly, and he says it: Those who don't need sex: remain like me, that is, alone. But whoever needs it and is burning: then marry.

Audience: It is better to get married than to burn. And it also seems here in what we read that he releases each person from revenge. It says: revenge is for God. It is not that God is vengeful, but that he says that revenge should not be in the human being. And a question I had about prayer, he says...

RFG: That we have to stay in prayer, but we have to see what prayer meant for Paul. At least we know what prayer meant to Jesus, that after giving the Our Father to friends... It is based on the prayer to Apollo that the Macedonians had, which was the one used by Alexander the Great; he transforms it and gives a ten-finger prayer to friends. And what does he say next? Immediately afterwards in Matthew Chapter 6, verse 8? He says: "And in that way pray," the Our Father, "and in that way pray, but do not forget that before you open your mouth, God knows what you need," as if to say: "You don't need to pray either." In other words, Jesus gives prayer and immediately liberates man from prayer itself.

Audience: And also, "Our Father who is in the Heavens," "Heavens" in *Ouranon* is not the same as *Kosmon* [*Spanish uses the same word for sky and heaven: cielo*], there is another meaning...

RFG: Many mansions.

Audience: Many things that happen, in the Our Father, unnoticed.

RFG: Yes, because Jesus says: "There are many mansions in my Father's house." So, many heavens. There is a part of the Old Testament that says the heavens are created by God and he destroys them to his liking, that is, it is really a Heaven where there are many heavens that God destroys and creates whenever he wants to. But there is a difference between *Kosmon* and *Ouranon*. Therein lies the basis to understand all this.

Audience: Concerning behavior, let's see... Behavioral is a

term that is used as a perversion of behavior, that is, when the behavior obeys an interest that is alien to the good or the human being.

RFG: But that, let's say, is a lateralization of the interpretation.

Audience: But what I want to say is one thing, that when he says “do not curse the enemy,” he is talking about the internal, because not only is the conduct, but the internal conflict is constituted fundamentally of the wounds produced by relationships. So, I mean that the difference between the external and the internal, when someone talks about an act, is a slightly perverse difference, that comes a little bit from the notion of sin and all that jazz, and that actually, when he says “bless the enemy,” that is the most deeply internal thing that can be said, because the one who can truly... To bless the enemy you have to look at the hatred you have.

RFG: There is no other way.

Audience: And that seems very real to me, and that in the Bible that barrier between thought and fact, for example when JesuKristos calls Lazarus, shouts out to him, does not think about...

RFG: Who shouts at Lazarus?

Audience: JesuKristos. “Get up and...”

RFG: Come out.

Audience: “...come out.” And then, that terrible difference between thinking about killing someone and killing them. So between the act and the thought there is an immense difference; that is true. But when someone talks about the act “bless the enemy” –and not only “bless,” but also “give him a drink and feed him”– it means something very internal at the same time, that is, it's both. There it says something that I do not understand, but that... it says “coals” Something like: “You will put coals of fire on their heads.”

RFG: Meaning God is going to take care of giving the ones that do so much damage what they deserve, but it is not by your hand that you avenge yourself. In a word, it is against every form of enmity between human beings and everything that involves dividing the human being. What Paul is saying is that the human being is an organism, and that the hand can be Eloy, and the other hand can be her. But the brain is not more important than the hand, because: what does the brain do without the hand? Or what does the heart do without the feet? Where does it go? That is, that organic vision of humanity: that we are all one and that each one has its function.

Audience: And that's why he says it at the beginning, "the sacrifice of your body." It is that, the sacrifice of your body which also means: stop being you to become that "One."

RFG: In that organism. It is like the heart: the heart gives blood and nobody notices it, nobody notices it, except when the heart gets sick, then yes, you know your heart is sick, it hurts. But I remember when I was a child, Father John told us, the first steps of Catholicism, he said: "The good leader is like the heart: he gives and nobody knows it." This little priest said it. Therefore he is like the heart: gives, gives, gives, and nobody notices it. What do you call that? The leadership of the heart. If one has to be a leader in any situation, luckily or unfortunately, let him or her be like the heart, that no one can tell is a leader. Very beautiful, very beautiful. That is the essence of Kristianity, it is in the essence of Kristianity. Something very similar is also in Zen, "the leadership of Zen." No one knows that the leader is there. He is directing but nobody knows. Beautiful, beautiful.

Audience: And that does not mean to become anonymous; it's about not being egocentric.

RFG: Of course. I told JK-2, I said, "We have to give up our names." I told him this in '79, I met him in '75 and I told him in '79 in Ojai and referring to the Ojai school, that we all had to be anonymous in the school. Or at least change our names, as is

done in Catholicism with those who enter a monastery, whatever the order, they renounce their name and another name is given to them. Then, “Father Flowermary” (laughter). “You don’t like the name? Deal with it, buddy” (laughter). “But my name is Eric.” “It doesn’t matter, now you are Father Flowermary” (laughter).

Audience: And that's for you to see your egocentricity.

RFG: Yes, Eric “the erect one” is now called Flowermary (long laughter in the participants).

But that happens in Catholic monasteries. I proposed something like that to JK-2. What did he tell me? “We have to use our names and be anonymous.” Beautiful, it’s an internal thing. We have to use our names to be responsible before the law, but anonymous. Again the invisible leader, the one who acts without... As he says, “if you are going to give alms, don’t let your left hand know what the right is doing.” In other words, everything has to be discreet, in a smooth way.

Audience: And if you are going to pray, enter your room and close the door, and pray in this way...

RFG: After having told you that God already knows what you need, so you do not even need to shut yourself in. There is a lot of beauty in this teaching.

(Short pause)

Audience: Could we talk about... about *faith*, about *faith*, since it is mentioned, for example, as a belief?

RFG: Faith. “Each according to his faith.”

Audience: Yes, everyone according to their faith. What is the difference between belief and actually listening?

RFG: Nothing to do, faith has nothing to do with belief. Even Paul says, Romans 13 says...

Audience: “It is more important to wake than to believe.”

RFG: “We’re closer to salvation by awakening than believing,” he says. Salvation means “the resurrection,” to be saved from *Kosmon*. So he is clearly saying that it is not about believing, but about waking up. Now, that awakening is faith, because faith, what is it? It is the Greek word *pistis*, which gives rise to the Mexican word *pistear* and the word, as I learned in the workshop in Dublin, of those who participated in the workshop, which in English is “pissed” –to be drunk, and the word *pistis*, interestingly enough, gives rise to *pistear* in Mexico and *to be pissed* in Ireland, or be drunk: your mentality changed, your mentality changed. That is what *pistis* means in its original sense, that there must be a psychological mutation that is *pistis*. That's the value, that's the awakening, nothing to do with “believe.” That is said in Romans 13 by Paul himself within the Christianity approved even by the Catholic Church. It means that *faith* is something very intimate, related to the psychological mutation and not that I'm going to repeat the words like this or like that, do you understand? Nothing to do with repeating things or believing in something. Nothing, nothing to do.

Audience: It is mentioned that Paul defines what faith is, even. I do not know if you could comment on that.

RFG: Yes. In that sentence that I say, Romans 13, “we are closer to salvation by waking up than by believing,” everything is said, he identifies awakening with faith. And then there is “losing faith,” which is another way of referring to faith, which is losing, what? Losing that psychological mutation that makes you live without conflict. Sometimes we lose faith, why? Is it because we stop believing in God? Not necessarily. We lose faith because we fall into conflict, because we live in a very adverse world, a world that has its very deep problems, and a humanity that has its very deep problems, that each of us share in one way or another. So, living in this world without touching it is difficult, then one can lose faith, as Raffaele himself, who was custodian of the Holy Sepulcher, or custodian of the tomb

of Jesus, donated by Joseph of Arimathea, which was in the middle of a garden. It was the grave of a rich man. In other words, he lost faith, he lost that psychological mutation, which is like *pistis*, *pistear*, it's like a sober drunkenness, where you feel without any conflict, suddenly some deep adversity happens in your personal life and you fall into conflict. That is losing faith, not necessarily ceasing to believe in God, because believing in God or not believing in God is likely to be very relative. In Buddhism very little is said about God, if anything.

Audience: What I'm trying to say... Somewhere Paul mentions faith referring, not as *pistis*, but referring to faith as nothing more than “belief,” that is, it is a question: if he at some point refers to faith as something which is nothing but thought, is it? Or is he always talking about faith as being drunk on the Holy Spirit? I mean, when Paul talks, does he talk about the two or...?

RFG: No, no, no. The psychological mutation... Even in Latin, in the Vulgate Bible it is said “*sobria ebrietas*,” the drunkenness of the sober. That is, the drunkenness of the sober, the sober drunkenness, with faith, something that transforms you, but that is not alcohol, it is not wine.

Audience: I think it's a matter of translation.

Audience: That is also a matter of thinking, isn't it? That we believe that faith is necessary as believing in God more than anything for our ego, as if he needed us to believe in him.

RFG: Exactly.

Audience: I was speaking only to clarify the translation, because I do not remember, but I have read that at least in the Latin American [Bible], Paul defines the faith and it seems that it is something like believing in something without having seen it, but for the simple fact of believing in him.

RFG: If you live Unitary Perception, that is not something you see, except internally, and you can't stop wanting to live like

this your whole life. But what we are saying, I identify Unitary Perception with the word *pistis* too, the psychological transformation.

In Paul's time, in the year 60, that is, the first century of Christianity and the first five centuries, there was a lot of emphasis on the question of what is most important to enter *Ouranon*. And there is a phrase of Paul referring precisely to that, where he says: "Do you believe that you are going to be saved by your works? Forget it. You are going to be saved by your faith;" but not in belief or non-belief, it is: "You are going to be saved according to how you are psychologically transformed."

Audience: Through *sobria ebrietas*.

RFG: Of course. It has nothing to do with a behavior or a belief. "Do you believe that you are going to be saved...?" Not with any work. "Do you think that you will be saved by your works, because you give alms to the poor?" No, no, no, that's secondary. The important thing is that you will be saved by your faith, by your psychological mutation. That is what he is saying. Paul emphasizes a lot that he is talking about something internal, a psychological mutation and that is *pistis*, and that gives rise, as I said, to *pistear* in Mexico and *pissed* in... Ireland, where it means "drunk."

Audience:[From Dublin] Rubén.

RFG: Yes, go ahead.

Audience:[From Dublin] It was in Catholicism and also perhaps in Protestant churches that suffering... I don't know, I can't find it now in the Bible, but somewhere Paul says in English: "I was brought...," "with suffering I was brought..." something like that, something like that, but "with suffering I was brought to faith..." but I think that this is a contradiction... What do you think about this? I don't know if...

RFG: Yes, beware also of the fact that there is an adoration of

the suffering of JesuKristos on the cross. And actually, it is not about worshipping suffering, because the cross represents the place where the resurrection occurs. So, if we see the cross as a symbol of suffering, it is not a Kristian symbol. The symbol is Kristian, and Paul says that too, because it represents the resurrection, not because it represents human suffering.

Now, to talk about suffering and compassion as part of being a Kristian, that's right. Suffering the consequences of being a Kristian at that time was death, because they threw you to the lions, the Romans took you to Rome and threw you to the lions in the circus, i.e., it was life or death. So what you are saying, back then, meant that you could end up in the lions, but it refers to suffering in a way that we have no reason to interpret as having to worship the suffering of Jesus on the cross, but the important thing, and Paul says –we can read it– that the cross is the place where the resurrection takes place, which is the most important thing in the Kristian teaching.

Audience: *[From Dublin]* Paul said something like: “Without the resurrection, our faith is ... meaningless,” something like that.

Audience: “Without resurrection, our faith is meaningless.”

RFG: Sure, he says I think in Corinthians 15 [1Cor. 15: 14]. He says: “Without resurrection, our life is meaningless.” And JesuKristos came in vain if resurrection does not exist. *[And if Kristos has not been raised, our preaching is useless and so is your faith]*

Audience: About *faith* and about what Javier asked. Well, faith is believing in something without knowing it, but he is talking about the unknown. I mean, I think he's talking about the person who lives an ordinary life and tells you “You can have another life.” Krishnamurti's response is: “Do it and see what happens,” but if not, let's see how one can conceive that silence is mind in the ordinary world. So *faith*, which has always been seen in absolute time, or from one idea to another, from what I don't know to what I should know...

RFG: As a conversion to another religion.

Audience: Now it looks like the act of entering the unknown... Be careful, because we go back to the previous dialogue. Not because the functional self decides (laughs) but... I do not know; Rubén called it “the great leap of the mind.”

RFG: Yes, yes, it's a great leap.

Audience: But it is very beautiful how the word *faith* approaches that leap.

RFG: Sure. The mind is transformed, it is a psychological mutation.

Audience: Faith is that leap.

RFG: Of course, faith is that jump, because it's a psychological mutation.

Audience: It could be defined as “getting drunk on the air from which one, not me, is born.”

RFG: Of course, getting drunk on the air where the One is born, not the unique Rubén or the unique Blanca. Yes.

Audience: I mention that faith is that leap, that sober drunkenness is the psychological mutation you're talking about. Knowing this is totally liberating, because of how faith is usually emphasized as a belief, and as having a code of conduct.

RFG: A great distortion.

Audience: A great distortion. Then, it is liberating and even loving, we can say.

RFG: Of course, JesuKristos frees you from praying and frees you from being good according to social patterns, because he

says to you: “You do not even need to pray because God knows what you need before you open your mouth.” So he frees you completely.(Mat. 6).

Audience: In relation to the suffering that was spoken about a moment ago. Krishnamurti said: “Who can understand this teaching? He who believes that he has lost everything.”

So I believe that there comes the idea that an interest or something more transcendent in the individual can arise from suffering. But perhaps it is the fact that when the individual is in extreme suffering or believes that he has lost everything, in some way he is more vulnerable, and therefore perhaps there is that association, right? That suffering is the way to that which the individual...

RFG: Ah, but there is another aspect of that phrase, which seems even more profound to me, that the sacred teaching is going to be understood by one who believes that HUMANITY has lost everything, not him, but all of humanity. Humanity is poverty, said John. That is, humanity is so poor... why is humanity so poor? Because it has lost everything, it has lost friendship, it has lost love, then of course as it has nothing... He who realizes that, will go naturally to the *pistis*, to the psychological transformation, because he is... If he is not disgusted, he is fed up.

Audience: And in the original teaching with a *K*, JesuKristos also mentions that the foxes have their burrows and the birds of the sky have their nests, but the son of man has no place to rest his head. So Kristianity also emphasizes this.

RFG: So there is no place, there is no thought in which to rest, and neither is it through thought, he insists. As John says in the first chapter; he insists on that phrase.

Audience: But then it is also the same, it is not because of something that you do, it is not by thought, it is not by will; it is added to you.

RFG: And it's not because you decide it either.

Audience: It is not by faith.

RFG: It's because of a psychological mutation.

Audience: By faith yes, but not by belief. "They will not say he's there or he's here because he's among you."

RFG: Yes, yes, that too. Another great phrase.

Audience: I think I deviated a bit from exegesis, but on the first understanding that humanity has lost it all, I think this is the first difficulty. The people whom you speak to about Unitary Perception, those who do not want to hear anything are always the ones who tell you: "Hey, but everything is not so bad." There the conversation is over.

Audience: "How pessimistic you are."

Audience: Then it's funny, because Krishnamurti always gave a talk at four o'clock, at first he started with...

RFG: Description of the world.

Audience: Description of the world and... First of the world and then of the interior, and then he went into the matter. But the terrible thing for humanity to realize that it has lost everything... In the media, political consciousness and education, there is still a notion of the future as development, as getting better. It's awful...

RFG: Denying what is happening.

Audience: That is not in the Bible, because the Bible is constantly telling the terrible tragedy in which the human being lives, and that it would be one of the first things to change, to replace that notion of the future with that of seeing what is.

RFG: Sure.

Audience: If it is believed that suffering is the path, in the individual, because it is perceived as well as the individual when the person...

RFG: It's a distortion.

Audience: It's a distortion. Then we can also think that as a society we have to reach the limit so that we can truly see a change emerge.

Audience: To hit rock bottom.

Audience: To hit rock bottom. There are even some schools of thought saying that, that it is necessary to hit rock bottom so that a New Jerusalem emerges. I believe that as it is inside, it is outside.

RFG: Yes, yes. The emphasis on suffering is a great distortion of Kristianity.

Audience: Even in the church, the *Way of the Cross*, to carry a cross, everything bad you have, “repent.”

RFG: But see the wisdom of the description of the *Way of the Cross*, that a person from Cyrene appears who tells Jesus: “No, no, give me the cross so that I carry it for you.” That is to say, that not even the *Way of the Cross* puts an emphasis on the suffering of Jesus because he has an assistant, who is a Cyrenian.

It means that you cannot emphasize the suffering of Jesus on the *Way of the Cross* either. We cannot. Furthermore, the emphasis must be placed on his words on the *Way of the Cross*: “Women of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, weep for yourselves and for your children,” and “blessed be the wombs that have not bore and the breasts that have not nursed.” Those are the words of Jesus on the Way of the Cross, not words of

suffering, but words of “look how things are, because if they do this with a good one –which was him– now that the grass is green, what will they do with the good when the grass is dry?” Luke 23: “What will they do with the good when the grass is dry?” That is, he is talking about the social and spiritual situation of humanity at this time. And the consequences, the consequences that if they do this with a good person now, what will they do with the good when the grass is dry, that is, when it gets worse? He is foretelling what is going to happen in humanity, which is going to get geometrically worse if everything we are saying –*metanoia*, Unitary Perception– is not taken seriously, urgently. That's why he talks about “being alert like a thief in the night,” [in Precinct B] because that understanding can come at any time, and you have to be attentive. Well, none of this is emphasized.

He is saying: “If you are doing this with a good man now that the grass is green, what will you do with the good when the grass is dry?” He is announcing that humanity is going to get worse, not better. Well, all that gets denied, all that gets denied.

Audience: [*From Dublin*] Rubén.

RFG: Yes.

Audience: After this, Jesus also says something when the disciples are asking how these things are going to happen... they are going to be brothers against their parents and parents against their mothers and ... When, when? He said that all this would happen in the current generation.

RFG: The funny thing is that nobody is making the relationship between that and the fact that seven out of ten couples end in divorce. “No (laughs), there is no relationship.”

Audience:[*From Dublin*] It's not apocalyptic.

RFG: Sure, it's not something for the end of time; it's something that's happening! It's happening: seven out of ten couples end up in divorce. Is the spouse against the spouse?

Yes, sweetheart, and if you do not see it, it's because you lack eyes and ears. Simple, very simple.

Do you have any other comments?

Audience:[From Ireland] Not at the moment. If I think of something, I will say it.

Audience: On... what John mentions, the Gospel of John, referring to “the wind blows,” how he is talking about the Logos identity. It says how a noun there becomes a verb, in the sense of “the wind blows,” how it is inviting resurrection.

RFG: In Greek it is said: “The wind *winds* [*i.e. blows*]” It is even clearer than in Spanish, because in Greek it says: “The wind *winds*” that is, the noun wind becomes the verb wind, which does not exist in Spanish. Read it in Greek, that's why it's much richer, because you see... “See how the wind blows.” The noun and the verb are one thing, it is like saying: “See how God loves.” The noun God is a verb, love. That is, “the wind *winds*,” the noun wind is a verb to *wind*. Beautiful, beautiful.

Audience: Yes, then about suffering, why does JesuKristos say to Judas Iscariot: “Do what you have to do?” Because I believe that this sublimation of suffering looks like an interpretation that JesuKristos would have stayed for that terrible torture, and that despite that he went on, determined to receive it. So, if it is not about sublimating suffering, why does JesuKristos is aware of and accepts such a terrible destiny, such a painful death?

RFG: In the synoptic Gospels, the answer is easy, it's easy. In John, it gets a bit harder exegetically.

Why does he accept suffering, for example, of his own ending and tells his friend: “Do it quickly”? Well, in the synoptic Gospels they had an obligation... Maybe taking Luke out, because Luke was a doctor from Syria who was not influenced by the Jewish tradition. But Matthew and Mark were not only influenced by the Jewish tradition, which was called *Midrash*, and they were not only influenced, but they wanted to be liked

by the *Midrash*. Then they put all these anecdotes, “next to the empty tomb there are two boys” and it turns out that in another synoptic it says: “beside the empty tomb there were two angels,” that is, they wanted to be liked by the *Midrash*, that is, with the Jewish tradition. And that is not seen in John and not seen in Luke. [They have] independence of a tradition, independence of a culture, in the way they write, right?

And then... another thing that the *Midrash* said was that everything that is referred to... everything that is referred to the Jewish Messiah has to be according to the *Midrash*, otherwise it will not be the Messiah. For example, Isaiah had said that the Messiah was going to be born and made the whole story of Jesus, as a kind of...

Audience: Prophecy.

RFG: Premonition or prophecy. And he says... Oh yes, he says he's going to be born where David was born, he has to be born in Bethlehem and he has to die the way he died. Everything is said already in Isaiah and other prophets much earlier... five hundred years before Jesus. It means that if the life of Jesus was not adapted to that *Midrash*, to that Jewish tradition, he was not the Messiah.

Audience: They would not recognize him as such.

RFG: They would not recognize him as Messiah. And Matthew and Mark are very concerned that everything that happens is according to the *Midrash*. Everything that happens to Jesus has to be according to the *Midrash*.

That is what Luke is liberated from, because Luke goes and talks with the Virgin Mary, with Mary. It is also called the Gospel of Mary because Luke changes everything completely.

Audience: He was not a contemporary of Jesus.

RFG: And he's not that contemporary. He was not a direct friend of Jesus, but comes after his death and speaks with his

mother, Mary, and so it is the Gospel of Mary. He has many details that are not in any other gospel. Luke is the gospel of details.

But independent of the Jewish tradition, of which it seems that Mary was not very aware, because she was a simple woman, a woman of the people... On the other hand, if you were a rabbi or a Jewish priest, you were aware of the tradition, as for example Matthew and Mark. Then everything has a lot to do with whether they adapted or not adapted to the tradition of the *Midrash*, so that Jews in general would accept Jesus or not. That was the exegetical fight, to put it some way. But Luke becomes independent, and John becomes ultra-independent of that tradition, to the point of saying that when those who govern Judaism, which was the Sanhedrin –that would be like the current Vatican but only for Judea–, in Jerusalem, there was Caiaphas, who was the chief, who said: “See, Mr. Pilate, in our law, the Jewish law, we cannot kill, let alone kill on the cross. So you have to decide to kill Jesus. Because we cannot kill him. But bear in mind that if you don’t kill him, they can make an army of the dead that will take you out of power.” Then Pilate did not dare to make the decision, says John very clearly...

Audience: “I find no guilt in him.”

RFG: He did not see guilt in Jesus. On the contrary, he said: “This is a good guy,” and then Pilate... Pilate even talks to his wife. His wife seems to have had a dream in which God tells her what she has to do, and oral tradition says that Pilate became a Christian, he converted to Christianity. The oral tradition.

The point is that Pilate does not see guilt and that is why he tells the people who were there: “Let’s see, who do you want: this zealot who is a murderer, who killed a Roman soldier, Barabbas, or This one that says he is God? Which of the two do you want to kill?” “No, no, this one who says that he is God.” “Why?” “Because this one who says he is God is going to make the army that is going to endanger the nation of Israel,

because the Romans are coming and they are going to tear us to pieces.”

So “this guy is going to be the end of Israel, because the Romans are going to come with everything they have when they know he can make an army of the dead, as he did with Lazarus.” That was the fear of the Sanhedrin. And then Pilate gives them a choice and they choose Jesus. And that choice... was it from that time or is it from this time, too? “Let the murderers go free.” “Let the murderers go free, screw the victims.” It remains the choice of humanity.

Audience: The world always loses.

RFG: Sure. “The hell with the victim; set the murderer free.” It remains the decision of humanity, and as long as it remains humanity's decision... That's why I read Psalm 82 that says: “Do justice, let the decisions you have made throughout the history of humanity end, because otherwise you will continue to be lost,” as we are lost. Psalm 82 is related to all this.

And therefore, to preserve Israel, they hand Jesus over, and because they could not kill, they give him to him whose law allowed killing. So, what kind of law is mine, that I have to use someone else to kill?

Today, in the law of the United States, the mastermind of a murder is guiltier than the murderer. They give more time to the one who devised the murder than the one who...

Audience: Executed it.

RFG: ... executed. Did something similar happen there in the Sanhedrin? “No, not us, but you, Pilate. Yes, because you represent Caesar. The one in danger is Caesar.” Ultimately, he was also in danger, the Jewish leader who was going to disappear with a Zealot revolution, where there would be another leadership without Rome and without the Sanhedrin. The Sanhedrin was made up of Sadducees, who were rich people.

All this is very difficult to find in any book of interpretation of the gospel. It has to be a book of deep exegesis, which incorporates history as well. Many times the exegesis forgets about history, both contemporary and that of the time of Jesus.

Audience: And also internally. Internally, suffering is the choice of the killer. That is, suffering is to reinforce the self.

RFG: Of course. Kill Unitary Perception and let the one who begets suffering live. Very beautiful, that interpretation. It is purely psychological. You see all the aspects of exegesis: history, psychology...

Audience: The true history of humanity.

RFG: Yes. The law... If there is no exegesis that considers all aspects, it is not exegesis. There has to be sociology, history, the law –now and then. Why was such a thing said and not another? All that. And why did he say one thing and not another? That is to say, it implies a very deep knowledge of the history of that moment and before, because Rome solidifies with Aemilius Paulus in the year 163 BC. Who does Aemilius Paulus beat? The heir of Alexander the Great, who was the owner of the world. So now Rome was the owner of the world, but it keeps all the cultures of Alexander and the religion of Alexander. All they do is change the names: Zeus becomes Jupiter, Helios becomes Apollo. The names change, but they are the same gods. Even religion was taken from Alexander.

The language of Alexander, as I said, prepares the way for the dissemination of Christianity in Greek. That's why John writes in Greek, so that the teaching is spread, because it was a teaching for all the people, it was not a teaching only for the Jews, because otherwise, he could have written in Aramaic, in Hebrew. Why didn't he write in Aramaic and in Hebrew? Because it was a teaching for all humanity, and that is another thing ignored by those who don't know that John writes the gospel originally in the Greek language, another exceptional

thing. And he takes Jesus to the beginning of God, not back to the day he is born or the day that John the Baptist baptizes him.

Any comments or questions?

Audience: So, it seems that in astrology... Well, there is something deeper, much deeper than...

RFG: It's implicit in the *Midrash*, that if he's not like this, this and that... then he's not the Messiah. It is an astrological thing. So, why do you think the astrologers [*the Magi or wise men*] are going to Bethlehem? It is clear that this is a historical thing. The same happened with Mani. When Mani was born in Persia, all the astrologers were there, because he was a person who was important. And the question is that Mani lived sixty years, the difference is that: he lived longer. And he divided, as I said, darkness and light in an absolute way.

But you can know what is going to happen and say: "Maybe if I go there, it will not happen because the moon is not going to be on top, it's going to be a little bit more on the side." And the thing happens anyway. And that's the hardest part... not tormenting yourself in the storm, which is what Jesus and JK are proposing, that whatever happens, you are attentive and therefore free from suffering.

Audience: Until death. That's why it is "living with death."

RFG: Death itself. When JK-Jiddu Krishnamurti- says to his friends from India: "What are you doing here? I know how to die alone." JK says to his friends, to Pupul, to all of them, to Mahesh Saxena, they all came from India, and he says: "What are you doing here? I know how to die alone." Beautiful, very beautiful.

Audience: And that is also another vision of suffering, because JK says that crises happen because of something, but he means the terrible things, he talks about when a child dies, and puts that as an example as well. Then he says: "It happens for a reason, and it is the time to be awake," that is, not that

suffering has value because “poor me,” but that the suffering has a value beyond the self, because it is what pushes a man to his limits to realize his conditioning. So, suffering has value, not because of the merits that I have accumulated, nor because of the bad things that I have gone through, and the points I have earned for Heaven, which is a vision in time, but that suffering has...

RFG: And that's a vision a Catholic won't understand.

Audience: ...but that suffering has a value beyond time, that when the self finds itself in an extreme, it is most likely to be aware of self-compassion, that is, to go beyond suffering, which is what you say about living the destiny in Unitary Perception.

RFG: Of course, without that “poor me,” which you said, “poor me”...

Audience: Yes, yes, yes.

RFG: “Poor me.”

Audience: The suffering, misunderstood in Christianity, misunderstood by Christianity with a *C* as you call it, is the suffering of the “poor me,” who also accumulates points, because thirty-two lashes are better than thirty-one.

RFG: That is, unfortunately, in the popular interpretation of Catholicism. Am I wrong? That's in the midwives who go to the Guadalupe [cathedral] and they go on their knees, and they are bleeding, because they are accumulating points with their suffering.

Audience: The comment you made the other time about the phrase “fear of God” comes to mind: that what it really means in Greek is “feeling of God.”

RFG: To feel God.

Audience: It's also another false connotation or rather belief about fear. That with fear... All our lives they make us feel afraid of God, because...

RFG: Because it is badly translated "fear of God," because it says *Timotheos* in Greek and it is fear of God. It isn't! It means: "the feeling of God."

Audience: Feeling of God. So, in that sense when you say feeling of God, again comes the congruence of the teaching, which is...

RFG: It's not fear.

Of course. And to fear something that is pure love... If you define God as pure love, why do I have to fear him?

Audience: Right now you mentioned that you read Paul, who says: "The wrath of God." What did he mean? Is it a...?

RFG: Paul with the wrath of God? Yes, that they will receive the wrath of God as revenge, as saying: "Do not take revenge," the emphasis is... "Do not take revenge, leave vengeance to the wrath of God," as if it existed, right? That is, leave revenge to the wrath of God.

Audience: That was Paul's belief, right?

RFG: The essence is... The essence is that you do not take revenge; there was a greatness of that teaching. Do not take revenge.

Audience: That can be understood as: the enemy that hurts is already far from the true life, that is to say, he is a slave of the self, and there is the wrath of God. Also in the whole Bible it is the same, always the punishment of God is that "you will not see me," why? Because the one who is hurting...

RFG: ...is already being punished.

Audience: ... cannot see him, he is already punished.

RFG: He already punished himself when doing the damage.

Audience: Then you can feed or give a drink [to your enemy] because... I always see it that way, the damage in the Bible is not seeing God, and that's what you said: Hell. Where is Hell? Hell is here, in the world.

RFG: Without a doubt. The Pope himself has said lately that Hell is a psychological state. It is amazing that the Pope said such a thing, because Catholicism resists theological changes. However, I think it was the previous pope, he said: "Hell is a psychological state." John Paul was saying: "Hell is a psychological state," to my surprise, because in general papal interpretations are rather conservative, hierarchical.

Audience: When we are children they teach us in Church, and the teacher of religion in the school, a way of seeing God as something that is not for you. That is why people and children in general no longer believe, because in addition to their problems of lack of love and affection, they see that God is something so important and they cannot understand it because it has nothing to do with them. Then it's something to look at over there and never here. So...

RFG: Yes, I mean, I have two hundred and eight bones, five liters of blood, and I'm going from here to Barcelona and back... but God has nothing to do with me (laughter). How is that understood? Two hundred and eight bones and five liters of blood, to be able to go to Barcelona and come back, and [claim] that there's not an energy... No, they will not make me believe it. There must be an energy that achieves that, first of all that the two hundred and eight bones do not dissolve in the environment as the oxygen dissolves. No, they are together, they've been together for seventy years, two hundred and eight bones called Ruben and five liters of blood are circulating, and sometimes even with high pressure (laughter), and you say:

“What energy does that? What is the energy that holds together the body, therefore the temple?” There has to be an energy in this temple, in this body, to keep it together, to keep it in balance with the environment, healthy balance, etc. There comes a moment that all that balance is over and death comes, sure, but it is still not explainable without a very, very important energy. That exists. We don’t need to make an effort to see it. We have about twenty minutes. Maybe they want to comment something in Buenos Aires.

Audience: [*From Buenos Aires*] No, thanks.

Audience: I have a comment about the first part. Why does JesuKristos say “in three days”? Why three days that “I will rebuild my body”?

RFG: Oh, a lot has been written about that. Yes, three days. Actually, a honest person is going to tell you: “I don’t understand why it has to be three days, and not five or seven.” But there is even confusion about the moment he dies, for having said that, because there are those who say that the resurrection is on the Sabbath and others who say that it is on Sunday, for example. So, in Catholicism it is accepted that it was on Sunday, why? Because it is the third day for the one who decided that within Catholicism.

And others say that no, that the third day was a Saturday, then they celebrate Easter on Saturday, that is, it is not a Sunday of Resurrection, but a Saturday of Resurrection. And everything depends on counting the days from the moment he dies. It was in *Nisan* 14, that is, the month of *Nisan*, day 14 of the Jews, or it was at another time.

Those are theological discussions that have historical components, such as how the Jews counted the days. The problem starts there, when trying to identify, within the Gregorian calendar, the Jewish calendar. What month is *Nisan*? On the 14th of *Nisan*, Jesus dies. Perfect, but what day of December, January, February, March? What day of March or April –as it seems– did it happen?

Audience: And then they added two months with the Caesars, right? That got bigger still.

RFG: To top it all come the Caesars, Julius Caesar and Augustus Caesar who add July and August to the calendar. Then it becomes a problem... of exegesis? No, it's a mathematical problem.

Audience: But isn't all this... wasn't this –when Gregory makes the change, doesn't he take any of that into account?

RFG: He must have taken it into account because what is done, as far as I understand, is associated with the full moon, if I am not mistaken. So I think it's a Sunday that is related to the full moon, the closest Sunday associated with the full moon of Aries. April is... Aries, is it?

Yes, the lamb, Aries is the lamb. It is the nearest day after the full moon of the lamb, which is Aries, then based on what we now know about the Gregorian calendar, Nisan 14, as we don't know what day it was, we have no idea of what day it was, then the full moon is taken as a guide. It seems that it was close to the full moon, so now it is associated...

Audience: Why the full moon? Because if...?

RFG: The full moon as an important astrological element, when [the moon] is opposite to the Sun, completely opposite to the Sun.

Audience: What happens is that there is something surprising, that something physical seems to happen, like a process. Process is a word in time, but JesuKristos in Chapter 3 of John speaks of being born, not about transformation; he speaks of a birth, that is, something that happens in the body as well. So...

RFG: But from the air, where sound and light are.

Audience: But does that have to do with the incorruptible body

of enlightened people? I mean, it seems that he is talking about a fact that covers the whole human being, because he clearly speaks of being born, he says: “Don’t you understand that it is not from the vagina?” Because he is talking about being born, he is not talking about a psychological transformation.

Audience: Yes, because he says: “Don’t worry about those who can kill your body.”

RFG: Aside from saying “born from the air.”

Audience: I say there is a part of the Bible too, in the Gospels, where Jesus says that “it does not matter that they kill the physical body.”

RFG: What does Krishnamurti tell me when I say that I might have to go to Vietnam? He says: “Are you going to kill?” I say to him: “If you are in an army, you have to kill, otherwise you will be shot.” “Oh, they’re going to shoot you, but you’re not going to kill.” He also puts the body as secondary, the spirit as primary.

Yes. “It does not matter if they kill your body.” I think that’s a Paul thing, a Paul thing; I do not remember exactly where it is. [Matthew 10:28] But there are unforgettable things about Paul, such as Romans 12, which we just read. Or when talking about marriage, Chapter 7 of Corinthians, First Letter to the Corinthians. They are unforgettable things because they are very revolutionary. And also when he speaks of the resurrection, a whole chapter dedicated to resurrection, and that it is not chicken meat or pork meat or cow meat or fish. That is, it is another body.

Audience: Neither woman nor man.

RFG: He says that there is neither woman nor man either. So...

Audience: *Anthropos.*

RFG: Sure. Is it the idea of the *Anthropos* from the Greeks which got into Christianity? It wouldn't be weird.

Audience: So it seems.

RFG: Of course, the *Anthropos* is a spiritual entity that is divided into two: *Ginos* (woman) and *Andros* (man) when it comes down to Earth. So, is it the *Anthropos*, greater than the angels, and as eternal as the angels, who were the first beings created by God?

Audience: And where's that?

RFG: That's in the Greek religion, and did that get into Christianity? Of course it did because if not, there are many things that are implicit that can't be explained more than... There will be neither male nor female. "There will be neither Greek nor Roman or Jew; neither man nor woman..."

Audience: "Neither slave nor lord."

RFG: "...neither slave nor lord." "Neither man nor woman" means that we are going back to *Anthropos*, which is a Greek idea, or something that was in Greek religion. The *Anthropos*, which is superior to the angels, closer to God than the angels, but when the *Anthropos* decides to materialize on Earth it will be as *Ginos* and as *Andros*, it will not be like *Anthropos*, but rather...

Audience: It enters duality.

RFG: Of course, it enters into the necessary duality that exists in matter and in energy: positive-negative; we still do not know... I do not know if this is associated or not, but the mystery of nickel is not yet known. What happens with nickel? What happens in matter at the level of nickel, that it is different from what we expect from Mendeleev's sequence in the other elements of matter? Mysteries of matter.

But the mystery that *Anthropos* has to become woman and man is another mystery.

So, if we are going to have another class, I would say that it would have to be the last, because we have seen the whole program, and in the next class we would see what happens in the student who teaches Unitary Perception. Role reversal Do you agree?

Now we have seven or eight minutes for comments or questions.

Audience: On interpretations of exegesis: whether there was any mistranslation, whether it was intentional or not, in the sense that whatever form it was, the important thing is to do that exegesis from Precinct B, and that is what matters the most, because Precinct C itself is biased, so it prevents us from seeing that which comes from the sacred.

RFG: It's true, yes. All exegesis necessarily implies an intervention of thought. And that's why there were schools of exegesis. Antioch: Jesus is only man; Alexandria: Jesus is only God. That is, in different cities Jesus himself was interpreted in opposite ways because thought intervened in the interpretation –the duality of thought, the law of Precinct C: dual.

Audience: Yes, but it seems that in that case the exegesis is understood as a body of knowledge, and I think what we have seen in this SPC [*Course*] is that the exegesis is to revive the teaching, that is, to revive it [*to redefine it*] ourselves. Then it makes sense, because to do that is to live the teaching, which is another dimension of exegesis, not to establish a school, but to live, to approach the truth, do you understand me?

RFG: Sure, in the actual facts. What it really means –in the facts. And Unitary Perception is what brings me closer to the essence, which was called *kerygma* in Greek, to the *kerygma* of the Christian teaching. Unitary Perception immerses me in the teaching, that is, it is not another piece of knowledge, but a fact.

Audience: About the angels or the archangels, could you say something, comment something?

RFG: Well, we have for example the famous angel Michael... Or Archangel Michael, who is one of the most famous, and he is said to be the first one, the first to be created by God.

And today, if you talk to a Jehovah's Witness, he'll tell you that the archangel Michael is JesuKristos, and you say, "Why?" And he says: "Because Michael was the first thing that God created," like Jesus. John says: "In the beginning was the *Logos*", that is, the first thing that God created was the *Logos*, that is, the Kristos. And the same is said of Michael the archangel. So, are the archangel Michael and the pre-earthly JesuKristos the same person? Apparently yes, Jehovah's Witnesses say. However, they are the only ones of the five thousand evangelicals that exist, besides the Orthodox Church and the four Catholic churches, the Jehovah's Witnesses are the only ones who will tell you that Michael and Jesus are the same person.

But nevertheless if you read about the archangel Michael, his origin is defined in exactly the same way as John defines the origin of Jesus. Does that mean that Michael is Jesus? Because Michael, what does he do? Michael is the patron of hospitals, who takes care of health. Health? What does health mean? Health was said in Rome "*salve!*" [*Hail!*]. Why did they say "hail"? Because health and salvation are the same word.

The Romans greeted each other with "salve," which means "heal." Ah, so if Michael takes care of health and puts his foot on the head of disease, in the images that there are of him, then that means he is Jesus? Because Jesus saves. In Greece he is called "Jesus Soter," which means "Jesus Savior." And then, Michael, what is he? It's *Iesus Salve* in Latin. Jesus Saves or Michael Saves, the same as... Again the same as Jesus. That is why Jehovah's Witnesses identify Michael, the archangel Michael, with Jesus Christ. But no, in other evangelical religions it is not like that, because they separate

Michael and put a sword to his side, and he is no longer just a medical protector of health, or the one who will lead you to salvation. Now he is someone who fights with the Devil.

Audience: Because Jehovah's Witnesses are the only... I think, I'm not sure, but I think that Jehovah's Witnesses are the only Christian sect that conceives Jesus as a prophet.

RFG: Oh, is that so?

Audience: And that's why I think they make that relationship [*Michael and Jesus*]. That is why they speak of "Jehovah, Jehovah, Jehovah," but Jesus is nothing more than...

RFG: Yes, unfortunately I am not an expert, but I know that in the theology of Jehovah's Witnesses, the archangel Michael is identified with JesuKristos, because they have a similar origin, in the words that were used to talk about their origins.

Audience: And are there no more details about the angels in the Bible? Are there no writings about angels?

Audience: In the Old Testament.

RFG: Well, sure, right? In general what they tell you is that they take the form they want, and if they take the human form it is only temporarily, although they say there are some angels who took the human form and liked it and stayed and even fell down to have children and everything. That is, they lost their status as angels, they fell in love with the human being so much that they lost their status as angels. But they are very few, says the Bible. The majority can take the human form, to appear human and in the New Testament several times it is mentioned that angels participate in events and then disappear because they were angels.

Audience: Oh, and there's also a notion that we all have a guardian angel.

RFG: Also.

Audience: There is a notion that every human being has a guardian angel.

RFG: And the big question is: why, when Jesus dies or before he dies, he says: “The heavens are going to open and you will see the angels go down and up,” why is that not so? And talking to a lot of people about this, the reason is... what do you like...? I don’t know... If you had the opportunity to spend a week with the chimpanzees, would you like it? I don’t know if anyone would say yes (laughter). I don’t know if anyone would say yes, I would rather be at the Caracas Hilton (laughter), and not spend a week with chimpanzees. Because what is implied is that we do not see the angels because the angels see us as chimpanzees.

Audience: There is no affinity.

RFG: Of course, we have lost the affinity with the angels because we have lost the affinity with *Ouranon*, which is the supernatural, that is, our life is too natural, in the sense... too attached to prestige, to profit, to pleasure, and there is not a life related to the supernatural, therefore we have lost contact with the angels and we have stopped seeing angels.

Audience: We’ve already stopped hearing and seeing...

RFG: Of course, if having ears we do not hear and having eyes we do not see, much less are we going to see the angels. And the angels themselves, would they like to be with us? With an inner life full of conflict, would they like to be with us? Of course not.

It’s like... I tell my dad one day... My dad was a very wise man, all the anecdotes I tell you about him are wise, right?
[addressing Cecilia]

And I say to him: “Dad, I’m going out with a girl and, can I tell you the truth? I don’t know what to tell her. I do not know what to say.”

He says: “Look, you don’t know what to say?” “I don’t...” “Well, look... What do you think a girl likes? That you make her have fun or that you come to her with problems? Do not ever talk about any problem with the girl, try to entertain her.” That was what he said to me. “Do not ever talk about any problem.” My dad knew that I liked to talk about problems (laughter), I always liked it. He tells me: “Do not talk about any problems, try to make her have fun –very wise–, because otherwise, of course you’re going to lose that girl.”

Well, I think that is related to the angels, who depart from us because we have many problems. Maybe we don’t talk about the problems, but we are full of problems.

Audience: And we do not see what’s in front of us.

RFG: Sure, and the angel, who is supposed to perceive everything, perceives you with problems and walks away. It approaches the person who is, according to the Bible, enlightened, content for nothing, do you understand me? They are few... They do not come close.

Audience: They’d rather stay with the chimpanzees (laughter).

RFG: Maybe they are with the chimpanzees (laughter).

Well, then, do we leave it here, is that OK for you in Buenos Aires?

Audience:*[From Buenos Aires]* Yes, yes... we leave it here. Thank you.

Audience:*[From Buenos Aires]* Well, perfect, greetings and thanks.

RFG: See you next Sunday. Thank you.

TOPICS - CLASS 14

- INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS 14 (898)
- BASIC NOTIONS OF THE TAO TE KING (898)
- READINGS AND CLARIFICATIONS OF THE TAO TE KING PARAGRAPHS (898)
- TAO TE KING PRESENTATION BY A STUDENT (903)
- HISTORICAL RECORDS OF LAO TSÉ, JESUKRISTOS AND JIDDU KRISHNAMURTI (905)
- COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS (906)
- PARAGRAPH 81 OF THE TAO TE KING (908)
- ABOUT TAOISM AND BUDDHISM (910)
- HOW YIN AND YANG ARE RELATED TO ARCHETYPES (912)
- AVOIDING FALSE CORRELATIONS (913)
- FIRST ROLE REVERSAL - CLASS 14 (THERAPIST-PATIENT) (916)
- FEEDBACK ON THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL - CLASS 14 (917)
- SECOND PART OF THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL (920)
- FEEDBACK WITH REAL CASE EXAMPLES- CLASE 14 (926)
- SECOND ROLE REVERSAL (THERAPIST- PATIENT) - CLASS 14 (936)
- FEEDBACK ON THE SECOND ROLE REVERSAL - CLASE 14 (940)
- THIRD ROLE REVERSAL (THERAPIST- PATIENT) - CLASS 14 (948)

- FEEDBACK ON THE THIRD ROLE REVERSAL - CLASE 14 (950)
- QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS IN GENERAL ON THE TOPICS OF THE COURSE (961)
- END OF THE CLASS AND OF THE SUNDAY PRESENTIAL COURSE OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (965)

CLASE 14

Psychiatry and Holokinetic Psychology Center,
Mexicali, Baja California, November 7th, 2010.

Rubén Feldman González (RFG): Good morning. November 7, 2010; the last lesson of the second Sunday Presential Course, which certainly I think has been quite different from the first, because many questions from the first Course were answered in this second one, so in this Course we had fewer questions from the students, and I think it was a very good Course. And as always, we remember that humanity has functioned with half a brain for almost a million years and the results are in sight, with war that has become permanent, and with growing misery throughout the planet. And now, with Unitary Perception, we hope for the solution of at least those two immense problems of humanity that have reached an extreme point.

Today we are going to see a bit of the *Tao Te King*, which is considered to be the sacred book of Taoism which, as has happened with all religions, has become very corrupt and has lost what it possibly had in its origin, with Lao Tse.

But I want to point out some things about the Tao Te King before starting the dialogue, and to start the dialogue. In the first place, the Chinese ideogram of the Tao [*presenting the ideograms on the screen*] is actually like a foot, shaped like an L, and inside there is a sort of square, which means the “foot” ideogram and the “head” ideogram as if it were inside the foot, which can be interpreted as something that happens from head to toe, which is the complete incarnation, so when we say Tao we are referring to the complete incarnation of the human being, which is possibly the most sacred fact, to seize the temple completely, which is the body, consciously. And another curious thing is that... do you remember the Gospel of John, the first verse, do you remember the first verse?

Audience: In the beginning was the *logos*.

RFG: In the beginning was the *logos*, right? And notice how it has been translated into Chinese. In the bible in Chinese, the first verse of the Gospel of John, which is the fourth gospel in the new Christian testament, is translated as: in the beginning was the *Tao*. Interesting, isn't it, that is the complete incarnation, which is the path of understanding, which is in us, from head to toe, as the ideogram says, which is the spirit and the totality of the human being: the *Tao*.

And there is also a symbol that represents the *Tao*, which is a circle with a white part and a black part, a well known symbol that implies the unity of the opposites, and that the hidden is in the manifest. And the word hidden has its representation in Greek *sakrito* from where "sacrum" comes, hidden, and from where "secret" comes, and of course from where sacred comes, then the hidden is in the manifest, the sacred is in the manifest, but we do not want to see the manifest well.

The *Tao* is integration, communion, homeostasis, that is, health and balance. And we believe that the seed has a past and a future, and there, in the center of the seed the root emerges and the trunk and branches emerge. And when we think about the seed we think about the transformation of that seed towards its roots and toward its trunk in another direction, but we never think about the center of the seed, where all the energy of the seed is, where time and space don't matter, there where there is neither roots nor direction. And is there such a place inside our being? Is there such a place, no matter where, where there is no root or direction? And is it that we are interested in being in that place which is like the center of the seed, which is pure energy, which the Chinese called *chi*, and which is at the center of the *Tao* symbol, where the past and the future are concentrated, outside of time, where the root and the direction are concentrated, but nevertheless where there is no root or direction? Are we interested in that place? A place that is in the temple of the body –because that is the place, perhaps the only place where it is worth being.

About 2500 years ago there was a gentleman in China who was called the old boy, and whom others called *the ancient child*, because he had a lot of wisdom and yet laughed at everything, was always happy and was extremely innocent. His name was Lao Tse, some called him, according to the Chinese provinces Lao Tzu –I think there are 66 languages in China–, and that man said thus...

Paragraph 1 the Tao Te King begins with: “The way that is hard to describe is the way of eternity. That which has no name or form is eternity. That which can’t be named is the beginning of heaven and earth, and it is beyond everything we know. And that which can be named is the mother of ten thousand formed things. When one is without desires, one can see the mystery. When one is full of desires, one can see the manifestations. Both emerge from the same source, but differ in their names. And all of this seems obscure. Obscure as darkness within darkness. But it is the gateway to all mysteries.”

That is the first of eighty-one paragraphs.

I’m going to mention some other paragraphs so you can see the nature of the book. For example, paragraph 4, which is, I believe, closely related (in its nature, of course) to chapter 3 of John, when Jesus speaks with Nicodemus, because let’s not forget that Lao Tse: 2600 years ago, JesuKristos: 2010 years ago.

Then, in paragraph 4, Lao Tse says (remember the word hidden means sacred): “The meaning is in the emptiness of a vessel, a vessel that is used but that does not fill or overflow. Oh, unknown origin of the ten thousand things. Make the sharp blunt. Untie the knot. Smooth the brilliance. Mix yourself with the dust in the road, lifted by the wind. I don’t know where you come from but you are everything that precedes that which decides to move with the wind of the road.”

It seems to me very similar to chapter 3 of the Gospel of John, the dialogue of JesuKristos with Nicodemus: “He who is born

from above, not from the vagina, is like the wind you hear between the leaves of the trees, who does not know where it comes from nor where it goes.”

And other interesting paragraphs... I'm going to read nothing but a few. Paragraph 38 is very nice and says: “The good is unaware of its goodness, thus it is good. The good is energy and not activity. Activity dissipates energy; activity is not energy. Energy does nothing yet it leaves nothing undone. Energy is without word and without motive; activity comes from word and motive. The fool is always in activity and talking, and much energy is wasted thus. Activity rolls up its sleeves trying to impose order when it has no answer. When Tao is lost, only energy is left. When energy is lost, goodness is left. When goodness is lost, justice is left. When justice is lost, the conventional, convenient ritual is left. The conventional ritual is, as we see, the shadow of justice and goodness; the beginning of chaos and confusion. The convenient ritual and ritual convenience are the superficial flower and not the real fruit of Tao. But the truly studious man sticks to what is solid and real and not to what is superficial. He picks the real, simple fruit and not the spectacular flower; he understands the imaginary life and keeps the true life.” It is beautiful.

And paragraph 40, for example... very short saying: “Returning is the movement of the Tao, the meaningful truth without roads. Yielding is the way of Tao. The ten thousand things are born from being and being is born from not being. Creation is invisible silence, and that is why we are.”

And well, there is one that refers to doing, which is paragraph 10, which goes like this: “Even if one carries the body and the soul and embraces unity, can one avoid separation (fragmentation)? Completely paying attention, though staying fully flexible, can you be like an effortless newborn child? Washing and cleaning the internal mirror, can you be without stain? Loving all men and ruling the country, can you stop doing anything? Opening and closing the gates of heaven can you work the way a woman works? Understanding all things and opening yourself to them all, are you capable of

doing nothing? Doing nothing means to give birth and to nourish, to keep without possessing, to work without a desire for reward, to guide without dominating. Doing nothing is listening in silence, and that is the primordial peace.” Very nice, paragraph 10.

And about guides or being guided, a small paragraph I think it is... it says: “Excess of color blinds. Excess of sound deafens. Excess of flavors makes the taste dull. Running races and hunting madden the mind as haste and ambition do. And luxurious things make us lose the meaning of life itself. Therefore, the wise man is guided by that what he feels, not only by what he sees while he feels.” He’s something else!

And about misfortune and about seeing well, are two different paragraphs with which I will finish the introduction to start the dialogue. Paragraph 13 is about misfortune. And it says: “Accept disgrace willingly. Accept misfortune as human condition. But, what does it mean to ‘accept disgrace willingly’? It means to accept being unimportant. Not being concerned with gain or loss. That is what “accepting disgrace willingly” means. And what does it mean to accept misfortune as human condition? Misfortune comes because we have a body, and without a body, how could misfortune exist? Surrender yourself humbly and then you will be trusted to care for all things. Love the world as your own self, then you will really be able to care for all things.”

And the 15th talks about seeing well, with which we are going to finish the introduction. And paragraph 15 says: “The ancient masters, called Shong Yen, were subtle, mysterious, profound, responsible. The depth of their knowledge is unfathomable. And since it is unfathomable, all we can do is to describe their appearance. Alert, like men crossing a stream in winter. Attentive, like men who are aware of danger. Courteous, like visiting guests. Yielding, like ice ready to melt. Simple, like blocks of uncarved wood. Hollow, like caves. Opaque, like deep, muddy lakes. But, who can wait in peace until the mud in the lake settles? Who can stay still until the moment of action? Those who understand the Tao do not seek to achieve anything,

and since they do not seek to achieve anything, they are not driven by the desire to change or stay the same. They just look well at what they are and everything that exists at the same time.”

This book was recommended to me by JK-2, by Jiddu Krishnamurti. It is the only book that I heard Jiddu Krishnamurti recommend. And we can start the dialogue with a presentation. Do you want to sit here?

Student: No.

RFG: Alright.

Student: Commentary on the Tao Te King: I wrote this comment after reading and having dialogue this week. Like everything seen from Unitary Perception, with RFG’s translation, the Tao Te King reveals its meaning completely, and makes this book really the book of life. The meaning is broad in its purity, and therefore in a few paragraphs a teaching can be summarized. They say that Lao Tse, before being exiled for refusing to serve the court, wrote this book at the request of a wall guardian, but little is known; everyone speculates about his life, and as he says: “few will understand what is important.” Unfortunately, Lao Tse’s work seems to have become a source of lapidary quotations. It is very easy to run the eye over it, looking for the phrase that attracts attention, which is suitable as the heading of a text, or even reinterpret it in a way that supports what you want to hear. It is a book that, in condensed form, contains the totality and all the relevant aspects of human existence. In it the truth is not put on a pedestal that you can’t reach, as it happens with innumerable books; it places responsibility directly on you, without circumlocutions. No doubt it is a beautiful book; you can look at four aspects: the Tao, heaven and earth, the wise, the world. Tao, in the words of RFG, the ideogram, Chinese word for Tao is a foot followed by a head, which means “incarnating from head to toe.” That is in the Tao, the sacred. That is if the ideogram is divided into two parts, but if it is divided into three, then three symbols are obtained: the foot, the eyebrow

and the sun. The sun under the eyebrow is just below the horizon, signifying the beginning or the end of the day, then the word Tao, divided into three parts and not two: steadily walking with life and death, with the beginning and the end. End of quote. One remembers JK: “Live with death in futureless silence.”

The ideogram character of the Tao, the sacred, is designed with fundamental aspects of human life. The sacred and the human in the same space, the density of meaning, responsibility and the sacred in human life.

Paragraph 62: “That is why the Tao (the second silence) is the greatest treasure of the universe.” end of paragraph. The Tao is what has no name, the unknown origin of the ten thousand things, it is outside of time. Like water, it is in the places man rejects, as for example the sewers, it is everywhere; in Buddhism, the lotus flower is the flower of enlightenment, a wonderful flower that emerges in the muddy waters.

Paragraph 25: “There was something complete, undivided, something mysteriously without form, before the heavens and the earth were born.” See Gospel of John, chapter 1, verse 1.

Paragraph 14: “Look; it cannot be seen. It is beyond shape. Listen; it can’t be heard. It is beyond sound.” Comment: what sees is all there is. The Yin and the Yang, the heaven and the earth, the light and the shadow, more than a division of opposites, shows the contrast that is complementary and necessary for there to be form. There is no division in the universe. This harmonious contrast becomes the division of opposites with the appearance of the egoistic observer who divides, who chooses, who can’t embrace the totality.

Paragraph 77: “The Tao (or Way) of heaven is like bending a bow; one takes from the concave to give it to the convex.”

Paragraph 5: “The space between heaven and earth is like a huge bellow.” See quantum physics.

Paragraph 2: “Therefore, having and not having arise together. Difficult and easy complement each other. Long and short antagonize each other. Tall and low support each other. Voice and silence harmonize with one another. And previous and subsequent follow each other.” The wise. The wise person lives in the Tao. He is a child of God, he does without doing, he does not want things and he does not stand out because it leads to suffering. Alone but in communion. He strengthens his body and not his memory, lives peacefully and silently, alert, friendly and hollow, surrendered to now, without doing his own will, without destiny. Without direction, like the wind. He speaks little, leaving no trace, innocent, persevering, with love to work or be idle, and his only fear is to lose the way.

Paragraph 4: “Oh, hidden but ever-present depth! I do not know where you come from. But you are everything that precedes that which decides to move like the wind of the road.” From the Gospel of John, chapter 3: “He who is born from above, not from the vagina, is like the wind you hear between the leaves of the trees. He does not know where he comes from or where he is going.”

RFG: Your comment is very good. Yes. I don’t know if there are more comments or questions about the Tao. Needless to say, nothing is known about the life of Lao Tse, but let’s not forget that nothing is known historically about the life of K, JesuKristos, except for what his friends wrote in what is now called New Testament, but there is no historical record of his presence... but that is also a reality for Krishnamurti, that is, the day that Krishnamurti dies, I bought Time magazine, to see what Time magazine said, and Time magazine never said anything. So if the people of the future are going to be guided by Time magazine, Jiddu Krishnamurti didn’t exist, just as JesuKristos didn’t exist according to history. And Lao Tse is another one of which nothing is known. He is not an exception to the rule.

We are emphasizing that it seems that these men, Lao Tse, JesuKristos, Jiddu Krishnamurti, were not recorded in history, and to the people of the future they could go unnoticed because

their births and deaths were not talked about, which really surprised me in the case of Jiddu Krishnamurti, our contemporary, and it continues to surprise me that nothing of JesuKristos has ever been said in history, leaving aside the sacred history that is the New Testament, and that nothing has been said about Lao Tse, although in his case, it may be because he lived a very isolated life, like a peasant possibly doing the daily tasks of gathering eggs and cleaning stables, and milking cows, that kind of life I suppose Lao Tse would live, and those men do not enter written history. I don't know if you have any comments.

Audience: Here is a paragraph that is very difficult, and I wanted to ask you if you could explain it. Paragraph 42: “The Tao is absolute. The absolute, being absolved of condition, is one. Unity (integrity) makes the absolute relative. The two appear: the integrity -the one- and the absolute - the absolved. By comparing the integrity and the absolute, the three appears. The three is the trinity (unity of three) and produces the ten thousand things. The ten thousand things can go from darkness (Yin) to light (Yang). And they are harmonized by the divine breath (Chi).” But above all the question is about the first part of the paragraph where it says “from the absolute to be absolved from condition”... until “Chi... the trinity.”

RFG: Yes, curious, isn't it, that this problem is repeated in Christianity, and there are Christians who still do not accept the trinity, or rather, God as the trinity, but [claim that] God is absolute and the only one. And there are other Christians, such as Catholics, who say that God is a trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. And here, I don't know if Lao Tse has something to do with that, as the seed of that, let's say, theological controversy that entered Christianity, but speaking with Raffaele Angelisanti [Franciscan Custodian of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem] about this trinity issue, he said that It was necessary because, just like there is God the Father, there is God the Son, who would be JesuKristos or Creation, JesuKristos as person and Kristos as Creation, son of God too, as Creation and the creatures, which are potentially children of God (the creatures), not currently but potentially, and finally

the Holy Spirit who is God in action in us, within us [and among us].

And it is a concept that a Catholic priest, like Raffaele Angelisanti, argued as necessary. It seems that Lao Tse too. And I don't know, if you have more to say about this. It's a theme that has caused, I don't know if the Thirty Years' War was due to this but... the excuse given for the war... –there is always an excuse for a war... and there is always an excuse to invent an enemy, but one of the excuses of the Thirty Years' War was the Trinity. I don't know if you have comments on this about the trinity.

Audience: Krishnamurti always emphasized the whole. Is it a trinity as a theological way of explaining God? Because he said: ...the whole is the important thing.

RFG: Of course.

Audience: And according to me, he never spoke in some triple way of understanding the whole, but as a whole.

RFG: Yes. Well, it's like... the egg is used to explain the trinity in the catechism, that just as the egg has a shell, and it has a white and yolk, so is God too, and therefore it must be understood, as if it were the egg that gives origin to all life, and therefore is separated into three parts. The trinity was explained like that to me, when I was seven years old, and I never forgot. But like everything, right? Thought manages to make its tricks, including making the separation or fragmentation of the unit. Lao Tse is constantly talking about the origin of the ten thousand things –which is explicit– and about something that is the Tao –which is hidden. Hidden, I said, which is synonymous with sacred, and therefore the Tao is hidden but there is something that is not hidden, which is the origin of the ten thousand things, which would be the explicit [order] of Bohm, where the multiplicity of energy is. But in the implicit order the energy is one. Even in science this issue of unity and multiplicity has been put into place. That in the implicit order the energy is one but it becomes explicit as gravitation,

electromagnetic energy, sound, nuclear energy, and all the energies that are studied in physics.

But the single energy of David Bohm's implicit order is not yet studied, because David Bohm is like, shall we say, suspended in the history of science, as has already happened with Copernicus, who was suspended for a long time, while Ptolemy continued to be taught. And it is another example that the one who talks about unity is rather relegated, relegated. And the trinity is exalted.

One of the things that Giordano Bruno presented, for Christianity to unite, was: first that the Pope had to disappear so that... all the branches of Christianity; Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant, evangelicals, Pentecostal, etc., would come together... then the Pope had to disappear, because the Pope was of the Catholics, and therefore the Pope refused, of course. And he burned Giordano Bruno, who was a Dominican priest, I understand, and he wanted all of Giordano Bruno's Christianity to come together and cost him his life. And one of the things he said was that the trinity might have to be revised, and the papacy had to be reviewed, and a lot of things had to be reviewed. And things went bad for him, really bad.

This whole issue of unity and multiplicity seems so complicated; it seems to bring so many consequences, isn't it? Academic ostracism was the cost Bohm paid, which he still suffers despite the impeccability of its holokinetic theory, from the mathematical point of view. And Lao Tse, we have already said, that he was never in history, that very few people know him, let's say, in the sense of having read this little book that, it is said, someone forced him to write. I heard that it was a king who asked him to write, and he [*student*] said that he was a wall guard, but it was not written, let's say, *motu proprio*, i.e., for his own reasons, but at the request of someone that he wrote.

It is said that he wrote 80 paragraphs and that 81 was added because the guy who asked him to write it was not very happy, so paragraph 81, - it seems this was true- because paragraph 81

says: “True words are not always beautiful; beautiful words are not always true. (laughter) The good one does not argue and he who argues is not good. The wise man is not always informed; the informed man is not always wise. (Laughter) The wise man does not try to accumulate wealth, -it seems the one who asked him to write this was rich- (laughter), the more he does for others, the more he gains. The more he gives, the bigger the abundance. (Was he perhaps asking for a retribution for the book?) The Tao of heaven has points, but it does not harm. It encourages without harming. The Tao of the wise is to work without effort or rivalries.” It seems they were 80, and this 81 was added because... “No, you have to keep writing!” And he wrote this, just this. That is another legend associated with Tao. It is very interesting.

Audience: One last lesson.

RFG: As a last lesson, which is funny if presented in this way, saying he was forced to add it.

Audience: What the text says, the ten thousand things can go from darkness (Yin) to light (Yang), and are harmonized by the divine breath (Chi)... I mean, I think Lao Tse, –and maybe it’s not from Lao Tse, because that, of course, is in Buddhism and in all the East– that for the existence of the ten thousand things, of the explicit order, they do not abandon the original void, and void makes sense, the void that science defines as... in a square meter of vacuum there is more energy than all the matter in the universe, or the vacuum that quantum physics has shown to be matter... then that principle of a having a contrast that is Yin and Yang, and an energy that is *chi*, is to make the ten thousand things exist and they just exist without losing the void, and that is why the wise person remains in a void, empty as the center of the seed.

RFG: It’s like the glass, right? The glass is useful because it has emptiness. [*N.T. The Spanish word “vacío” means empty, void and vacuum.*]

Audience: He says that a room is useful for the space between the...

RFG: ...it is not useful for the walls but for the space between the walls... [*i.e., its emptiness*].

Audience: So it is not only a philosophy but a way of life. And then it's incredible... if you look at the theory of implicate order, it's incredible...

RFG: It's tremendous. It is repeated scientifically. Yes. Well, there are exegetes who say that the Buddha, when he leaves his wife, goes to the Chinese side and gets in touch with the Tao before beginning his life of teaching, etc. And there are those who say that the Tao is what gave rise, at least in the Buddha Gautama, to Buddhism itself. And the original Taoists complained that Buddhism was a distortion of Taoism, and so... But all these things are very intricate and it is necessary, of course, to know much more of the original languages to know where the core of all these discussions is, of the discrepancies, because I have already said, for example, that in the case of Buddhism that has become fashionable in California, in Oregon, in New Mexico and in states like (let alone big cities) but states like Colorado, where there are very rich Buddhist centers, rich in money, giving classes, people go and take classes, they give diplomas, you can buy mantras for 2, 3 or 4 thousand dollars each mantra. Mantra means sound. Each person has their own mantra, that is, their own sound. But well, that's what has become of them, unfortunately, these teachings that have something very serious and very beautiful in themselves, in their origin. But what we are seeing is an adaptation to the marketing of the United States, both with Tao and Buddhism, especially the latter, then what you see is a frightening fragmentation, like Buddhist words... as I said yesterday, the word *sunya* has 17 translations in English, the word *upaya* has about 20 translations into English, although for me the proper translation [of *upaya*] is "a ploy to awaken you." [*Sp. Estratagema*]

But there are seventeen more translations in Buddhism, in United States Buddhism, I mean, translations into English. And there are many essential words of Buddhism, Dharma, etc., which also have many translations. Although dharma is supposed to mean teaching or doctrine, it has many more translations. Yes, it seems that there is only one book written by the Buddha, which is the *Dhammapada*, which is inside the *Sutta Pitaka*.

Dhammapada, in the Pali language, means teaching, since in the Sanskrit language, *dharma* means teaching, therefore in Pali, *dhamma* means teaching as well.

And then that one short book is attributed to Buddha. It is a very interesting book, I am surprised how the Buddha thought of the one who dies and who does not go to nirvana, to paradise, but stays floating around like a ghost and wanders looking for a womb to be reborn on earth or reincarnate. And then he refers to the womb you're going to find, and he suggests that finding a good womb is not very easy, and possibly less easy every day. To find a good womb to reincarnate, and then, of course, what kind of life would we have in a world more degenerate than the previous one, so reincarnation looks like hell. For a good Buddhist, reincarnation is hell; it is the great punishment, for not having been liberated of the *skandhas*. Here is another essential word of Buddhism, the *skandhas*: that we are constituted by various elements or *skandhas*. I think there are more than 200 English translations of the word *skandha*, that is, you cannot study Buddhism in English because you do not know what you are reading.

Audience: The translator writes the book.

RFG: Do you realize? That's why JK is doubly valuable, because it's in English right from the start, and you cannot play with the translation anymore. It is clearly there in English, and for the contemporary English speaker, so that there are no problems of exegesis, etymologies, semantics, vested interests, etc., etc., etc. Any other question or comment?

Audience: They also translate yin and yang as heaven and earth, right?

RFG: Again a translation, but that is not original, but it is like that. Because the yin, yang... the yin, at least Carl Jung defines it as the feminine, and yang the masculine. And then many archetypes, right? You know, the shadow, the *anima*, the *animus*, and so on. The *anima* would be the yin in the human being, in the human mind, the *animus* would be the yang in the human mind, and this is what Carl Jung describes, who was a student of oriental philosophies.

RFG: And if in Greek the action of the air... –look at this, in Greek the action of the air was translated as Holy Spirit. “You have to be born of the air, Nicodemus,” but on the other hand the action of the air appears. Ah, what, do I have to be born from that action of the air, that is, of the Holy Spirit, which is part of God? And where is it? It is within us, that is, the Holy Spirit is the part of God that is within each one of us. Even when they met, I believe that as we met yesterday, I want to believe; without hierarchies, in a completely friendly way... they were very careful not to have hierarchies because if the Holy Spirit is in everyone, it means that it can speak through any mouth. That is written in the New Testament. If the Holy Spirit is in everyone, ah, then it can speak through any mouth. Watch out! No one should be prevented from speaking, because it could be the Holy Spirit that is being expressed. It is very beautiful! That tendency to human unity, to listen to each other, to solve problems together, in a supporting, fraternal way, and as a unit. All that is implicit in that original Christianity. Now, four hundred years later, the Holy Spirit becomes part of a trinity, it is no longer the action of the air within us, it is now something that is already part of God, well, everything is a part of God, and if the creation comes from God then everything created is sacred. That is why those who contradict the idea of the trinity cling to the fact that everything created is sacred. And Krishnamurti one day said: “Either everything is sacred or nothing is sacred.”

Audience: Was he talking about the ABC brain? Sometimes I get the feeling that talking about the trinity is to speak about the three psychological precincts. I don't know if I'm wrong but I have that feeling.

RFG: And then the Holy Spirit would be B, you say?

Audience: I could not put the Holy Spirit in B, because Christianly the Holy Spirit is what remains with us, so being strict, it would be C, wouldn't it? And B would be Jesus, the son...

Audience: hmmm I don't like it when...

Audience: ...I don't like to think that is the case, but sometimes I have the feeling that the trinity is like talking about the three mental precincts.

RFG: If one looks at this carefully, I already anticipate innumerable controversies. It is better not to present it that way. [Let's not make false correlations].

Audience: Yes.

RFG: There are beautiful Buddhist stories, for example that three monks are commissioned to carry three well-carved ebony statues of the Buddha to another convent, and they have to go through the snowy mountain, and when they reach the top of the snowy mountain to get to the other convent, they have to spend the night there and they are freezing. Then one of them begins to make a fire in the old fashioned way, and takes one of the three statues and starts burning it. Then the other monk, who was asleep, wakes up and says, "it feels so good." "Indeed, it feels good." And when he sees the two Buddhas, he says: "What happened to the other Buddha?" "I'm burning it, do you realize how much heat he gives?" "Are you crazy?! Burning the Buddha, the statue of the Buddha? That's madness." "But, are you cold?" "Yes," "Well, pass me another statue." (laughter) So, the unity, Zen, right? The unity... and from that original unity we ended up with the lamas... that if

they touch you, that's good for you, or because they sell you a mantra, that's good for you... that is, the intermediary taking a place of hierarchy, an incontrovertible hierarchy of course, because "God sends him" and "God says that this is the lama, because he has a speck on his nose or somewhere else and then he is the lama. And he is the greatest lama..." well excuse me! As Steve Martin says, excuse me, but I do not believe it! There are many who buy into it, that so-and-so is the great lama and all those Tibetan tales... But there is also a Chinese lama, so there is the problem, which of the two lamas is the true one, the Tibetan or the Chinese? And so... fragmentation never ends, why? Because there are hierarchies, hence the corruption of the original teaching. Sadly.

Possibly there were Christians, such as Thomas himself, who went to Madras, and in Madras, well, they took him up on a roof and threw him down, which was the end of Thomas, at least physically, because he continues with us in his work. What I want to say is that they assassinated Thomas because he said things they could not tolerate, and I don't know what he would say about the trinity, because it was not a problem of Thomas' time; that became a problem in the year 400. So the trinity was not a problem for Jesus. Jesus said: "there is in you the Holy Spirit; when you have a problem ask him and he, who is inside you, shall answer." Beautiful. And so... I think there are different conceptions of the order of the sacred: that of Jesus, the apostolic one, and finally, the imperial one, which is when the church is approved by Constantine, and the rules and the gathering of books begin, etc.

Audience: At least today's text, which has an extraordinary utility, and it is to show the fantasy of division, to not confuse man. Then unity is silence and division is naming. Because yin and yang, regardless of what yin and yang are thought to be, of all that I have studied, what is fundamental is never to speak of yin without yang being present. Do not lose the whole even if you name it, and that is the teaching.

RFG: Yes, and the symbol of Tao is black and white but white has a little black dot and black has a little white dot. That is, one in the other, and each one has a bit of the other.

Audience: What is the yin there and what is the yang?

RFG: Well, the yang would be the black and the yin the white... for example...

Audience: No, the yin is the black, because it is the dark, the shadow, and the yang is the light.

RFG: Right, but there's a bit of darkness in the light. As JK said: "there is no rose without thorns." And Jesus said: "Do not call me good because only God knows who is good." Jesus himself said it.

Audience: Even the yin-yang was put it in three dimensions, turning it into a sphere.

RFG: Was it a sphere?

RFG: And another thing that surprises a lot in the teaching of the New Testament is that a man like John the Baptist is not in paradise. "The smallest in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist," says Jesus. As if to say that John the Baptist is not in paradise. And then there is Peter who does not enter because, well... he cut Malchus' ear, he had children, then he does not enter, but he remains symbolically in a good place, which is the entrance, and he is with the key at the door, that is, he has a place of honor, but outside. This is beautiful... if you think... people who were very good and who are not in paradise. So, what do you have to do to enter paradise? You have to be 150% good... (laughter)

Well, the question that JK asks me, when we went for a walk: "Will you continue being one of the many or will you start being one of the few?" That is, the few who understand the good or the sacred. There do not seem to be many... who are

even interested, so how are they going to understand if they are not even interested?

I don't know if there are more questions or comments. In Argentina, are there any questions or comments?

Audience: No, Rubén.

RFG: Nothing? Then we could move on to the next part of the last class: reversing roles, which is lots of fun, we always laugh at the expense of a victim who is the volunteer who will teach Unitary Perception; but this is very important, as an exercise, to learn a lot, even of Holokinetic Psychotherapy, of the nature of Holokinetic Psychotherapy. That is the meaning of this role reversal exercise.

And I thought of Yolanda, if you want to teach Unitary Perception, and I would make it as difficult as possible for you, so that there is a good dialogue at the end and a good critique, what do you think? You have to come here. You are a therapist and I come as a patient to therapy...

Student (T):*[In the role of holokinetic therapist] I would start by asking if you feel comfortable where you are.*

RFG (P): *[In the role of patient] Yes, thank you.*

T: *I invite you to attempt Unitary Perception together, to feel the weight of the body, at the same time that we listen to the sound and we perceive everything that is perceptible at the same time...*

P: *Yes, but... won't you let me tell you why I'm here?*

T: *I think... alright, let's see why you feel bad.*

P: *I feel bad because I'm always quarreling with my wife.*

T: *And if we see at the same time while we feel the weight of the body, or while we listen to all the sound and perceive*

everything perceptible at the same time, we would hear the problem as another sound...

P: *But I do not see a relationship, doctor, between the sound and the fact that I fought with my wife...*

T: *Attempt it without thinking, just attempting to feel the whole weight of the body at the same time as we listen to the sound and perceive all that is perceptible at the same time, and listening to that as just another simple sound, we see that it is lost, without taking relevance from the problem.*

P: *What is being lost? What, doctor?*

T: *The feeling of anguish and fear that you have because of the problem with your wife.*

RFG: We'll suspend this for a second to see how we're doing... we start with... [a critique]. Is your axe ready? (laughter)

Audience: Well, yes, first make the diagnosis, right? See how sleep is, how energy is. If there is no good sleep and there is no good energy, there can be no attempt of Unitary Perception, because the patient will not understand it...

Student: Yes, but I started with the idea that we had already made the diagnosis.

RFG: And what about the rest of the exchange, here?

Audience: Yes, well, there is still haste, but not as much as before, she seems quite calm... to talk about wholeness, we must first explain to the patient from the very beginning what Unitary Perception is. If we don't have that definition of what Unitary Perception is first...

RFG: Do you think it was missing?

Audience: The definition of Unitary Perception was missing, at the beginning so that...

RFG: Then, diagnosis, haste, and the definition of Unitary Perception.

Audience: I don't know if someone else wants to make a comment.

RFG: You... by the way you look at her... (laughter) you're ready for the alpha strike...

Audience: Well, this is role reversal... I think it has to be something more human, I mean, what you have in front of you is a patient, and he is a human being, then you have to be one with him. So if he comes with a problem, first you have to listen to him and see that problem. If there is no problem, then the definition can be given, with you attempting it [*Unitary Perception*] from the beginning, then...

RFG: Are you saying that the patient's problem was missing?

Audience: That is, more sensitivity towards the patient, who is a human being with you, so it's a bit more than telling him what needs to be done...

RFG: As for example, specifically...

Audience: The guidelines, more than the guidelines.

RFG: Sure, what would you have done, say, instead of what she did?

Audience: Well, it's not what I would have done but... it should... be sensitized with the patient... you can't do much with a reversal of roles, but...

RFG: Well, we're attempting to get closer to therapy, to good holokinetic therapy, then... of course there's a lot we can do, we're learning from this...

Audience: Yes, but...

RFG: And you say more sensitivity. I would like you to expand more on that, can you?

Audience: To feel the patient and then to understand him, basically, the patient will feel that...

Audience: Listen to him, you mean...

Student: In other words, listen to the problem; let him tell you a little more...

Audience: Accompany him, yes...

RFG: Now, do you assume that she lacked sensitivity to the patient?

Audience: Yes, kind of.

RFG: And, what makes you believe that? Some detail that makes you believe that...

Audience: Well... basically listening to him... he is suffering, coming to you as if asking for help... then if you give him the definition out of the blue [*suddenly*], then, besides not understanding you, he will feel more hurt.

Student: So you say we should give him time to tell the problem, to let it out, is that what you're saying?

Audience: Yes, and accompany him and tell him what happens to him and when he has understood everything that happens, you can attempt the definition.

Student: To give relief by talking about the problem constantly... wouldn't that also give continuity to the problem?

Audience: No, you listen to him, once is enough, just seeing... letting him see that you are listening to him, so that he does not feel bad, and that you are being one with him. Your interest is, I think, that he attempts Unitary Perception...

Audience: Okay.

Audience: Although it is a role reversal, the reality of the situation weighs. And to make the connection for someone who insists that the problem is that he fought with his wife, so you can see there, that by attempting Unitary Perception, that person is going to solve that problem. To make that connection, which is in the written work, at that moment in a real way, listening to someone, you have to be very prepared. And at first, yes, it's true; you have to listen to him. But of course, Ruben is also attempting to add difficulty, and she knows it, but even if it was not difficult, how do you make the connection between a person who does not know, who comes there because he has quarreled with his wife, and listening to all the sound?

RFG: And I took a real patient, and more than finding it difficult, they feel rather disappointed that you talk about the sound when they come to you with the problem of their woman, right? "I come because of my wife and you talk to me about the sound," and that is a shock that you find in therapy at every step.

Student: That's why that question was very good too. What does the sound have to do with my fighting with my wife?

RFG: Sure, and that's what the patient told me, that's why I brought it.

Audience: And what should one answer? (laughter)

RFG: But then, before seeing what needs to be done, I would like you to see, to tell me what was missing. You mentioned haste, definition... that there should be more contact with the patient, more sensitivity.

RFG: Blanca, do you have something?

Audience: No.

RFG: Javier, do you have anything about what happened?

Audience: Let's keep seeing and I will say something later.

RFG: I'm still holding on to the first word, which was haste. It seems there was a lot of haste, right?

Audience: Yes, I believe that the attempt of Unitary Perception is the guide...

RFG: Yes.

Audience: The attempt of the Unitary Perception is the guide and if one does not attempt Unitary Perception, the patient is going to drag us with his problem and it is going to be just one more therapy. That is the great difference, subtle, but true difference.

RFG: Yes. And the danger that the therapist, and I mean therapists who already have their professional degree and everything, that they fall, as they have fallen, into techniques they learned in the faculty of psychology, where the 32 psychologies are entrenched. Then, when you don't know what to do with the patient who, say, "bothers" you, with his problem and you don't know how to face it, you return to the known, which are the techniques you learned, if it is not gestalt, it is from psychoanalysis or from some lesser things.

Audience: Behaviorism.

RFG: Etc.... behaviorism... behaviorism is used a lot when, in despair, the therapist resorts to the countable, and we enter the field of counting. Do you want to say something, Karina, about what happened?

Audience: And Rubén, it's a question. Wouldn't it be better to listen to thoughts as they come, as if they were another sound, so, I don't know...?

Student: But I think that's what I said, right?

RFG: It was what she said, "if you think about your wife or the problem, listen to it as another sound, feel it as another sound," I do not remember how she said it but she said it. What I insist is that I think it was a bit hasty. With too much haste, with regard to what therapy has to be, a place of relaxation, a place of rest. Or school, the word school, *skole* means rest; it does not mean that they throw problems at you all the time. And the word therapy means a service of peace. And I saw you with much haste, as it happened the first time, it is true that less haste, but there is still haste.

Then, well... pass the microphone.

Audience: I suggest you invite Rubén, and not the patient, so he doesn't need to act. That she invites Rubén to Unitary Perception, it may be better.

RFG: Yes, but I bring this patient because these are the things which you are going to find. That patient is real, the one that I present here...

Audience: Yes, for you to act, but for her it could be easier if...

RFG: Yes, yes. To try to make it as natural as possible, of course.

Student (T):*[In the role of holokinetic therapist]* Are we still comfortable... at ease?

RFG (P):*[In the role of patient]* Yes, to tell you the truth, I had already become uncomfortable.

T: *Make yourself comfortable.*

RFG: That's very important.

T: *We continue with the invitation to feel the weight of the body on the chair together, to listen to all the sound while we feel the weight of the body on the chair, and to see everything perceptible at the same time, while we feel the weight, we hear all the sound...*

RFG: Now we go back to the question. Is there haste or not? There's... with that haste I can't listen because you're already inviting me to see while you're still not sure if I'm listening.

Student: Oh, okay.

RFG: And the way you start to be sure is when you see the patient immobile and relaxed, then once you see him motionless and relaxed you follow that cue and add the other sense, very calmly, without formulated haste.

Student: And for example if I can't see him relaxed, if he insists on not wanting to see...

RFG: *"It seems to me that you are still not listening."* You tell him, because, what is the *hallmark...* the guarantee... that the patient is doing what you tell him? Peace, stillness, and if the patient is neither still nor peaceful, you have to say to him: *"I'm under the impression that you are not listening to all the sound."*, *"And why not?"* They can say that to you, because they have told me, *"because I still don't see you in peace, I don't see you in that stillness that peace gives."* You tell him why. Then the patient could take a formulated attitude of stillness and peace...

Student: But he still looks tense.

RFG: And you're seeing he's about to explode. Then you say: *"Be careful with the formulated peace, leave yourself in peace..."* as Meister Eckhart said...

Student: Let peace flow...

RFG: *“Leave yourself in peace, do not formulate peace, do not attempt peace, let it come.”* And you are interacting based on what you see, what the patient says but also what you see. We continue...

Student: Okay. *“Are you comfortable, feeling the weight of the body on the chair?”* I never asked him, *“do you feel it, are you feeling it...?”*

RFG: I do; I want to be sure that he is doing what he has to do.

Student (T):*[In the role of holokinetic therapist]* Are we feeling the weight of the body on the chair? Do you feel comfortable?

RFG (P):*[In the role of patient]* Yes, thank you.

T: *Now, at the same time that we feel the weight of the body on the chair we hear all the sound...*

P: *But can I ask you a question, doctor? I still do not see the relationship of listening to the sound and feeling the weight and that I fight every day with my wife...*

T: *Try this, to get out of the repetitiveness of the problem, to see it without giving it much relevance, then...*

P: *But it's ruining my life.*

T: *We return to the same thing, attempt to feel the weight of the body to see...*

Student: Oh, I lost my track... *and at the same time.*

RFG: This was a real case. And that was the man... *“I do not see the relationship between listening to the sound and that I fought with my wife...”*

T: *Try to get out of the repetitiveness of the problem, the cycle of the problem of constantly thinking about it. Probably if we attempt Unitary Perception we will get out of that cyclicity of the problem, of the continuity of the problem. So, if you are comfortable, we attempt again to feel the weight of the body on the chair... do you feel... do you feel comfortable?*

P: *Yes.*

T: *Now we attempt to hear all the sound at the same time, while we continue to feel the weight of the body on the chair, we manage to hear all the sound without naming the things we are listening to, and if the name comes, we simply hear it as another sound...*

P: *What name are you talking about?*

T: *Of the things we hear (laughter).*

RFG: No, I mean, people come to you with things like that... then you take advantage, if they come with that –which they do! You take the opportunity to say: “do you hear that sound in the street?” But without giving it a name; we don’t know what it is, it can be a truck, it can be...

Student: Yes, but I do not say “*listen to the truck*”, but “*listen to that sound*”.

RFG: Sure, “*do you hear that sound?*” Maybe it’s a truck, or maybe it’s a plane landing, we don’t know. “*Do you hear the sound, hear it in your brain*”, etc.? But you are referring to a sound because he does not know what naming means. Then, not to name Yolanda in the act of seeing Yolanda, and to see [everything visible] with the back of the eye, say, because we are seeing the visual field, for example.

Student: Then, just like when I tell him that... in the same way, if he begins to think about the problem with the wife, he only needs to see it as another sound...

RFG: Sure. Of course. That would be the “theological” ideal of holokinetic therapy (laughter). Which happens! It happens, as Cecilia has seen... I don’t know if you saw Roberto yesterday... he seems another person, his skin, he looks younger, more vital...

Audience: Yes, calmer...

RFG: More coherent, more peaceful, more vital, calmer, and he’s taken nothing more than two sessions with Cecilia so far.

Audience: Tremendous.

RFG: I say, if two sessions can do that, imagine the six sessions that are proposed, at least, and the twelve that are proposed as a contract...

Student: A change of life...

RFG: What can they do? Sure, our life changes. Well, then, how do you see this?

Audience: I had a little question. It’s been very good, and the problem of whether the patient continues to refuse to see the relationship has arisen, can we explain them the origin of their conflict a bit?

RFG: Well, what you say is a part of sensitivity; it is a part of putting yourself in the patient’s shoes... I do it. It doesn’t mean that it has to be done as I do, but I do it...

Student: But, for example in that case, it would have helped at that time to say: *“I understand your problem, I understand you, I know what that is...”*

RFG: That helps.

Student: *...but let’s not stop attempting Unitary Perception.”*

RFG: Exactly, because that perception, as you well said, is going to take you out of your cycle, of pain, anger, sadness, fear, and so on.

Audience: Then, I could if he's still stubborn...? (laughter)

RFG: You can count on that, he will keep being stubborn...

For example, in this case, what would you ask the patient to get to the source of his conflict with his wife?

Audience: No, just asking him, talking to him... well, yes, asking him a little how that relationship is to understand it a bit and then tell him that...

RFG: ...he will tell you: *"What relationship?! I have no relationship; we never talk, and when we talk we fight!"* And patients do tell you that... what would you do?

Audience: Well, we could talk a bit that the origin of a relationship that is in C does not have a future...

RFG: Ah, and we would have to enter the ABC. You say there are circumstances where ABC education is fundamental, right?

Audience: Yes.

Student: But would the education of... be done in each patient?

Audience: Because you give him the opportunity to...

RFG: I don't do it with every patient, but there are cases (stubborn patients) where a little education comes in handy...

Audience: You give them the opportunity to look a little more at the issue, then they understand it more...

RFG: Yes, I do use education in therapy a lot, almost always, except that the person, exceptionally, is rather calm, which is very rare. Did you have something to say?

Audience: I wanted to ask Cecilia, who has her experience, what she does when a patient constantly insists on their problem.

Audience: Definitely, I try to make them understand how the mind works, so that they realize that we are immersed in Precinct C, which is the cause of all our conflicts. The patient... I never tell them “probably” as she said “*the problem will probably go*” ...I state... somehow I say: “*Even if you don’t understand now, let’s go slowly*” I always say this: “*and although holokinetic therapy, which we are going to start, doesn’t seem familiar...*” because at first, yes, of course, I let them explain the problem to me, but I do not let them wander too much because I place questions along the way so that they don’t go infinite on their narrative...

RFG: So they don’t get carried away...

Audience: Aha, and when I hear them and more or less realize what the patient’s problem is, for example, in the case of Rubén [in the role of patient], who now mentions him, who had problems with his wife, etc... if he is in the office, it is because he wants to solve the relationship or because he wants to reaffirm the separation, because already in his head somehow he is fed up and already wants to divorce...

Audience: He wants a solution, right?

Audience: Aha, he wants a solution...

RFG: Or a permission, as Wallenberg said, the friend of Krishnamurti that I knew, do you remember? Psychologist, friend of Karen Horney and Fromm, who said that coincidentally.

Audience: Aha, then I ask the question specifically to the patient: “*Do you think that the relationship has possibilities and that is why you are here? Would you like to improve the relationship and end the problem or do you really...?*”

RFG: As Wallenberg said, “*or do you need my permission to divorce?*”

Audience: Exactly. “*Or are you somehow... are you still together?*” I ask. “*Yes, we are together.*” And also, the paraverbal way in which the patient tells you things; he tells you a lot paraverbally. Their mouth tells you one thing, but their expression is telling you something else. For example, I saw your face like this... [*making facial expressions*]. So I see the facial expression that tells me enough: he is fed up, for example, right? And sometimes the patient tells you: “*no, it has become impossible.*” Then I stick to what the patient says. And I make them see also whether the main problem is not generated by us, because we ourselves are lacking in peace. Most patients are surprised by that question, right? “*Would you like to live in peace? Do you believe that being in peace could help your partner to better understand your problem as a couple, and that she also needs to realize that she is not at peace and wants to feel at peace? So let’s start with you, we’ll start with you, because you can’t do anything for the other person. You can only do something for yourself.*”

Student: Would it be prudent then to invite the person’s partner as well?

RFG: Well, eventually it may be necessary.

Audience: On the way, when we already have had several sessions, I say: “*could your wife come with you?*”

Student: After several sessions.

Audience: Yes.

RFG: Yes, but about what you said before, I remember again Dr. Wallenberg, who spoke with Krishnamurti in Ojai at meetings of 5000 people, he would stand up and ask him questions. And Wallenberg had a card that he gave me one day, which read: Dr. Wallenberg: “*You have my permission to be*

happy” and then you looked at the other side: “*You do not need my permission to be happy.*” (laughter) Which is what you were saying in other words.

Audience: Yes, exactly, I say so. I say: “*we can’t do anything for the other person but we can start with ourselves.*” And in the relationship we always have a responsibility for the relationship to go well or not. We have to see the part that corresponds to us, and I even say to them: “*Whether that relationship can continue because you are going to realize that you can live in peace or not... that’s for you to solve along the way, if you have to continue or not continue the relationship, you will decide, the only one that will decide, but the important thing is that we see that we are not in peace.*” Well, that’s how we started... and when the patient feels surprised that Holokinetic Therapy is something so simple, I tell him directly: “*Even if it seems so simple to you, as it is, you will realize that it has implications that are not so simple, as we are going to see along the way.*” Definitely, when we started Unitary Perception, I anticipate where I know the patient is in some way, and that doubts come to him.

RFG: And that also means, as I think we are suggesting, by saying sensitivity, that you put “all the meat on the grill” in the therapeutic act; that “meat” called Ruben, on the “grill” of the therapy, you put all of it.

Audience: Yes, for example, I say... “*we are feeling the weight of the body together, slowly, effortlessly, even if it seems unfamiliar, do not worry, you trust what we are doing and we will discover it on the way.*” And since it is not familiar, and I know it is not familiar to him –and also to make the quantum leap, as you say that “*what’s the use of this?*” I say: “*even if you do not see the relationship of what the use of this is regarding your problem, on the way we will discover that it is deeply related,*” then, slowly, and we begin with the weight of the body... “*Let’s feel together the weight of the body, the feet on the floor, at the same time we realize that the body weight is on the chair...*”

RFG: And do you find challenges? As for example, I do not find a relationship with the problem with my wife. What was the last challenge you found in that attempt of yours?

Audience: I'll have you know, that has happened to me every time I've been in therapy with patients, who, due to the fact of my anticipating their doubts, do not manifest them, why? Because I paraphrase what I think they are feeling, thinking... *"Even if you feel that there is no relationship with your problem, we are going to see why..."*

RFG: Right, you beat them to it...

Audience: *"Even if you feel that this thing we are starting, this Holokinetic Therapy, has no relation with your problem, we will see how it is related to that problem and to all the problems..."*

Student: But to always anticipate... is it not like inhibiting, could that also inhibit the patient, that he no longer wants to ask...?

RFG: Or they can tell you, *"No, it's not true!"* But...

Audience: I don't set them up for that. I don't set them up for that because I tell them: *"Do you have questions, doubts?" "Do you feel that this doesn't... do you feel that..."* etc. *"Tell me honestly because the more honest you are with me, the more I can help you."*

Audience: Because it can also be intimidating, right?

RFG: She says it could be intimidating.

Audience: Now, at this moment, we're explaining, obviously to explain it I'm not saying things as they happen in the office; in the office, we are talking about several appointments down the road and in the first appointments obviously I first explained to them how the mind works in ABC... I do explain,

they realize that they have always been in Precinct C and that it is the reason for the main conflict of the human being.

Student: And that is a way to quickly see your problem and quickly see what their problem is and that it is in Precinct C.

Audience: Yes, because there is no one who doesn't realize that when I start crying for something, afterwards I end up with a lot of sadness and then anger comes... and since it works like this in all brains, it is not an exception for the patient... so I say: *"Have you noticed that you start crying and then in a moment there comes a lot of sadness and out of sadness comes anger?"* And they sort of click at that point, because who doesn't live it like that? And also, who hasn't lived without having realized that the body is there where it is? That we constantly get out of touch with the energy? *"Don't you notice that you are always thinking about the future, and what that person said yesterday?"* That is very revealing for the patient.

RFG: When you went out, we were talking about a patient, who came yesterday to the meeting, of seventeen people, a free meeting on Saturday... there was a patient of yours who seemed another person, younger, calmer, more coherent. Did he not challenge you in this style?

Audience: You see, this patient is one of the most challenging ones I've had, maybe, because to begin with he has a lot of knowledge of psychology.

RFG: He's a psychologist.

Audience: Yes, he is a psychologist. We've done pretty well because I think he's also very eager to get out of his problems, and that's why he's here. So he is very participative in Holokinetic Therapy, that is, he is very receptive to everything, and you can see that he really wants to understand, and that has helped a lot.

RFG: And there was no challenge.

Audience: Well, everyone's challenges. I believe that to a greater or lesser degree, or lesser or greater intensity, the challenges are the same: *"I want to feel at peace," "I want to live happily," "I want to be calm and able to do what I have to do without so many conflicts and problems..."*

RFG: Those are wishes, but in terms of challenges, I mean when he challenges what you are saying, saying it's not true...

Audience: Yes, he doesn't say it's not true, but he does question many things. He does question them but precisely what has helped me a lot is that he is reading, and as I also give a lot of literature to patients when I think it is appropriate, I start with small things, or with more digestible things, I recommend it. And that also helps, I say: *"read this and we talk about your questions on this next week."*

Student: That is, if it is appropriate, because the patient can say: *"I didn't come here to have you assign homework to me."*

Audience: So I say to the patient: *"Do you like to read?"* They say: *"No."* Ah, then I do not give them anything. *"Do you like to read?"* *"Oh, I like it a lot,"* *"would you like to read more about what we are doing, about holokinetic therapy?"* *"Oh, yes, please,"* or I recommend what to read or not read. If they say no, then I leave them alone because I know they're not going to read it, but if they says yes –but not in the first session, but when we have already advanced in the therapy and I see them interested in knowing more...

Student: But it could also be counterproductive if he did not have time during the week, *"I did not read, I'm not going to the session,"* why? *"Because she's going to ask me and I don't know."* Can't it be like that?

Audience: No, because I do not ask them if they don't bring the subject up next... I don't say: *"Did you read what I gave you?"* Forget it; I'm not going to tell them that. If he says to me or she says to me: *"ah, I read what you gave me, I didn't understand this, I didn't understand that,"* then we start talking

about what I gave them. If they don't bring it up, I don't bring it up. And I don't mention it again until the patient brings the subject to me of what I gave him, and he read, then...

Audience: Or any question...

Audience: ...that he brings me... "*ah, what you gave me the other day...*" Ah yes, then we start talking about it. If he does not bring it up again, I will not mention it again, nor will I ask him.

RFG: Well, any last comments before the break?

Audience: Well, she said "manage to"... "*manage to hear the sound.*"

RFG: Oh, do not put it in the future. It is now! Not *manage to* [or *achieve*], because that is in the future; it is now that we have to listen. Not *manage to hear the sound* but *hear the sound now*.

Audience: And above all also, when one begins to invite Unitary Perception... as a final comment...

Audience: The guideline is oneself, that is, one begins to attempt Unitary Perception together with the patient, and one realizes when one really has the attention in the fact of feeling the body weight, and at the same time, when you're incarnating, then you're also seeing what the patient, as Rubén said very well, is manifesting to you. If the patient is like this or tense, you notice... and you mention it... if he is moving his leg... "*we are realizing if there is anxiety.*"

Audience: You can make him see, "*you feel uneasy, but why?*"

Audience: No, I do not say "*you feel uneasy*". No.

RFG: "*Let's see the restlessness together.*"

Audience: *“Are we feeling the anxiety? Are we moving our leg? Is there any concern?” “There is restlessness!” ...not “you are restless”!*

Audience: No, as in... *“do you feel restless?”* As a form of question.

Audience: I do not ask them that. *[Several people speak at the same time].*

RFG: I don't know if you know the anecdote of JK with Mrs. Zimbalist, who lived together, and Mrs. Zimbalist told that, say, Krishnamurti was in a room in the house and she was in another, and suddenly she starts to move her foot because she was planning a trip, she was sitting but moving her foot with restlessness, and she hears Krishnamurti say: “the foot!” “the foot!” (laughter) and he was not even looking at her, but he knew she was moving her foot. One of the anecdotes... and in therapy you can do the same: “the foot?” for example... that's one way among many...

Audience: I don't do that...

RFG: The foot... or let's see the restlessness together.

Audience: We must avoid everything that predisposes the patient to become defensive.

RFG: Of course. Like confrontations.

Audience: Or you can take a short glance at it (laughter)

RFG: Or... “that foot is driving me crazy!” (laughter)

Audience: Really therapeutic (just kidding).

RFG: It's not therapeutic, no... (laughter) So, I don't know if you're ready for the break and then we come back.

RFG: We've seen and learned a lot.

[15 minute break]

Alright, let's start another role reversal, as a kind of learning what Holokinetic Therapy should be...

Student (T):*[In the role of holokinetic therapist]* Are we sitting comfortably?

RFG (P):*[In the role of patient]* Yes.

T: *I would like to start, if you like, by inviting you to feel the weight of our body together, and at the same time we feel the weight of our body, we hear the sound... What happens? Can we feel it?*

P: *When I feel the weight I forget the sound and when I hear the sound I forget the weight...*

T: *What do you think if we keep attempting... to feel the weight... at the same time we hear the sound. That is, our brain is feeling the weight of body at the same time that it listens to the sound. We only need to realize, then it is possible to realize at the same time... we simply have to realize that, not so much to understand it but... rather to attempt it... in the experience.*

P: *Sure, that's what happens, which is one-two, and it's not one... the sound and the weight, but it's one or the other but not the two together.*

T: *Exactly, both at the same time. And we continue constantly attempting... at the same time that we are feeling the weight of the body we are listening to the sound... and at the same time we are seeing the entire visual field... And well, we keep attempting to feel the weight of the body as we listen to the sound and let's see the whole visual field, and so if you wanted to, you can tell me what brings you here... but feeling the weight of the body and listening to the sound... let's see if we can talk while feeling the weight of the body and listening to the sound, at the same time...*

P: Well, I have thoughts that repeat and repeat themselves, and thought won't leave me alone, I feel bad...

T: *Okay.*

P: *I have to wash my hands every five minutes... but now that we are doing this, I feel calm, and I have not seen the thought appear...*

T: *Do you realize that we can be talking, listening, and yet at the same time we can also feel the weight of the body and listen to the sound?*

P: *Yes.*

T: *That is, because you are talking and you are listening at the same time...*

P: *Sure... and then do you believe that with this attempt to listen to the sound and look at the light and feel the weight at the same time, that repetition of the thoughts that overwhelm me will disappear?*

T: *Well, what happens if we feel the weight of the body, now, at this moment at the same time we hear the sound?*

P: *Sure, that thought is absent...*

T: *Right. So we are seeing together what happens with thought. Thought ceases, right?*

P: *Yes, it really does. That thought that bothers me does not repeat itself. I can remember it but it does not bother me or repeat itself.*

T: *And yet, what about life, now in this moment, are we not alive?*

P: *Yes, but I don't know what you want to tell me.*

T: *Well, what I want to say is... this is different, this way of life is different from how we are used to living... do you find a difference?*

P: *Well, of course, it's something else. I had never been told this... about listening to the sound, etc., and I see that it solves that repetition of thought...*

T: *Neither had I, but we're discovering...*

P: *Sure, sure.*

T: *And well, we keep attempting this way of perceiving, which is the way of perceiving, and well, this way of perceiving, which is the way of perceiving, is Unitary Perception. It is different from how we are accustomed to perceive; that other way is in fragmentary perception, which is a perception not only in parts but in fragments. And that is why, as we are discovering together, the experience is different.*

P: *But... why do you say not only in parts but also in fragments? Why do you separate parts from fragments?*

T: *Well, for example... at the same time that... –I mention this because it can be, if it happens to you that a thought emerges, it is part of the perceptible but it is not a fragment of what is happening.*

P: *Right, because if I see that thought, let's say, while I see the visual field, that thought ceases or stops bothering... is that what you're trying to tell me?*

T: *That's what we're attempting to discover and that's what happens and now... I don't know if thoughts are now emerging...*

P: *No, I remember the thought that bothers me but it does not bother me or repeat itself now.*

T: *Okay. So I say this in case at some point after you leave this place, for example, a thought or that same thought emerges... that thought is part of the perceptible, then we realize that it is part of the perceptible, just like the visual field and the weight of our body are part of the perceptible...*

P: *Of course, I don't have to stop seeing just because I'm thinking.*

T: *Exactly, and in that seeing we are discovering that thought ceases...*

P: *And even if it doesn't cease, it doesn't bother you.*

T: *Exactly, that is, it is just another part of the perceptible... and well, I insist, we continue in the attempt of Unitary Perception, feeling...*

P: *And the same thing can happen with desire...? For example, I am happily married, but there is a girl next door who looks a lot like Scarlett Johansson, and the girl next door is driving me crazy... I think a lot about her... And can this also be done with desire?*

T: *Well, now you remembered the girl next door. You're remembering, then we can see that memory at the same time that we are feeling the weight of the body and listening to the sound... that is, let's see together... what happens if we see it...*

P: *Right... the same thing happens as with the thought that repeats itself.*

T: *It ceases.*

P: *It goes away... and it does not take long for it to go.*

T: *Are you telling me or asking me?*

P: *I ask, because it seems to me that as soon as I started to listen, the thought of the neighbor was gone...*

T: *Exactly.*

P: *And is it right that it is so... does it mean that the thought goes away immediately as soon as I begin to see and listen at the same time?*

T: *Exactly. How much time does it take to listen and feel the weight of the body and see the visual field at the same time? How much time is required?*

P: *Sure... none!*

T: *There are things that require time, but this is a brain function that does not require time.*

P: *Right, how much time do I need to see you? No time! I am already seeing you...*

T: *Exactly.*

P: *Is that what you mean?*

T: *Exactly, at this moment, if we are attempting Unitary Perception, and if we realize... life is happening... at every moment...*

P: *And then... I don't need to do anything else, no technique so that thought is not repeated, either that repetitive thought that bothers me or that desire that I have for the girl next door? Don't I have to do anything, no breathing technique or some empty chair technique? (laughter)*

RFG: *I believe that here we can see, after this relieving laughter, the criticisms of what happened. Do you want to start?*

Audience: *I thought it was good instruction and consideration of the direction of the idea that the patient could bring, and not to stop it but perhaps address it. There is a concern with the*

patient's direction, a question, then, let's say, he kind of embraces it and brings it here, to Unitary Perception. Something happens, I don't know if with everyone, in the definition of Unitary Perception, which sometimes we say "time" twice in the same sentence. For example, we will listen to all the sound at the same time as we continue to feel the weight of the body, we realize the whole visual field and we continue to hear all the sound at the same time. That happens, a redundancy in the statement...

RFG: Do you think it's not useful?

Audience: I think it's useful when... it's that sometimes you just say it without realizing you just said it.

RFG: Well, I actually say it as you say it but with the intention of repeating so that the patient does not forget that it is at the same time. That is what happened to me at the beginning: that it was not at the same time.

Audience: Is that what you mean?

Audience: To say again...

RFG: Without realizing it.

Audience: Aha, if we are giving the instruction of what it is, the simpler it is, the faster and better it can be understood...

RFG: But, there, for example in my case, you already know me, I am very repetitive because I have realized or I think I have realized that it is necessary to repeat, because this, which is so simple, doesn't enter people's mind if it is not repeated... at the end of a five-hour workshop, a five-hour seminar, a person approaches me and says: "And how is Unitary Perception done?" which is what I had been explaining in the last five hours...

Audience: Yes, what I say is coherence in the sentence. I finish a sentence and I can repeat it again, but having finished the first sentence properly. Open it, close it...

RFG: Yes, of course, what you are saying is not to leave sentences unfinished...

Audience: Yes, that. It seems to me that once I noticed that with “listening.” And as for the rest, very good... I don’t know if I missed something... ah, I think you also exchanged the word “see” for “perceive.” It is listening, feeling the weight and perceiving the visual field, or seeing the visual field. Maybe what is to be done can bring [the patient] closer to the fact: see with the eye or perceive all the visual field. Because, how did you say, “listen to all the sound at the same time, feel the weight of the body” and I think you replaced perceive with see, then, perceiving the visual field, yes, we already bring it to the eye. But to *perceive*... the observation of the eye is no longer included.

Student: I mean, like I left the phrase halfway.

RFG: Or rather, I think what you are saying, is that you have to emphasize the word see, with respect to the visual field, instead of perceive... the word see, when it refers to the visual field, is less vague than the word perceive You said that, right?

Audience: Yes.

Student: It’s seeing... yes, yes.

RFG: Yes, see, with the eye. Many people... for example the word visualize is used a lot in gestalt and in other techniques, and many patients tell me: “yes, yes, I am visualizing...” “No, no, please, I did not tell you to visualize,” –because “visualize” means imagine. To visualize actually means to imagine. “Then, please, do not visualize. See! Are you seeing me, or are you visualizing me?” Because if you’re seeing me, it means you’re not imagining anything about me, not necessarily, right? That is, one thing is to see, another thing is to visualize –for

example–, and another to perceive... We should be concrete and clear with the words we are using. Well, any other criticism?

Audience: Yes, well, very good, Javi. Because in addition, you have felt the patient, you have been accompanying him... but I insist a little on the three precincts...

Audience: In education...

Audience: In educating, in teaching about the three precincts... that repetitive thoughts are something of C...

RFG: A little education. The laws of C are cyclical repetition, etc...

Audience: Yes, at the beginning, so that you understand what is being done, because sometimes it takes time to understand and during that time it takes, they are no longer attempting Unitary Perception, so if the understanding comes from the beginning, then the attempt can be more intense.

RFG: Yes, I believe the same. That's why I say: read the [Written] Work. Why? I do not say it to pester people but because I think that's the way it is. When you know the subject well, it will be easier... the subject of Unitary Perception... when you have read it, it will be easier to do that Unitary Perception.

Audience: I just have a question, now, regarding the words see, visualize and perceive. If we are seeing that the patient is with his eyes closed, we can't tell him to see... or can we?

RFG: Well, *“see that darkness with your eyes closed... but do not forget that in that darkness of the closed eyes there is also the visual field.”* *“Do not focus on those little things that move... no, but in the totality of what you see with your eyes closed.”*

Audience: Ah... with closed eyes, isn't it then to perceive?

RFG: It's seeing with the eyes closed.

Audience: Seeing with your eyes closed... okay.

RFG: Seeing the darkness, because it is undoubtedly darkness. And in the darkness, little things appear... do not concentrate on them but on the whole visual field.

Audience: And probably what they say about educating at the beginning could also be to avoid the patient from suddenly dragging you and therapy itself becoming cyclical, right? To be repeating the problem every time... could it be?

RFG: Well, because if you educate, maybe you have to repeat... in my experience I feel that I have to repeat the same thing many times, to my regret because I realize that one has not been understood... and if the patient returns with something repetitive, persevering, it is because he has not understood... You have no choice but to hit him with the axe of repetition, which is a compassionate act. To repeat the three precincts and repeat them... *"Well, I remind you that there are three precincts in the brain... you haven't heard that anywhere, but... there are three precincts..."* and repeat! Repeat the educational part... if you want, giving some variety or other examples, so that they understand better, and so on. What I change are the examples... like... an example of the girl next door, another example of repetitive thinking, etc., etc.

Audience: I also think that it is convenient to educate the patient because this time he comes for the girl next door or for the recurring thought of washing his hands, but what Holokinetic Psychology wants is that for any problem that occurs or that comes, that he addresses it from Unitary Perception, I think that Javier missed that a bit and above all...

RFG: The educational part.

Audience: Yes, the educational part, and we really hope that later, maybe, he becomes an expert...

RFG: There are cities where there are people who started as patients and became professors.

Audience: What he's saying is very important, and it reminds me that in the consultation, one of the things I say to the patient is precisely this: *"You now come for a very particular problem, which is the one that you're telling me about. In Holokinetic Psychology and the therapy that we are going to start, how do we look at it?"* Then in Holokinetic Therapy we will help the patient to realize how to look at a problem, whatever it may be. Because we approach the very process from which all problems arise, in such a way...

RFG: That's not something you've heard before...

Audience: Aha. And I say: *"And you know what? Because what we want is that you never come back anymore because you alone are going to take this to your life forever to solve any problem that may arise. Why? Because in life we always have things, unexpected factors..."*

RFG: Yes, now let me clarify this, Cecilia... That is true; what we want is for the patient to never need us again, to be free, and happy, which I believe is the destiny that humanity has forgotten. And then, what I have written, and I still maintain it, is that you can make a contract of twelve sessions after which, you say to the patient: *"You now know what to do with your life, live it that way. Let Unitary Perception be not a little thing more, but your whole life. But within six months..."* –that is, what is called a *booster* session in some therapies, as it is done with vaccines, a booster, i.e., the English word for re-vaccination; in the same way, a booster session, which is like getting vaccinated again. *"In six months we will see each other to review what happened to you in those six months, what difficulties you have had. That is, it is not that you leave forever, but that in six months we will see how you are doing."*

Audience: ...I tell them to come with a specific problem, because I also like from the beginning that the patient knows

what to expect. Yes, I also tell them about the sessions, but I tell them, we are going to start with six sessions. If you come for six sessions, then we will re-evaluate if we need six more, and we'll see along the way. You are going to give me the guide also of how we are going. And when we go well, we meet the [twelve] sessions, which has happened with some patients, then as we have a lot to offer here, in terms of dialogue meetings, seminars, I focus on that, not in the sense that they will come as a patient, but as a human being interested in further research, as a person.

RFG: But as part of the therapy it is also advisable, in my opinion, to tell them to come back in six months to see how they have done with Unitary Perception, if they have forgotten about it, with someone who of course reminds him within six months he has a session with you. Because before you leave you say: in six months, on such-and-such a day and hour we'll see each other again. What for? To see what happened in those six months.

I felt compelled to clarify this... not telling them not to come back, but to come back in six months to see what happened. *Booster* session, or reinforcement session.

Audience: Oh, just another thing I wanted to comment... with respect to when we are inviting the fact of Unitary Perception, also something that I think has been very effective in perceiving, when we are inviting Unitary Perception and we want to tell the patient to be aware of the visual field, I realized that when I say to the patient: "*your eyes are resting on a point, right?*" –for example. We realize that even if we look at a fixed point, there is a visual field with color and light, so the patient, as if realizing that it is true, had not realized that even though he is looking at my face while I speak... for example I say to them like this, "*you are seeing my face while I am explaining to you, but do you realize that although you see me, there is a visual field with light and color?*" And the patient finds out that he had never realized he could look at a point while seeing the field of vision. And that has helped a lot, also to realize the visual field. And if you close your eyes, I also tell

you, if we want to close our eyes or have our eyes open, in closed eyes there is also a field of vision, while in the darkness there are points of light...

RFG: Yes. I don't know if anyone else wants to comment...

Audience: Very good Javier. I was just seeing that Javier's first invitation... and he said "*listen to the sound,*" then the difference between saying "listen to the sound" and "listen to all the sound" came to mind.

RFG: It can be taken by the patient as a sound...like listening to music. Only one sound.

Audience: Yes, what sound? Then, when you say "hear all the sound"... you are not saying "all the sounds," but "all sound"... because by saying... all the perceptible sound...

Audience: That also reminds me that it is very important, and it also helps a lot when we tell the patient "not to name what is perceived, not to name"... that's like a click...

RFG: A liberation...

So... Javier was fine, very good. Thank you for your support and you will always be welcome as a psychologist.

Student: Thanks.

RFG: All you need is that little test, which I think you can easily pass. It is not a difficult test, neither the written nor the oral part.

I just wanted to comment on how interesting that exam is, taken in a Congress. It's different from the individual exam, because there are fifteen teachers there, and what I wanted to emphasize was that it's easy. I realized that there were no difficulties in the answers because the questions practically lead to the answers themselves.

Well, you wanted to go next. I think it would be convenient.

Student (T):*[In the role of holokinetic therapist] If you can explain to me, why do you come here to the office?*

RFG (P):*[In the role of patient] Well, my son says that my wife is poisoning his food, and anguish is killing me. As I suffer from high blood pressure I was recommended to see a therapist. My son's psychiatrist, who diagnosed him with schizophrenia, recommended that I see a therapist because I am very distressed, not only because of the diagnosis they gave my son, even though I am happy that they have diagnosed him, but mainly because at home my son says my wife wants to poison him with food. And that anguishes me, and I want to see if it is possible to diminish this anguish.*

T: *Of course, that's a massive stress, but the advantage that the family has is that your child is already in treatment, so now we are going to start with Holokinetic Psychotherapy, which is Unitary Perception. And from Unitary Perception we will see that anguish, which is the reason why you come here to the office. If you allow me, let's start Psychotherapy. I am going to ask you, please, to be comfortable before starting... we are going to start Psychotherapy, and I hope that although it seems very simple, let's go together to the fact of Unitary Perception which is: to feel the weight of the body on the chair... at the same time you feel the weight on your shoulders... we see the entire field of vision, 180°, if you prefer to have your eyes closed it's fine, but we see the visual field at the same time we feel the weight of the body...*

P: *I feel kind of heavier.*

T: *Heavier... but... is the anguish there?*

P: *No.*

T: *OK... we continue... feeling the weight of the body, seeing the entire field of vision and listening to all the sound that*

reaches your brain... my voice without naming my name... well, tell me, how do you feel?

P: *Quiet, very calm.*

T: *Is the anguish gone?*

P: *Yes, it is as if it didn't exist at this moment, although I am sure that I will get home and I will feel anguished again...*

T: *That's right, because, well, you have a problem, but we have seen that at this moment the anguish is gone and I think that if you go to your house you will also see there because you have your eyes. So I'm going to invite you to take this therapeutic act that we do here in the office home, when you drive, when you interact with your son, with your wife... it's not that difficult...*

P: *No, not really.*

T: *I'm glad it seems so easy to you because if the ear and the visual field are always with us, then I invite you to realize... – and that any problem is addressed or any event in your life.*

P: *Yes, for example, when my son says to my wife: "I'm not going to eat this, because it's poisoned by you," do you think I have to face the situation like I do, scolding him, or I just have to be silent, listening? What do you recommend?*

T: *Yes, precisely, what we have done here... we will continue to feel the weight of the body, seeing the entire visual field... before this event, of your son believing that his mother is poisoning his food, or anything else, you're already aware that your son is in treatment, and eventually in the future, if you like, your wife can come...*

P: *Yes, she is doing worse than me, because my son's aggression is more towards her. But I am also very distressed to see how she feels... even though my son has stopped hearing*

voices, but he continues with the idea that she poisons his food...

T: *Surely there is also anguish in your wife, but she can also feel peace, like you in this moment, when the anguish has disappeared. We can tell her to come and together you'll invite each other at the same time, so you take this psychotherapy home. Not with your son...*

P: *And that's what I was about to say, will this work for my son?*

T: *No, with your son, no. Your son already has a specialist here who sees him.*

P: *Don't you think it would be good for him to also hear all the sound?*

T: *No, it would not be good for him...*

P: *Why do you think it would not be good? He is very young; he is 18 years old...*

T: *Unfortunately, your son has a diagnosis of schizophrenia, and he is not suitable for [Holokinetic] Psychotherapy. Far from helping him, it could scare him a little. Let the psychiatrist take care of him, your son, and I can gladly attend to you and your wife.*

RFG: *We can start with... the graduate and professor... Yolanda.*

Audience: *Degree in Biology...*

RFG: *Yes. Bachelor in Biology, professor Yolanda.*

Audience: *Well, I have an observation, apart from that you did very well. I feel that Rubén was also giving you several times the cue for... what you said... to educate. I did not really see the*

example of where you were attempting to educate him about the three precincts... that's one of the observations I have.

Student: Well, I really saw that the patient was not too stubborn (laughter). Well, that he was not so resistant.

RFG: Ah.

Audience: I saw him calm... but if he had said... *“But this is recurring”*...

Audience: Well, I felt that... he was giving you a cue for that, when he tells you, two or three times, that when he gets home he will have this again. Then, probably there you could have taken advantage to emphasize what the three precincts are, and mainly what Precinct C is and why his problem can be repetitive and cyclical.

RFG: Yes, important comment. You, don't you want to contribute?

Audience: Well, the diagnosis was missing... ruling out schizophrenia in the father. I think that although Rubén is the specialist...

RFG: No, of course. Dad of a schizophrenic.

Audience: He's the dad of schizophrenic, we must rule out schizophrenia. Just because the psychiatrist is very good, that doesn't mean we should be hopeful that the diagnosis in him has already been ruled out.

RFG: Very good.

Student: I assumed it had already been ruled out.

Audience: Yes, but anyway, I believe that in psychotherapy we have the obligation to discard...

RFG: Every time!

RFG: It's very good that we see this, as a class, rather than as a criticism, that we have to be relentless with the diagnosis, and the least diagnosed diagnosis –pardon the redundancy- is that of schizophrenia, because they do not ask basic questions, which are: do you hear voices? Have you ever felt that people are against you? and so on, and they don't ask about those things... especially "do you hear voices?" They don't ask those things, or how they sleep, since sleep may also be affected, etc.

Audience: Yes, I remember when I saw schizophrenia in the university, a psychiatrist told us about a case in which a wife and husband arrive at the emergency room, and she was saying that her husband was behaving like a child. Then, in the session, the husband was completely normal, and before saying goodbye he says to the doctor: "Doctor, do you think clowns will come to my party?" So that's where she realized he was a potentially schizophrenic patient.

RFG: And he behaved impeccably.

Audience: And he behaved impeccably!

RFG: Well, it's a wonderful example because it precisely points out the need to delve into the diagnosis of schizophrenia in any case that comes, which includes depression, bipolarity, and so on.

Audience: Everything you did is fine, just be a little clearer, concise and concrete, without repeating too much in the indications, if it is clearer to say something... Women tend to use more words, right?

RFG: But that form was good for me to take the fact seriously.

Audience: Yes, I think the instructions were very good. I think you can be a little more concise in the indication.

RFG: Do you think so? Could you give an example?

Audience: Yes, you said to her: “Well, I feel relaxed...” I do not remember what she said... and what came to my mind is: do you realize that feeling the weight [of the body] is not the same as thinking about feeling the weight? For example.

Audience: I liked it a lot. I really liked the pattern... that pattern for the flow of words and for the indications that she gave in the fact of Unitary Perception. I think she did not emphasize too much the fact of Unitary Perception, she made an indication only and then she addressed rather the things of the moment, his wife, of his house... and she did not take up again how to listen and the fact of Unitary Perception; she just made a single indication and then did not return to the fact. But her patterns and everything was very good, and very pertinent also in the verbal, there was no chatter, nor anything excessive...

RFG: Yes, I did not see excess.

Audience: No. Very good. Aha.

RFG: Yes... Javier?

Audience: I would like to tell you that... well, the importance of... well, she did, right? I mean the attempt of Unitary Perception. I mean, the importance in the Holokinetic Psychotherapy, that the movement that is happening in Unitary Perception, knowledge of what to say comes from there... and when it is necessary to say it also matters; I believe that you only discover that in the attempt of Unitary Perception, seeing...

RFG: Seeing, the paraverbal clues we said... if he is very restless, if he is very tense.

Audience: And also, the qualifiers that come from our mouth when we are with the patient, what I mean is that maybe there are times when it's better not say them in the sense of how the other person takes it...

RFG: Give an example of that.

Audience: Yes, when he said: “*Unfortunately your son is ...*”

Audience: The word is used to say: “*unfortunately so and so has this, then...*” Qualifiers can go unnoticed to us, but Precinct C absorbs them, because unconsciously...

RFG: Hypnotically.

Audience: Yes, hypnotically.

RFG: “It’s a disgrace.”

Audience: Yes, exactly.

And well, to comment that there are no rules in Holokinetic Therapy, of being able to say first is this and then is that. That is, we have to know that education is important in the patient, but I think there are going to be patients or people who are educated from the beginning and they are told about A, B and C, or maybe others in which this happens in the middle of the session, or others at the end of the session. So that’s what I think we have to be careful with, because it is not a preset, which is what Precinct C does, in the way of giving therapy, right? That we have to know that, but that intelligence itself, which occurs in Unitary Perception, is going to say when it has to be done, that’s what I wanted to say.

RFG: Yes, always following the paraverbal clues. Stillness, etc.

Audience: In that sense, I think, it seems important to me that before the therapy the patient is told about the precincts, how the META process works, for example. The patient usually had not realized that the thought involves an emotion and a visceral reaction at the same time, therefore the thought contents that are emerging, and especially when it is a problem, are the cause of the conflict, precisely because it is a unitary process.

RFG: Would you have done something with this particular patient, with regard to delving deeper into the META process, regarding the anguish of the father?

Audience: Well what I would have done... I would have explained, of course, how to get out...

RFG: No, the patient said he was anguished because his son complained that he had been poisoned. Would you have done something in therapy with respect to META, of that father's anguish?

Audience: Do you say educational?

RFG: No, in the therapeutic act. "Your memory... how is that anguish, emotionally you call it anguish and in your memory, what is it? And, do you feel palpitations while you feel anguished, etc.?"

Audience: No, I approach or have approached it in this way: I said, for example, *"have you noticed that sometimes you do not want to think about the problem, you do not want to think about your child having this problem? And that on top of not having a will over those thoughts, it seems that they reinforce themselves, and the thoughts that you want to escape from appear more frequently?"*

RFG: Even if he's watching television.

Audience: Even if you're watching television, and precisely, I say: *"And we look for a lot of escapes, we go to the movies, we go to the television, or we talk on the phone," and I give him examples... "And even if you were escaping all day, you get to your bed," I say, and "what happens then? There comes the constant and incessant stream of thought from which you escaped all day, but you did not notice that throughout the day you lost energy, because the thought is there, recalcitrant, in spite of you, right? That is, we believe that we have a will over thought, but it turns out that we do not have it as much as we think."* I say something like that... then the patient sometimes

even laughs, because he realizes that it is true, he can't stop seeing it. And in that sense I make them see the META process, to make them notice, and already in therapy, obviously, how to see the anguish, which is what we are talking about. But I think education in Holokinetic Psychotherapy is important, that the patient is aware even of the META process, which he does not even know how it works. And also the belief that we have will [control] over thought, which is also a false thing.

RFG: Yes. In a role reversal, in Chile, in Santiago, a woman told me: *“Are you doing Christian education, in therapy?”* She asked me. *“Are you doing Christian education, in therapy?”* *“Why?”* She gave me a long answer... and it's something to wonder if it is true, but the important thing is that education exists of what A, B and C are.

Audience: Interestingly, without talking about anything religious, a patient I had also told me the same thing: *“ah, you tell me many things like what I think they say to me in church, when I went to church...”* I don't know which.

RFG: Yes, he happens to be an obsessive patient, right?

Audience: Well, yes, he is rather a regenerated addict...

RFG: Only Karina and Blanca are left.

Audience: Well, I thought it was very good, it had a good rhythm, you did it from the attempt itself, the others already talked about the details. Very good.

RFG: Good.

Audience: Just a question. What happens to the person who has bipolar depression? Once they have their treatment and they can go with the psychologist, once they have the treatment...

RFG: As long as this treatment proves to be effective in what aspect...? Do you remember what it is?

Audience: If energy and sleep stabilize.

RFG: Very good. Once sleep is stabilized, then Holokinetic Therapy can begin.

Audience: Okay, then once stabilized... since they are very... what is the correct word?

Audience: Fickle. Agitated.

Audience: Aha, fickle, or that they leave the medication at any time...

RFG: The therapist has the obligation to ask about the medication in such a case. That is, this man had no diagnosis, well, no problem, but if you know you're seeing someone with depression, the first question is: "*Are you taking your medication?*"

Audience: Because another thing is that they lie a lot...

RFG: It's also true.

Audience: Then how can one...

RFG: It's also true, but after you ask them if they're taking their medication, what would you ask them as a second question, Karina?

Audience: About the medication?

RFG: You ask a depressed person, whom you are seeing in therapy because he was already sleeping well, then the first question is: "*Are you still taking your medication?*" *Right?* "*As recommended... that is for life.*" And would you ask that depressed person a second question?

Audience: Well once the sleep is stabilized, how is the energy?

RFG: No, the second question is “*how are you sleeping?*” That is the second question: “*how are you sleeping?*” They are the two most important, “*are you taking your medicine?*” They can lie to you and say yes and no, but if you ask them, “How’s sleep?” and they are sincere, they will probably say “*bad*”... “*short*.”

Audience: Probably you can also see the tired, emaciated appearance of the person... who can say “*I’m sleeping well*,” but...

RFG: Of course! That is the clue. So, only Natzio is left.

Audience: Yes, I thought it was very good. And there is something to comment... that at one point he said: “*feel the weight under [on] your chair*,” then perhaps we should never forget that the attempt of Unitary Perception is mutual, that is, that every phrase encompasses the patient and the therapist... she missed that a few times.

Audience: You can’t feel the weight under the chair...

Audience: No, sure, on his chair... but that she did not say “*under*,” that’s what I said. (laughter)

RFG: Yes, what you are saying is...

Audience: Let every phrase that leads to the attempt of Unitary Perception include the therapist and the patient...

RFG: As, for example: “*we are feeling the weight*”.

Audience: Exactly.

Audience: Oh, I also think that in that pattern she said: “*feel the weight on your shoulders*”...

RFG: Oh, yes, she said it that way.

Audience: Is that correct or...?

RFG: Well, I took it as correct because, of course, one is already steeped in the fact, but... you, how would you criticize that phrase?

Audience: This is what I am now asking myself, if to feel the weight on one's shoulders...

RFG: Yes, feel the weight *of* one's shoulders or *on* one's shoulders.

Audience: But she said the weight *on* the shoulders, then... it's like saying the whole world is on top of us, or I don't know.

Audience: ...the weight on the head...

RFG: Well, actually, from the scientific point of view, there is a weight on the shoulders, and you know it is huge: that of the atmosphere. But I tend to say it differently, not on the shoulders but of the shoulders. "*Do you feel the weight of your shoulders?*"

Audience: It's like saying, "feel the weight of the whole body," right?

RFG: I remember that when she said it that way it did not bother me because I felt the weight of my shoulders.

Audience: Ah, okay, but then, is it appropriate to say that you feel the weight on your shoulders?

RFG: It did not bother me, but *of* your shoulders may be more appropriate... although scientifically there is weight on the shoulders.

Audience: Sure, yes, that's why I say.

RFG: Yes, but I use “*of the shoulders*”, because we are talking about perception, we are not talking about a mercurial abstraction of the atmosphere.

Audience: And for example, another thing is... when he tells you that he feels heavier. Isn't that also stress? And she did not mention any of that, at that time I “clicked,” when the patient says “*I feel heavier,*” and she continued with the therapy. Wouldn't that be a sign of stress, a reason to ask how sleep and energy are, etc., etc.?

RFG: Ah, sleep, energy, and also the complications of stress. If it is stress, what point of stress is he at, in the evolution of stress? Gastritis, arthritis, high blood pressure...

Audience: And can you continue with the therapy when there is stress?

RFG: Stress therapy... you know: rest and sleep.

Audience: But can Holokinetic Psychotherapy continue [if there is stress]?

RFG: Yes, with stress, it can. The point is that when you ask about sleep, which I ask in each session, there must be good sleep. If there has not been good sleep, the session can continue but, in my case, I know that if there is no good sleep, I know that in the case of the depressed I have to make a change in the medication, because sleep has to be good.

Audience: But for example, in this case that she is not a doctor, she can't say...

RFG: Oh, no, you have to refer them to the psychiatrist.

Audience: Okay, so, we also have to realize that, right? The signs of stress... like when attempting Unitary Perception, feeling heavy, tingling, etc., etc.

RFG: Sure. And also at what moment of stress they are. If they're at suicidal ideas, which is the last point, or at gastritis, which is the first.

Audience: So, is it appropriate to refer them to the psychiatrist, at that time too?

RFG: If it's due to stress, I don't know, because the indication in stress is very easy to say: sleep more, rest more. But in depression it is different because if there are problems with lack of sleep and energy, you already need medication. Go to the psychiatrist.

Well, I would like to say we have fifteen minutes left. I would like to not use time in a role reversal, but to see if there are any questions or comments regarding the four modules that we have seen, which have been diagnosis, which has been science, which has been... –science applied to Unitary Perception and related to Unitary Perception–, language, and finally exegesis. Is there any question or comment, either here or in Buenos Aires, about any of these modules?

Well, then we were saying that instead of making another role reversal, since we are almost at the end, it occurs to me that it might be better to ask questions or make comments on any of the four modules that we have given in this very special Course, because it is very different from the first. I think it's as good as the first but different, and if there are any questions or comments about the four modules we've seen, which are diagnosis, science, language and exegesis. If there were questions or comments on those four modules to finalize this final class... We have not seen the decoding of language, things like that, because that is already psychosocial.

Audience: What does the sacred have to do with the human?

RFG: Well, we saw the four words, *sakrito*, secret, sacred... that is, if an executive of a corporation has a secretary, it is alluding to something secret and sacred, in the simple fact of having a secretary. The word secret means sacred. And I

believe that there is nothing, as JK clearly says, that everything is sacred or nothing is sacred, and that there is nothing that is not sacred in the human being, even that fact, which is sometimes annoying, of having to interrupt a task to go to the bathroom, even that is sacred, because if that fails, health is also in danger, very much in danger. So there is nothing that is not sacred, not even the eschatological, but the eschatological... look how interesting the word eschatological is. Eschatological means excrement, from the point of view of human functions, but eschatological also means the deep study of exegesis. So there is an eschatological exegesis that goes even more deeply than we have gone, in every event, for example, of sacred history. For example, with the study of the resurrection, there is an eschatological exegesis of the subject. And yes, I believe that everything is sacred, our whole life, and our relationships, all sacred. And in the organized churches are the sacraments, which is the institutionalization of sacred things in our lives. Originally they were nothing but baptism and the Eucharist, the only two sacraments, and then all the others were added. But from the beginning they began to institutionalize events of human life that were considered particularly sacred, without the other events of life being not sacred. Either everything is sacred or nothing is.

Audience: You started saying that if there were questions already to finish -of the four modules- and I started to go through the notebook here, of some notes that I made while he was asking you the question [of the sacred and human], and in red (which I think it's the only red thing I have here) I had highlighted the phrase that says: the greatest enemy of sanctity is the me, Cecilia. I found the coincidence interesting...

RFG: Yes, that was said by Patanjali long before Jesus, that the worst enemy is the self. It is written in Brahmanism, from almost the beginning of Brahmanism. The worst enemy is the "I."

Audience: I don't know if in the question it was implicit to ask if the "I" is sacred.

RFG: I think it is, because it is something that gives continuity to memory in a particular way...

Audience: The functional self?

RFG: Sure! But there is a self that is very annoying, which can make our life a misery, as it does, with what I call non-functional self, which is the self that instead of caring for excellence in the exercise of a function, cares about being the best doctor, not a doctor who fulfills his function in an excellent way, but he wants to be the best doctor in Mexicali, or wants to be the richest doctor in Mexicali, in that case, status overcomes function and both are, shall we say, particularities of the self. But the self is sacred because it gives continuity to memory, and memory not only allows us to get home, memory helps us to say: "Oh, dear, I realize that I am not in Unitary Perception." It is tremendously important, as part of the functional self, to realize that one is not in Unitary Perception, and that, JK said, is the beginning of Unitary Perception, it is enough for you to realize that you are not in it to start being in it. And is memory sacred? Without a doubt it is. And, is imagination sacred? Yes it is. In spite of the fact that we live an imaginary life, because the imaginary over the true has been overvalued, imagination has a tremendous importance, for example, as we sometimes speak with Cecilia, in the management of time. If we have to arrive here at 9 in the morning, as we arrived today, it means that yesterday we went to bed early with Cecilia. I think it was 9:30, something like that, when we went to sleep, why? Because we had to get up very early today, at least in our wake up patterns, we got up, I think at 6 o'clock. I got up at 6 o'clock in the morning, I generally wake up a little later, although if I'm very busy and have a lot of work I get up at five, but in general I wake up at half past six, seven, and today I woke up at six. Why? Because knowing that by going to bed early last night we are preparing the punctual arrival of today is part of memory and imagination. And in that sense, imagination and memory are sacred too.

What we are saying about imaginary life is that it has replaced real, non-imaginary life. And that is the tragedy! That our relationships are imaginary is tragic. If they are not true, it is tragic. And one day JK referred to the tragedy of imaginary relationships saying that the worst thing that can happen in a relationship is that the person you love lies to you, because it seems that the world disappears for you and that the sun gets duller. When the person you love lies to you, ooh, the sun is over. And it is extremely traumatic, extremely morbid, for the person who realizes the lie in the relationship; it is a wound, a blow. Trauma, as it is called in psychology. So, is the relationship sacred? Yes, and especially the non-imaginary relationship, the true relationship. Because there is also a tendency for the relationship to be imaginary, and that is tragic. That is often pointed out by JK, the relationship, friendship, marriage, has become imaginary, it has become imaginary because it is more virtual than real. Or virtual, the space between my hands together is virtual; I have to separate the hands for it to be a real space. Here there is a real space, but this space between my hands together is virtual. And relationships have become virtual, that is, imaginary, they do not have space, they do not occur in space but they occur only in memory, which is something virtual in the human being, something that does not occupy a space. Yes. What is the relationship between the human and the sacred? Possibly we have departed from the sacred as humans, but I believe it is necessary to return to understand that either everything is sacred or nothing is.

Audience: There comes another phrase that I am reading here from Lao Tse, which you also mentioned... I say that while you are saying that, I am reading here a note, I did not write Lao Tse, but I think it's from Lao Tse, it says (October 10): "misfortune is the essence of human life; to make misfortune ours is freedom from it."

RFG: Well, we can read it. It's chapter 13... or paragraph 13: "Accept (says Lao Tse) accept misfortune voluntarily. Accept misfortune as the human condition. But what does it mean to accept misfortune voluntarily? It means accepting to be

unimportant. Do not worry about gain or loss. And that is called accepting misfortune voluntarily. But what does it mean to accept misfortune as the human condition? Misfortune comes because we have a body, and without a body, how can misfortune exist? Surrender humbly and then you can be trusted to take care of all things. Love the world as yourself, and then you can truly take care of everything.” Very beautiful. But also (as in Christianity), Lao Tse calls the human condition “misfortune.” And in Christianity, the valley of tears. In that there is common ground, and in Buddha too.

In the 4 noble truths of the Buddha, the first is: to live like that is to suffer. The second great truth (of the four): to want to live like that is to suffer, and the third noble truth is: not wanting to live like that is to suffer. And the fourth truth, for me, is Unitary Perception: that the exit is not going out. The exit of suffering is Unitary Perception. Being in that complete incarnation that is the symbol, of the Tao.

Audience: The ideogram.

RFG: ...the ideogram of the Tao, complete incarnation represented in the ideogram of the Tao, and on the cross, and in almost all the sacred symbols. That the complete incarnation... is Unitary Perception, and it is the exit of suffering. JK says it, JesuKristos insinuates it many times, and I believe that, well translated, it is the fourth noble truth of the Buddha. It is translated in 35 ways in the English language, that’s why one never knows what the fourth noble truth of the Buddha is, because it is badly translated. But if we take the fourth noble truth of the Buddha as Unitary Perception, ah, it becomes clear to us, that to live like that is to suffer, that to want to live like that is to suffer, to want to continue living as we live is to suffer, and not to want to live like that is to suffer, then, alright, Unitary Perception! Not doing anything else but looking at what is happening, what we are, and that seeing is producing a blessed change, which ultimately brings contentment for nothing, from the first instance it brings joy for nothing. I don’t know if you have any other questions or comments before finishing.

Audience: In Argentina?

RFG: No comment or question in Argentina?

Audience: No, thanks.

RFG: Well, here, too? So well, we finished the second Sunday Presential Course, on November 7, 2010.

Audience:*[From Buenos Aires]* Sorry, one last question here came up. Here goes...

Audience: Rubén, speaking with a cousin of mine about Unitary Perception, he asked me: “how do you see the fact of one’s relationship as humanity with the cosmos,” do you understand? He started talking about the angels or the presences and went beyond. I say, well, “beyond?” I never questioned it further, because I do not care much about it either, but when he asked me that, the subject came up, I remembered what you had said that when you open consciousness, sometimes you see ghosts or angels but, beyond that? I never felt curious about that, I don’t know if you want to talk about it or not but he asked me, and I don’t know what to answer...

RFG: Well, and the answer I would have given is this: why do we have to talk about presences and entities and angels, if before that we have to become aware, for example, of a good night like it was last night, or as surely it’s going to be tonight, that there is a park 20 meters from our house? Well, we already said with Cecilia, “Let’s go to the park.” And that is going to be our contact with the cosmos, going to the patio, caressing the trees and petting the dogs, it is a contact with the cosmos while we look at the stars, if the moon is full, it becomes magisterial, if the Moon is next to Jupiter it becomes very beautiful... and in the park everything is beautiful, and it is the contact with the cosmos, the sky is even better, and the night sky is something... well, sacred... as we said that everything is sacred or nothing is, but it is also beautiful, to look at it! To look at the cosmos, and the peace that comes from looking at

the stars. We have lost that contact with the cosmos, because we are watching television or fighting with the spouse or on the computer or talking on the phone with someone and we forget to look at the sky, the minimum contact with the cosmos. And then we imagine, that's why I say, I return to the same thing, that we fall into the imaginary life of the angels and the archangels when we do not even have contact with the stars and with the full moon. I mean, what cosmos are they talking to me about? Are they talking about the cosmos of the archangels or the cosmos of Jupiter, which I have in sight? We have to start with what we have in sight, perceptible, and it is very beautiful to look at the sky again, maybe we forget. Start there, I would say to that friend.

Audience: It reminds me of the question that Thomas asked Jesus: how are we going to finish?

RFG: Of course! Peter asks Jesus that question. Jesus answers: "Do you even know how to start yet?" Start here, incarnate completely here, perceiving everything in Unitary Perception, including the sky, which is the contact with the cosmos, the night sky. The diurnal sky, as long as we are not looking at the sun, is also beautiful, not only because the birds appear, or because there is an extraordinarily beautiful cloud, but the night sky can be even more beautiful perhaps because one feels at peace looking at the stars. And we no longer look at the stars, very few people look at the stars, and maybe the imaginary life gets there interpreting cosmos as the opposite of what it is, because in reality the place of the angels and the archangels, with whom we seem to have broken all contact, is *Ouranon*, not *Kosmon*, and we do not see the stars. I believe that if we break contact with the stars and the Moon, not even looking at them, what hope can we have to meet an archangel? I don't know if I answered you, Georgina.

Audience: [From Buenos Aires] Yes, she says you did, thank you very much.

RFG: And, well, with this I think we can end the Sunday Presential Course, which is the second, which has been

particularly different and very beautiful. Finally, thanks to everyone who participated, for the support, and because I believe that together we have confirmed some things and learned others. And farewell!

Let's keep in touch. Farewell!

INDEX

(DSM) AND THE DIAGNOSIS IN 5
AXES, **20**

A

A NEW WAY OF DOING SCIENCE, **360**

ABOUT PALINGENESIA, **787, 791**

ABOUT SOME KRISTIAN MARTYRS,
599

ABOUT TAOISM AND BUDDHISM,
898, 910

ABOUT THE DIAGNOSTIC AND
STATISTICAL MANUAL, **20**

ABOUT THE RESURRECTION BODY,
780

ABOUT THE SEMANTICS OF WORDS,
392

ABOUT THE DHAMMAPADA (WRITING
ATTRIBUTED TO BUDDHA), **653**

ABOUT THE TAO TE KING, **653**

ABSTRACT THINKING, CHILDREN
AND, **388**

ACTION VS. ACTIVITY, **585**

ANSWERS TO FREQUENTLY ASKED
QUESTIONS IN INTRODUCTORY
SEMINARS, **734**

APPEARANCE AND CLOTHING, **419**

ARCHANGEL MICHAEL - ANGELS
(EXEGETICAL INTERPRETATIONS),
775, 892

ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT
(PERSONAL DETAILS AND
PRESENTED PROBLEM), **411**

ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT
(QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS),
696

ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT, GLOBAL
QUESTIONS, **701**

ASSESSMENT OF SENSORIUM, **423**

ASPECTS OF REALITY EXPLAINED WITH
THE METER, **450**

AVOIDING FALSE CORRELATIONS, **913**

B

BASIC NOTIONS OF THE TAO TE
KING, **898**

BEING A MIRROR OF EACH OTHER,
589

BEING A SON OF GOD (JOHN 1)
BORN OF THE AIR (JOHN 3), **836**

BENEFITS AND CONTINGENCIES OF
UNITARY PERCEPTION, **633**

BERNHEIM'S EXPERIENCE (THOUGHT IS
HYPNOSIS), **10**

BOHM AND THE QUANTUM THEORY,
352, 356

C

CHILDREN AND ABSTRACT THINKING,
388

CHRISTIAN EXEGESIS, INTRODUCTION
TO, **758**

CHRISTIANITY WITHIN CHRISTIANITY,
SOME VIEWS OF, **861**

CHRISTIANITY, (SUBSTANTIAL
DIFFERENCES) AND MANICHAISM,
846

- CHRISTIANITY, GROUPS AND JEWISH NATIONS AT THE BEGINNING OF, **827**
- CHRISTIANITY, THE DISSEMINATION OF GREEK AS THE LANGUAGE OF, **831**
- CHRISTIANITY, THE INFLUENCE OF PLATO IN, **244**
- CLARIFICATIONS ABOUT LANGUAGE, **297**
- CLARIFICATIONS AND COMMENTS OF THE READING: *EDUCATION AND VIOLENCE*, **548**
- CLARIFICATIONS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT: *DIALOGUE ON CONSCIOUSNESS*, **486**
- CLARIFYING THE HORIZONTAL CONFLICT, **642**
- CLARIFYING THE MEANING OF FREE WILL, **167, 485, 501**
- CLASS 1, TOPICS, **5**
- CLASS 2, TOPICS, **80**
- CLASS 3, TOPICS, **153**
- CLASS 4, TOPICS, **225**
- CLASS 5, TOPICS, **296**
- CLASS 6, TOPICS, **339**
- CLASS 7, TOPICS, **400**
- CLASS 8, TOPICS, **463**
- CLASS 9, TOPICS, **537**
- CLASS 10, TOPICS, **590**
- CLASS 11, THIRD ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT (QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS), **696**
- CLASS 11, TOPICS, **671**
- CLASS 12, TOPICS, **750**
- CLASS 13, TOPICS, **823**
- CLASS 14, COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS, **905**
- CLASS 14, TOPICS, **896**
- COHERENT LANGUAGE OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, THE, **434**
- COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS AND COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS, **216**
- COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS -CLASS 14, **906**
- COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT THE READINGS CLASS 12, **800**
- COMMENTS ON FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS IN SEMINARS, **739**
- COMMENTS ON METADEPRESSION, **91**
- COMMUNION CANNOT BE FORMULATED, **386**
- COMMUNION IN JOY AND SADNESS, **588**
- COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING OF TIME, **15**
- CONCEPTS OF KOSMON AND OURANON, **227**
- CONFIDENTIALITY, **25, 419**
- CONSCIOUS CONTACT WITH HOLOKINESIS, **459**
- CONSCIOUSNESS, **228**
- CONSCIOUSNESS, CLARIFICATIONS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT READING ON, **486**
- CONSCIOUSNESS, READING ABOUT, **476**
- CONSCIOUSNESS, (KRISTIC, ADAMIC AND HUMAN) **72, 837**
- CONTROVERSIAL WORDS IN EXEGESIS, **656**
- CREATION IS HAPPENING IN ALL THE UNIVERSE, **265**

D

- DHAMMAPADA (WRITING ATTRIBUTED TO BUDDHA, **653**

DEFENSE OF DENIAL, THE, **323**
DEFINITION OF UNITARY PERCEPTION
FROM DIVERSE FIELDS OF STUDY,
13
DEFINITIONS OF MIND AND UNITARY
PERCEPTION, **300**
DEFINITIONS OF UNITARY
PERCEPTION, **275**
DEPRESSION AND METADEPRESSION,
142
DEVELOPMENT OF THE PATIENT, **416**
DIAGNOSES THAT DO NOT BENEFIT
FROM UNITARY PERCEPTION, **19,**
504
DIAGNOSIS, **108**
DIAGNOSIS IN 5 AXES, TREATMENT
AND PROGNOSIS, **425**
DIAGNOSIS IN PSYCHIATRY,
QUESTIONS ABOUT, **98**
DIAGNOSIS, REVIEW OF THE EXAM
ON, **468**
DIALOGUE AND QUESTIONS IN CLASS
3, **202**
DIALOGUE ON THE EXEGESIS OF THE
GOSPEL OF JOHN, **844**
DIALOGUE ON THE READING "THE
COHERENT LANGUAGE OF
HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY", **443**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEPRESSION
AND METADEPRESSION, **142**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EVOLUTION
AND MUTATION, **640**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FAITH AND
BELIEF, **868**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HUMAN MIND
AND "MIND, PERIOD", **139**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRECINCT B
AND A, **121**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SYNOPTIC
GOSPELS AND THE FOURTH
GOSPEL, **832**

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TEORIN, EIDEN
AND OPSETAI, **390**
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRAGMENTARY
PERCEPTION AND UNITARY
PERCEPTION, **286**
DIFFERENT IDEAS ON THE
MANIFESTATIONS OF JESUS, **856**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRECINCT C
AND B, **147**
DIFFICULTY WHEN TRANSPOSING
WORDS IN EXEGESIS, **784**
DO WE SEE THE PRESENT OR DO WE
REPRESENT IT?, **268**
DOCETISM AND EBIONISM, **829**
DOGMATIC PREMISES, **349**
DYADS AND TRIADS, **281**

E

EDUCATION AND VIOLENCE (FROM
THE BOOK: "COMPLETE
INCARNATION"), **545**
EDUCATION AND VIOLENCE,
CLARIFICATIONS AND COMMENTS
ON READING, **548**
EGO FUNCTIONS, **405**
EMERGENCE OF HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOLOGY, THE, **8,**
END OF THE CLASS 14 AND OF THE
COURSE, **965**
ENLIGHTENMENT AND SANCTITY,
198
ESIKIA, THE MOVEMENT OF, **234**
ESIKIA, THE SCHOOL OF, **178**
ESIKIA: STILLNESS AND SILENCE, **178**
EXAMPLES OF THE HYPNOSIS OF
THOUGHT, **42**
EXAMPLE OF AN EGO FUNCTIONS
CURVE, **406**
EXAMPLE OF A PATIENT'S INITIAL
ASSESSMENT, **410**

EXEGESIS OF THE PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD, NEW, **455**
EXEGESIS, CONTROVERSIAL WORDS IN, **656**
EXEGESIS, DIFFICULTY WHEN TRANSPOSING WORDS IN, **784**
EXEGESIS, THREE KINDS OF, **771**
EXEGETICAL REVIEW OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN, **825**
EXPLANATION OF THE M.E.T.A. PROCESS, **276**
EXPLICIT ORDER EXISTS STILL WITHOUT THE OBSERVER, THE, **349**

F

FAITH AND BELIEF, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN, **868**
FALSE CORRELATIONS, AVOIDING, **913**
FATE AND PRECINCTS B AND A, **609**
FEAR OF DEATH, **121**
FEEDBACK ON THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL, CLASS 14, **917**
FEEDBACK ON THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL, CLASS 8, **518**
FEEDBACK ON THE PRESENTIAL COURSE FROM STUDENTS, **556**
FEEDBACK ON THE SECOND PART OF THE FIRST ROLE REVERSAL, CLASS 8, **528**
FEEDBACK ON THE SECOND ROLE REVERSAL, CLASS 14, **940**
FEEDBACK ON THE THIRD ROLE REVERSAL, CLASS 14, **950**
FEEDBACK WITH REAL CASE EXAMPLES, **926**
FEUDALISM IN MANKIND, **255**

FINAL COMMENTS ON HOLONOMY AND HOLOKINESIS, **460**
FIRST ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT-CLASS 11 (CASE PRESENTATION), **677**
FIRST ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT, CLASS 11 (QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS), **678**
FIRST ROLE REVERSAL AND FEEDBACK -CLASS 9, **542**
FIRST ROLE REVERSAL, CLASS 14 (THERAPIST-PATIENT), **916**
FIRST ROLE REVERSAL, CLASS 8 (THERAPIST-PATIENT), **517**
FRAGMENTARY PERCEPTION, **28, 272**
FREE WILL, CLARIFYING THE MEANING OF, **167, 485, 501**
FREEDOM OF THE HUMAN CONDITION AND MISFORTUNE, **593**
FUNCTIONAL BRAIN PRECINCTS B AND A (A MATTER OF STUDY), **607**
FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, **7**
FUNDAMENTAL TOPICS, REVIEW OF **752**

G

GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT, **23**
GLOBAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS: THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PATIENT, **700**
GREEK AND JUDEO-KRISTIAN WORLD VIEWS OF FORTUNE AND DESTINY, **604**
GREEK AS THE LANGUAGE OF CHRISTIANITY, THE DISSEMINATION OF, **830**

GROUP MIND, A CONTINGENCY OF
UNITARY PERCEPTION, **598**

H

HAMLET, THE SUMMIT OF WORLD
LITERATURE, **197**

HISTORIC TRAGEDY OF THE WORD
MIND (516), **494**

HISTORICAL RECORDS OF LAO TSE,
JESUKRISTOS AND JIDDU
KRISHNAMURTI, **905**

HOLOGRAM (A PARADIGMATIC
INSTRUMENT), **29**

HOLOGRAM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
WITH HOLOKINESIS, THE, **371**

HOLOKINESIS, REVIEW OF THE EXAM
ON, **465**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, **156**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY
(SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION), **156**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY,
FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS, **7**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY,
REVIEWING CONCEPTS UNDER THE
LIGHT OF, **621**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, THE
DISSEMINATION OF, **259**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, WORDS
OF APPRECIATION FOR THE
WRITTEN WORK, **674**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY:
COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING OF
"TIME", **506**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY, **504**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY,
COMMENTS ABOUT THE SESSION,
531

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY, MAIN
FEATURES OF, **516**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY,
PROGNOSIS IN, **515**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY,
REVIEW OF BASIC NOTIONS OF,
538

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY,
REVIEWING IMPORTANT
CONCEPTS IN , **636**

HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY, THE
OBJECTIVE OF, **506**

HORIZONTAL CONFLICT, **642**

HORIZONTAL CONFLICT, KNOWN
TECHNIQUES AND
PSYCHOTHERAPIES, **505**

HOW YIN AND YANG ARE RELATED
TO ARCHETYPES, **912**

HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS, ADAMIC
CONSCIOUSNESS AND KRISTIC
CONSCIOUSNESS, **71**

HUMAN MIND AND "MIND, PERIOD",
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN, **139**

HUMAN POTENTIAL, IMAGINARY
LIMITS TO THE, **196**

HUMANITY AS AN ORGANISM, **867**
HYPNOSIS OF THOUGHT, THE, **246,**
346

HYPNOSIS, HUMAN PRONENESS TO,
166

HYPNOSIS, IS IT POSSIBLE TO GET
RID OF?, **12**

HYPNOSIS OF THOUGHT, EXAMPLES
OF, **42**

I

IF THE WORLD WERE A CITY WITH
100 INHABITANTS, **595**

IMAGINARY LIMITS TO THE HUMAN
POTENTIAL, **196**

IMPLICIT ORDER AND THE EXPLICIT ORDER ARE IN THE SAME PLACE, THE, **393**

IMPORTANCE OF THE COMPLETE AND REPEAT READING, THE, **676**

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD THE SACRED, **307**

INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT, GENERAL ASPECTS, **23**

INSTRUMENTS OF THOUGHT AND THEIR WAY OF EXPLAINING REALITY, **28**

INTELLIGENCE AND LOVE IN PRECINCT C AND IN PRECINCT B , **488**

INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIAN EXEGESIS, **758**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 1, **7**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 2, **81**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 3, **153**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 4, **227**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 5, **297**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 6, **341**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 7, **402**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 8, **465**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 9, **538**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 10, **592**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 11, **673**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 12, **752**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 13, **825**

INTRODUCTION TO CLASS 14, **898**

INTRODUCTION TO THE PATIENT'S MENTAL STATE, **418**

INTRODUCTION TO THE ASSESMENT OF THE PATIENT, **404**

INVITATION TO FRATERNAL, EXPLORATORY DIALOGUE, **492**

IS C INACTIVE WHILE B FUNCTIONS?, **54**

IS IT POSSIBLE TO GET RID OF HYPNOSIS?, **12**

IS MIND A FIFTH ASPECT OF THE EXPLICIT ORDER?, **457**

IS THEORY KNOWLEDGE?, **361**

J

JESUS' WORDS ON THE WAY OF THE CROSS, **876**

JEWISH GROUPS AND NATIONS DURING THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY, **827**

JK AND THE WORD MEDITATION, TALKING ABOUT, **149**

K

KNOWLEDGE AS ABSTRACTION OF UNIVERSAL FLUX , **369**

KOSMON AND OURANON, **227**

KOSMON AND OURANON ACCORDING TO JOHN ZEBEDEE, **829**

CHRISTIAN EXEGESIS, INTRODUCTION TO, **758**

KRISTIAN MARTYRS, ABOUT SOME, **599**

KRISTIC, ADAMIC AND HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS, **72, 837**

L

LANGUAGE IN FRAGMENTATION, THE ROLE OF, **368**

LANGUAGE, CLARIFICATIONS ON, **297**

LAO TSE, JESUKRISTOS AND JIDDU KRISHNAMURTI, HISTORICAL RECORDS OF, **905**

LAWS OF PRECINCT C , **230, 252**

LET'S TALK ABOUT TREATMENT, **97**

LOGOS AND LOGIC, **657**

LOVE FOR THE CREATION AND FOR
THE CREATED, **303**

M

M.E.T.A. PROCESS - DOES SHE
COOPERATE WITH THE
PSYCHIATRIST?, **422**

M.E.T.A. PROCESS, **128, 136, 276**

MAIN FEATURES OF HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOTHERAPY, **516**

MANICHAISM AND CHRISTIANITY
(SUBSTANTIAL DIFFERENCES), **846**

MEDICAL HISTORY AND HISTORY OF
MENTAL DISORDERS, **416**

MEDITATION, TALKING ABOUT JK
AND THE WORD, **149**

MEMORY, THE FOUR TYPES OF, **250**

MENTAL STATE OF THE PATIENT,
INTRODUCTION TO THE, **418**

METABOLIC SYNDROME, **83, 151**

METADEPRESSION, **87**

METADEPRESSION, COMMENTS ON
91

METADEPRESSION AND DEPRESSION,
318

MIDRASH (JEWISH TRADITION) IN THE
SYNOPTIC GOSPELS, **883**

MIND AND UNITARY PERCEPTION,
DEFINITIONS OF, **300**

MIND, HISTORIC TRAGEDY OF THE
WORD, **494**

MIND, THE NEW DEFINITION OF, **242**

MOVEMENT AND DISPLACEMENT, **357**

N

NEW EXEGESIS FOR THE PARABLE OF
THE VINEYARD WORKERS, **455**

O

OBJECTIVE OF HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOTHERAPY, THE, **17, 506**

OLD PARADIGM IN PSYCHOLOGY,
SOME CONCEPTS OF THE, **512**

OPEN QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
ABOUT THE COURSE CLASSES,
966

ON THE DHAMMAPADA (WRITING
ATTRIBUTED TO BUDDHA, **653**

"OPEN THE WINDOW TO LET THE
WIND IN", **240**

OTHER WORDS THAT WERE REMOVED
FROM THE DSM, **145**

OUR INNER VIOLENCE, **300**

P

PALINGENESIA, ABOUT, **791**

PARADIGM SHIFT IN SCIENCE,
PRECEDENTS OF THE, **7**

PARAGRAPH 81 OF TAO TE KING,
913

PARAPHILIAS, **110, 145**

PERSONAL DETAILS AND PRESENTED
PROBLEM (IN THE PATIENT'S
ASSESSMENT), **411**

PERSONAL HISTORY AND FAMILY
HISTORY, **414**

PHILOSOPHY AND METAPHYSICS, THE
INFLUENCE OF, **325**

PHYLOGENETIC IMBALANCE IN THE
NEWBORN, **189**

PRAYER, **207**

PRECEDENTS OF THE PARADIGM
SHIFT IN SCIENCE, **7**

PRECINCT A AND ENLIGHTENMENT,
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN, **236**

PRECINCT B AND A, DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ,**121**
PRECINCT B IS NOT CYCLICAL, **596**
PRECINCT B, THE PEACEFUL SILENCE OF, **232**
PRECINCT C AND PRECINCT B, INTELLIGENCE AND LOVE IN , **488**
PRECINCT C, LAWS OF, **230, 252**
PRECINCTS B AND A, DESTINY AND, **609**
PRESENTATION OF A DIALOGUE MEETING, **475**
PRESENTATION OF A STUDENT: ABOUT TAO TE KING, **903**
PRESENTATION: OBJECTIVES RELATED TO HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, **725**
PRESENTATION: SLEEP AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH UNITARY PERCEPTION, **728**
PRESENTATION: STRESS AND UNITARY PERCEPTION , **745**
PRESENTATION: TIME AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PREVIOUS PSYCHOLOGIES, **717**
PRESENTIAL COURSE, FEEDBACK OF STUDENTS ON THE, **556**
PROGNOSIS IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY, **515**
PROLOGUE, **3**
PSYCHOSOMATIC MEDICINE, **124**

Q

QUANTUM PARADOX AND THE PARADOX OF MOVEMENT, THE, **353**
QUESTIONS ABOUT DIAGNOSIS IN PSYCHIATRY, **98**

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON "EPISTEMOLOGY OF LANGUAGE", **775**
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 5 AND 6 OF THE BOOK: HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY (THE ONLY SCIENTIFIC PARADIGM IN PSYCHOLOGY), **344**
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON FOURTH TOPIC PRESENTATION: "STRESS AND UNITARY PERCEPTION", **747**
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE FIRST TOPIC PRESENTATION:"TIME AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH PREVIOUS PSYCHOLOGIES, **719**
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE THIRD TOPIC PRESENTATION, **732**
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS, CLASS 1, **31**
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS, CLASS 3, FINAL, **220**
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS, CLASS 5, **309, 329**
QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS, CLASS 7, **428**
QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS, CLASS 8, **513, 534**
QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS, CLASS 2, **134**
QUESTIONS FROM STUDENTS, CLASS 3,
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS IN GENERAL ON THE TOPICS OF THE CLASS, **961**

R

READING AND CLARIFICATIONS OF
TAO TE KING PARAGRAPHS, **898**

READING AND COMMENTS: PSALM
82, **833**

READING THE BOOK "QUESTIONS
FROM STUDENTS TO RFG", **263**

READING, HAVING DIALOGUE IN
UNITARY PERCEPTION AND
ATTEMPTING IT CONSTANTLY,
634

READING: "DESIRE", **788**

READING: "DIALOGUE WITH AN
INTELLIGENT SUICIDAL PERSON",
792

READING: "EPISTEMOLOGY OF
LANGUAGE" (THE PASSION FOR
SILENCE), **772**

READING: "LAZARUS" (JESUS OF THE
DESERT) (789), **763**

READING: DIALOGUE ON
CONSCIOUSNESS, **476**

READING: EDUCATION AND VIOLENCE
(BOOK: "COMPLETE
INCARNATION"), **545**

READING: THE COHERENT LANGUAGE
OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY,
434

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE
RESURRECTION BODY, **887**

REDEEMING ONESELF FROM
HYPNOSIS, **260**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRECINCT A
AND ENLIGHTENMENT, **236**

REPETITIVE THOUGHT AND ITS END IN
UNITARY PERCEPTION, **59**

REVIEW OF BASIC NOTIONS OF
HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY,
538

REVIEW OF FUNDAMENTAL TOPICS,
752

REVIEW OF THE EXAM ON PREVIOUS
SUBJECTS AND DIAGNOSIS, **341,**
468

REVIEW OF THE EXAM ON
HOLOKINESIS, **465**

REVIEW OF THE EXAM ON PREVIOUS
SUBJECTS. (PSYCHODIAGNOSIS,
SLEEP, THOUGHT AS HYPNOSIS,
STRESS, ETC.), **341**

REVIEW QUESTIONS IN CLASS 5, **309**

REVIEW: THE M.E.T.A. PROCESS, **128,**
136, 276

REVIEWING IMPORTANT CONCEPTS IN
HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY,
636

REVISION OF CONCEPTS UNDER THE
LIGHT OF HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOLOGY , **621**

ROBERT STOLLER AND PARAFILIAS,
109, 145

S

SANCTITY AND ENLIGHTENMENT,
198

SANCTITY AND ENLIGHTENMENT ,
THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN, **240**

SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION IN
HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, **158**

SECOND ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT,
CLASS 11 (QUESTIONS AND
COMMENTS), **686**

SECOND ROLE REVERSAL (THERAPIST-
PATIENT), CLASS 14, **936**

SECOND PART OF THE FIRST ROLE
REVERSAL (THERAPIST-PATIENT),
CLASS 8, **526**

SECOND PART OF THE FIRST ROLE
REVERSAL (THERAPIST-PATIENT),
CLASS 14, **920**
SECOND ROLE REVERSAL AND
FEEDBACK, CLASS 9, **557**
SEEING SADNESS IN UNITARY
PERCEPTION, **304**
SEMANTICS OF THE WORDS, **392**
SESSION OF HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOTHERAPY: FINAL
COMMENTS, **531**
SIGNALS OR MIRACLES AND
RESURRECTION, THE, **838**
SILENCE AND QUESTIONS THAT ARISE
FROM THE UNKNOWN, **808**
SLEEP AND ITS VALUE, **159**
SLEEP AND STRESS, **154**
SOME CONCEPTS OF THE OLD
PARADIGM IN PSYCHOLOGY, **512**
SOME VIEWS OF CHRISTIANITY
WITHIN CHRISTIANITY, **861**
STILLNESS, THE IMPORTANCE OF,
218
STRESS, **21, 83, 122, 154**
STRESS AND ITS COMPLICATIONS IN
EVERYDAY LIFE, **268**
STUDENT QUESTIONS, **135, 167,**
180
SUMMARIZED REVIEW OF PREVIOUS
TOPICS, **200**
SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF
SCIENCE, **673**

T

TALKING ABOUT JK AND THE WORD
MEDITATION, **149**
TAO TE KING, BASIC NOTIONS OF,
898
TAO TE KING, PARAGRAPH 81, **908**

TAO TE KING, PRESENTATION BY A
STUDENT, **903**
TAOISM AND BUDDHISM, ABOUT,
910
TEOREIN, EIDEN AND OPSETAI, **390**
THE "IDENTITY OF THE SELF" AS PART
OF "THE STREAM", **802**
THE 4 ASPECTS OF REALITY
EXPLAINED WITH THE METER, **450**
THE ATOM AS DAVID BOHM DEFINED
IT, **453**
THE ANTHROPOS OF THE GREEKS,
889
THE AURA, **292**
THE BRAIN AND ITS THREE WAYS OF
FUNCTIONING, **9**
THE BUZZING, **287**
THE CONCEPTS OF KOSMON AND
OURANON, **227**
THE DEFENSE OF DENIAL, **324**
THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SANCTITY
AND ENLIGHTENMENT, **240**
THE DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS OF
UNITARY PERCEPTION, **275**
THE DISSEMINATION OF HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOLOGY, **259**
THE DISSEMINATION OF THE GREEK
AS A LANGUAGE OF
CHRISTIANITY, **830**
THE ESIKIA MOVEMENT, **234**
THE EXIT IS NOT INSTINCTIVE,
INTELLECTUAL, EMOTIONAL, OR
BEHAVIORAL, **811**
THE EXPLICIT ORDER EXISTS WITHOUT
THE OBSERVER, **349**
THE FOUNDATIONS OF FEAR, ANGER
AND SADNESS , **665**
THE FOUR TYPES OF MEMORY, **250**
THE FOUR ASPECTS OF REALITY
EXPLAINED WITH THE METER, **450**

- THE FUNCTIONAL SELF AND UNITARY PERCEPTION, **848**
- THE HOLOGRAM (A PARADIGMATIC INSTRUMENT), **29**
- THE HOLOGRAM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH HOLOKINESIS, **371**
- THE HOLOGRAPHIC MODEL AND MEMORY, **354**
- THE HUMAN PRONENESS TO HYPNOSIS, **166**
- THE HYPNOSIS OF THOUGHT, **246**
- THE "I" WANTS TO CONTINUE AND PERPETUATE ITSELF IN CONFLICT, **555**
- THE IMPLICATIONS OF GOING AGAINST THE CURRENT, **615**
- THE IMPLICIT ORDER AND THE EXPLICIT ORDER ARE IN THE SAME PLACE, **393**
- THE IMPORTANCE OF NOT MIXING, **271**
- THE IMPORTANCE OF THE COMPLETE AND REPEATED READING, **676**
- THE IMPORTANCE OF PEACE, **320**
- THE IMPORTANCE OF STILLNESS, **218**
- THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING OUR HYPNOSIS, **260**
- THE INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD THE SACRED, **307**
- THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY AND METAPHYSICS, **325**
- THE INFLUENCE OF PLATO IN CHRISTIANITY, **244**
- THE METABOLIC SYNDROME, **83, 151**
- THE MIDRASH (JEWISH TRADITION) IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS, **878**
- THE NARROW DOOR, **130**
- THE NATURE OF FRAGMENTARY PERCEPTION, **272**
- THE NATURE OF THE SELF, **322**
- THE NECESSITY OF HAVING DIALOGUE, READING AND ATTEMPTING UNITARY PERCEPTION, **327**
- THE NEW DEFINITION OF MIND, **242**
- THE ORIGIN OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY, **156**
- THE OBJECTIVE OF HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOTHERAPY, **506**
- THE PEACEFUL SILENCE OF PRECINCT B, **232**
- THE PROBLEM OF MEASURE, **365**
- THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEAR AND DESIRE, **284**
- THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPACE AND CONSCIOUSNESS, **231, 235**
- THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRECINCT A AND ENLIGHTENMENT, **236**
- THE ROLE OF PRAYER, **206**
- THE SACRAMENTS, **812**
- THE SCHOOL OF ESIKIA: STILLNESS AND SILENCE, **178**
- THE SELF-DENIAL OF GOD IN JESUS, **852**
- THE SIGNS OR MIRACLES AND RESURRECTION, **838**
- THE SIMILAR FATE OF SOME CHRISTIAN MYSTICS, **610**
- THE THREE CONSCIOUSNESS (KRISTIC, ADAMIC AND HUMAN), **72, 837**
- THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE BRAIN WHEN PASSING INTO PRECINCT B, **267**
- THE TRUTH SETS US FREE, **118**
- THE UNIVERSAL MIND, **648**
- THE WORD CONSCIOUSNESS, **228**

THE WORSHIP OF SUFFERING AS A
MEANS OF SALVATION, **875**

THIRD ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT,
CLASS 11 (CASE PRESENTATION),
692

THIRD ASSESSMENT OF A PATIENT,
CLASS 11 (QUESTIONS AND
COMMENTS), **697**

THIRD ROLE REVERSAL (THERAPIST-
PATIENT), CLASS 14, **948**

THIRD ROLE REVERSAL (THERAPIST-
PATIENT), CLASS 8, **530**

THIRD ROLE REVERSAL AND
FEEDBACK, CLASS 9, **566**

THREE CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE
BIBLE, **72, 837**

THREE DOGMATIC PREMISES, **348**

THREE TYPES OF EXEGESIS:
HOLOKINETIC, HISTORICAL AND
CANONICAL, **771**

TO BE BORN FROM ABOVE, **326**

TO WHAT ORDER DO THE FOUR
ASPECTS BELONG?, **456**

TRANSFERENCE AND COUNTER
TRANSFERENCE, **25**

TRANSFORMATION OF THE BRAIN
WHEN PASSING INTO B, **267**

U

UNITARY PERCEPTION IS "BUILT-IN",
194

UNITARY PERCEPTION IS FREEDOM OF
THE PAST, **306**

UNITARY PERCEPTION, BENEFITS AND
CONTINGENCIES OF, **633**

UNITARY PERCEPTION, DIAGNOSES
THAT DO NOT BENEFIT FROM, **19,**
504

UNITARY PERCEPTION, READING AND
HAVING DIALOGUE IN , **634**

W

WATCH OUT FOR HIDEOUTS, **96**

WHAT DOES SLEEPING WELL MEAN?,
504, 527

WHAT ROLE DOES LANGUAGE PLAY
IN FRAGMENTATION?, **368**

WHY DOES UNITARY PERCEPTION
NOT SPREAD MORE?, **279**

WHY HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY?,
13

WHY IS BREATHING NOT EMPHASIZED
IN HOLOKINETIC PSYCHOLOGY?,
56

WORDS NO LONGER USED IN THE
DIAGNOSIS (DSM) , **109, 145**

WORDS OF APPRECIATION FOR THE
WRITTEN WORK ON HOLOKINETIC
PSYCHOLOGY, **674**

BIBLIOGRAFY

English:

The Great Leap of Mind
Beyond Silence
Holokinetic Psychology
Jesus of the Desert
Complete Encarnation
My Meetings with David Bohm
My Dialogues with Jiddu Krishnamurti

Spanish:

Psicología del Siglo XXI
Psicología Cristiana
La Percepción Unitaria
Lo Profundo de la Mente
La Mente También es Percepción Unitaria
Degeneración, Reproducción y Resurrección
De la Prehistoria a la Atemporalidad
Kristos y 21 Siglos de Cristianismo
La Mente y la Realidad Indivisa
Preguntas de Estudiantes a RFG
Mis Diálogos con Jiddu Krishnamurti
La Salida de la Hipnosis Mutua y Colectiva
La Tristeza, las Palabras y la Comunión
Relación, Religión y Aislamiento
Sutta Pitaka y Tao Te King (versión traducción RFG)
El Libro de Éfeso

Sites:

unitaryperception.org
holokineticpsychology.org
holokinesisbooks.com

