

## Meeting #015

### EU Session Transcript

Attendees: Robin, Ronald, John, Michelle, J O'Donnell, ++

Speaker 1: I'm not sure, but I'm under the impression that Tolstoy wrote a gospel. Does anybody know anything about that?

Speaker 2: Yeah, he wrote a gospel. Did he he wrote his version of the gospels. He figured that he could improve on the ideas contained in the gospel. So he wrote his own. And not only that, the Orthodox Church did indeed hold us in odd and automatising. Oh okay. So this is about Tolstoy. You just didn't mean Tolstoy

Speaker 3: Um the chapter titled The First Growl makes me think that this is the first of many growls, and I've never been able to see th a sequence that corresponds to this. Uh w which has sort of left me thinking this is a a simple uh tale that gives some indication of the psyche of these people on earth, uh but I can't I've never gone any further with it for larger Metaphors or anything. These odd people on earth

Speaker 2: Is this a wolf's growl or a dog's growl or other kind of growl? Is it a bear's growl? I don't know. What who's growling? What kind of thing is growling, do you reckon?

Speaker 3: I've always pictured a dog. This isn't as b these people are not presented the power-possessing beings as glorious or or savage as a wolf or is logical actually, and that you've got uh um uh pets gone awry

Speaker 2: It's a good question because what does that mean, the first growl? Does it mean Gurdjieff's first growl about humanity? Or does it mean a growl by humanity or certain parts of humanity? I mean it doesn't say Is it the power-possessing beings that are growling? Nobody got any opinions. Really? Human beings without opinions? Well, what a sainted collection of human beings this is. Maybe maybe it's the rest of the book is a grail. I suppose that worked. According to a brief summary, Tolstoy attempted to strip Christianity. of its ethical essentials, rejecting miracles, mysticism, and all supernatural elements. So basically This guy called Jesus turned up, said a few things, and he crucified him. That's um the Tolstoy Gospels

Speaker 4: The s the story that Bill Zebab tells in this chapter seems to me it it kind of keeps switching around. I mean it starts off by implying that the this author is um is not very good and is just kind of recycling stuff for money And then it says that what he's written is in danger of waking people up. And then So then they tried to to crush it, but that has its opposite effect. And then it ends up with people thinking he's very famous, but actually they haven't read his book at all It just seems to be sort of, you know, going back and forth all the time. It's a bit hard to I know make sense of in a straight line.

Speaker 2: I don't think it's quite the truth either. I don't think it was this um Spat with the Orthodox Church that made Tolstoy famous. It was war and peace that made him famous. And he wrote that before he wrote this stuff. But you know, the um Gurdjief never ruins a good story by insisting on the truth.

Speaker 5: I mean if you see these two stories are somehow connected. It's it's like um um Belzebug uh wants to teach Hassin something So he's first he's s telling him that by calling them slugs he's uh on very thin ice and now he's saying If you call them slugs, look at this guy, Tolstoy. I mean he's not naming him, but what happened there somehow. So that is um That um yeah, I I

don't know, but I'm still thinking about uh uh who is uh uh who is knuring what crawling crawling. Can't say

Speaker 6: And who are the yeah, who are the ancient barbarians, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Johnny?

Speaker 5: Yeah.

Speaker 6: I think he's making fun. He does a lot. And and he's poking the bear, you know, he's growling. He growls all the way through Beelzebub as a writer. He's growling at us, you know. If you if you look at P at You know, I go to the zoo frequently because I like to hang out with the lions and the timers and all. But when they growl, it can be friendly and it can also be a warning. But it is up to you to make up what that is. So I think, you know, the the story I mean, I'm a slug at times. Um, you know, seriously. And, you know, that's kind of a slap in the face when he says, you know, the slugs. Because there's a part of me at times it's a slug. And, you know, I have to learn how how metaphorical that really is to get myself out of sacrificing and punishing myself. You know, again, he's he's just making fun and trying to point to the The parts of us that get lazy, which I mean, seriously, really all of us, we do have laziness. We have sluggish digestion.

Speaker 2: Oh yes, we do, yeah.

Speaker 6: Yeah. So we have sluggish atmosphere too.

Speaker 2: Oh yeah. How do you oh you know It's lucky we're all on Zoom or else our sluggishness would just infect everybody else. Well not necessarily.

Speaker 6: It makes me wonder uh I'm right. I'm rewriting for my website all the time. I'm thinking, I'm going to write about being a slug, how that feels, and then how it feels when you're not being a slug. I can't see that either is rewarding.

Speaker 2: So what's the difference between the behavior of Carapat and the behavior of the Orthodox Church.

Speaker 6: That's a great question, but first I wanted to ask you, I recently came in touch with um some Russian Orthodox uh people who and I'm wondering if Gurdjieff because I I see a real difference. Um I'm not able to in explain it But Orthodoxy in Greek and Roman, I mean Greek and Russian Orthodox Church is a different doctrine. And I'm wondering if you knew that or, you know, could someone expand on that or blah blah blah

Speaker 2: Well, he does expand on that later on when he talks in in the first chapter of the second book, The Fruits of Former Civilizations, because Although that purports to be about the Greeks and the Romans, it's really about Roman Catholicism and Greek Orthodox. So, you know, there's an awful lot that can be discussed there uh about that distinction.

Speaker 6: But what about the Russian? See that's that's what got me involved. The Russian Orthodox people. I have clients who are from the Ukraine and uh from from ru Belarus and they talk they go to the Russian Orthodox Church and those are their people and they don't really um see kindly to going into a Catholic church or whatever. You see, and I'm wondering what the difference is. Sasha, do you know

Speaker 7: Uh I don't know some really basic differences. There is some ch differences in let's say uh they use all calendar uh not like Greeks uh Greeks change to a new one but I don't know some Well, I know that Gougier mentioned that they are fasting with the fish and make jokes about that,

how they But I don't know what exactly is doctrinal difference

Speaker 2: Have you been to uh a d uh Russian Orthodox um service, Gwyn

Speaker 6: No, um, but you know, between us, uh, Robin, you're in Austin, me and San Antonio, there's a Greek Orthodox monastery. There's a Greek monastery outside of Kendalia, which is halfway between um Austin. It's on two it's off 281. So you would have but what I'm going to do is I'm going to take myself on my little field trip. And I'm gonna go out to that monastery and I'm gonna ask them that question.

Speaker 2: Well, that'd be good.

Speaker 6: Because I understand there are a couple of Russians that are out there I thought that would be a great way to find out.

Speaker 2: I used to go to the Russian Orthodox Cathedral in London, which is very close to um uh the Albert Hall. It's kind of just along the road from the Albert Hall and London ice again there. There are a number of things that are distinct differences in experience between a Roman Catholic and Russian Orthodox service. Um particularly there is no musical instrument in a Russian orthodox environment, the only musical instrument they allow is the voice. So they sing, if you like, hymns or whatever, but it's only a voice. There are no organs in the church or anything like that. There's no um No happy slappy guitars or anything like that either.

Speaker 6: Do they chant or do you know do uh do they do chanting like uh You know how in the Jewish temples they're they chant the Torah would be the litany, wouldn't it?

Speaker 2: And um I I can't remember to be honest. I mean the priest comes out Gij said that the Orthodox ceremony goes back to the birth of Christianity, which is about 150 years before Christ. in Egypt. That was supposedly where it is created. That's just Gurdja saying that. And that the um the service is objective and it hasn't changed Whereas the Catholics have changed significantly. And I don't know about the language or anything like that. I should suspect that the language of the Orthodox service is not the same as it was 2,000 years ago. The form of the service is supposedly the same.

Speaker 6: Are the priests in both Greek um, this is one of my big questions on my field trip, are they celibate?

Speaker 2: No. No, absolutely not.

Speaker 7: And Bujir as a boy was in the in the choir in the church. So there is a choir music singing or chanting usually in the church, in all Orthodox church.

Speaker 6: But many of those are a cappella without instruments.

Speaker 8: Yes.

Speaker 6: And those are powerful. I mean that to me to hear those what you're talking about chanted or sung. Without instruments, it makes it even more powerful. That's my

Speaker 8: I could I had the opportunity to to um see the Greek Orthodox service especially by uh uh with a bat baptism and I was in T PC in an Orthodox church and um What was the other thing? And I can say it's just the language. I didn't understand neither Greek or or Russian at that time. but it's it's especially the language that's uh that makes the difference. But I had the

impression that Um the the basic things are the same, so they yeah And they they just the priest has to have a good voice that's very sonore and can can uh lead through the service.

Speaker 2: Could you have said the first thing?

Speaker 8: No, that's what what I what I suspect that that uh the the priest has ah and the next is I remember now because I I worked on on the cemetery And there was was a Greek uh uh Eurussian uh g grave of um of soldiers that uh um c came to death in in the second world war and they on the ninth of ma on the ninth of May They had a service on the cemetery and I can't could hear there as well the Russian um service for for the death and it was the same, no instruments. It was the voice of the priest.

Speaker 2: Goodja said that originally the Catholic Church was higher than the Orthodox. But that it degraded and continues to degrade. He said the mistake they made was to go searching for midday at two o'clock in the afternoon

Speaker 8: What does this mean? Searching for midday at two o'clock in the afternoon?

Speaker 2: Well, it me there's one thing that it means, you're not really going to find midday at two o'clock in the afternoon. Yes. There was a that's a quote from Giji. They went searching for midday at two o'clock in the afternoon.

Speaker 6: I recently got real interested in all of this through uh trying to figure out uh the division when Constantine was um organizing the Bible. There's so much broohaha about all of that. You know, and so so many things were, you know, he was pagan before that happened. So to me The Constantine factor. To me, the Catholic the today's Catholicism is a reaction against that. It's a reaction against Like to me, all the I mean, this is just my opinion, as always. You know, I think that the Catholic Church rebelled in in uh actual adding to the ceremonies and the things that go up I can't believe that AI business. My thumbs up. I mean, seriously. I do I do hand movement when I talk and they put my hand up, they put thumbs up, they you know I'm I'm worried about AI. You know, it's watching Gwyn's ever action, but not listening to me.

Speaker 2: I understand completely. You only have to do that and all of a sudden. Well, it doesn't work on me It's your thumb. You've got the magic thumb.

Speaker 8: No, it w it worked on you before, Robin.

Speaker 2: Yeah. Okay.

Speaker 8: Yeah.

Speaker 6: But all I'm saying is Gurjev brings up to me, he sits between Constantine and the new and the Roman Catholic Church in a way of telling a story that, in one level, is oppositional And sarcastic and sardonic. And in he's making a lot of inferences Because the truth is, you know, when you look at the King James Version and how it was constructed, it's crap. I'm sure nobody says that about the Bible, but at this point it is kind of it's kind of a propaganda thing

Speaker 2: One of the um influencing factors with Constantine and Christianity happened um 200 years before Constantine and that was Domitian, the Emperor Domitian, I think that's pronounced like that or something like that divided the Roman Empire into two pieces and the border was pretty much the border of Croatia. And everything that was to the east of it eventually became Orthodox, and everything to the west became Catholic. And that began with the adoption of Constantine religion for the whole of the empire. The empire was still there, but the

administration had been divided and eventually the whole of the empire divided.

Speaker 6: Well, Constantine, so so that's great information, and that's 200 years, so Constantine, and he was a pagan.

Speaker 2: Yeah. But Christianity had grown it it become very popular, you know.

Speaker 6: Yeah.

Speaker 2: Um well I mean yeah

Speaker 6: Was he influenced by that? Was he influenced by that division over a 200-year period? I mean, what what's going on during that 200 year period?

Speaker 2: That's an administrative division. Right, but when you have an administrative division, you eventually get two emperors, which is eventually what happened. You you had, you know, the everything under Constantinople and everything under Rome was just separated. And that made, you know, um Constantine was about 300 and 300, 350 AD. Um Um um the um the basic texts of a church were only being organized around that time. I don't know the date of the um uh the meeting but it was around 300 AD so It was all sorting itself out and hadn't been sorted it out by then, you know.

Speaker 6: So where did he so where did he get the monks? Where where did they come from? Did they come from this division as well or what?

Speaker 2: There was the church in Rome, and there was a church, mainly the church in Syria, actually, but the church in Rome and the church in Syria, and they were separate. And the church in Egypt, which was Coptic, that was separate too. Um, but that would be more in alignment with the church in Syria than with the church in uh Rome, because Rome was under Peter. You know, everything that followed from Peter. Constantine supposedly Adopted Christianity as a political move that made great sense because in one way or another it allowed him to marginalize political opponents that weren't Christian. It's sort of like that. I think you would have to redo a detailed study of it to get a complete picture. But Constantine wasn't desperately holy. It seems to have been a political move. Bit like Henry VIII inventing the Church of England.

Speaker 1: Is it true that um well I've heard that the at one time there were two Vaticans, one one in Rome, then there was a second one in the south of France And both claim to be the Orthodox Vatican somewhere like Pepignon or Avignon or something like that on the on the Mediterranean.

Speaker 2: I don't have the full details, but as I understand it, they had separate popes. And in order to make it, in order to try and bring it all back together, they created a third pope. So Laura III really. And um and um the third pope was eventually adopted and and the other two th uh popes had to stand down. But yes, the the the Catholic Church became intensely political. But by then it had its own armies, you know

Speaker 6: So much drama around the church. Seriously. the di the development of the church and so much drama and so much um it's like its own form of Beelzebub You know, if you write the story of the church, it wouldn't be any more fantastic than this, than Gergef's writings.

Speaker 2: Yeah, it's really weird. I mean, you know, one of the things that I thought was really weird, but only looking back, was all of these crusades. You know, what's that about?

Speaker 6: Not to mention the Templars.

Speaker 2: Well actually that was very strongly related to the Templars.

Speaker 6: Exactly. And not to mention the arising of the Illuminati. I mean, seriously? I would love to see Gerja facing off with that. I'm inviting him to I'm inviting Birja to my next meeting of Know It All Everything about philosophy and religion with all my, I hate to say, male intellects I must be the the uh thorn in mid inside. I I cannot understand why I would be the thorn, but I think It says so and so fear pistols.

Speaker 2: Edwin, what happens on February the twentieth?

Speaker 6: Well I think your birthday's coming up.

Speaker 2: Well that's February the nineteenth. What happens on the twentieth?

Speaker 6: Well, you're affected with your solar return by the twentieth

Speaker 2: You know what I'm telling that there's a conjunction between Neptune and Saturn on the 20th.

Speaker 6: Yes. So the truth will come out one way or the other. Some will sacrifice and some will just beat their head against the wall, you know, like really How long does this take plenty? You know, a lot is happening. Cosmologically, things are happening to upend everything that we thought was true. Okay, so if the vibration has hit people who don't want to accept that, down they go And to never never land with Alice.

Speaker 4: So the picant trait that he's talking about Seems to be to me sort of a kind of pompousness about how these three b these three brain beings operate, that they have votes and they set up councils. And go through and fill out forms and write reports and stuff like that. And it's all sort of puffing themselves up with. Little outcome

Speaker 2: I think you can take that chapter as a warning to people in the work not to tell anybody that you're in the work. Because you might tell people that they're mechanical. Or that they're slugs. Or that they're mechanical slugs Now if it's Gwyn, she doesn't mind being a mechanical slog, so she doesn't get upset, but normal human beings would form a cancel and create an anathema.

Speaker 9: I'm not sure. I would say a normal person wouldn't not even understand what you mean when you say I'm in the work, I'm somehow special. I observe myself. They would think you are just a little crazy.

Speaker 6: Well and and really if you put us next to society, we are a little crazy. And so there's people in the work that are very mechanically in the work. And you cannot get them out of that mechanicality in the work. What about that? Orthodox and there's Catholic work, evidently.

Speaker 2: You're talking about the Gurdjieff Foundation and everybody else.

Speaker 5: I mean, it's not the same, but um my first teacher I had, he was a Usus San Yasin and he was a professor at the university in Cologne. And when he went to Pune and took Sanyas and then he was supposed to wear orange clothes, nobody was going to his um a Vorlesung, what is that, to his to his lectures anymore. He was completely alone standing there. And he was quite a good and well known professor and everybody wanted to be in his courses. But after that everything changed. I mean at one at at some point other people came like I came and He was not wearing the orange clothes that time anymore. But it's a little bit also what what you can see when when

you are too much showing off w what is the work it it also has outside a certain um friction

Speaker 6: Well you saw what happened to Osho when he showed off, came over here to the States, and you'd see what happened to him. Yeah. Yes. He's a brilliant man. I mean it's like It happens. I mean I had to deal with uh and I'm a psychologist, had to deal with people that went over to Pune. got into the um you know how you have to isolate yourself for a few days before you they couldn't stand that they came back to the States went crazy I'm curious. Uh, whatever.

Speaker 5: But what still is for me f uh weird in this first chapter, I reread it now a little bit. is that how strongly Baelsebot reacts on this, let's say, small childish mistake and and going very in much in detail and scaring Hassin off Very badly. And in the end he's smiling at him, going to the next chapter and saying, Yeah, but you know, you can be lucky too, like this Tolstoy gu guy. He basically got famous. So It's it's uh, I can't really I I don't I don't know. It's it's weird. It's just weird

Speaker 2: Well it it's worse than that because he's mentioning what Tolstoy did and Tolstoy took um the Gospels and rearrange them according to the way that he thought. And that's exactly what Gurdjieff does in the Tales. He takes the gospels and he rearranges them. For instance, he changes the role of Judas from being the betrayer to a saint. So this is something good is doing. Um, he didn't get anathematized for it.

Speaker 6: Well, you know, some of his stuff though, in like the Judah story, became more conscious and more dual in as time went on. So when he wrote this, now you've got people who can say, you know, Judas is like a saint. because of some of the proof. But at the time he wrote this, it was not true. And he so he has many, many times in here where he had to have known the the future in a a way of archetypal knowledge, like he knew um the truth in a story. You know, it's it's amazing. I guess that's why we're all reading his stuff rather than Tolstoy's. But

Speaker 9: I think it's a good idea what Robin brought in. Actually the whole we could read the whole chapter like this because not Hassin calls the uh human beings slugs goodev does it so so and he does it he he does it in he i in in every chapter yeah he says We are stupid, we are strange, we are we have a uh disturbed psyche. So in in in in fact, yeah, it's really a good idea. So in this sense, he In a way when when you uh mentioned before the carapet, he start to to project on people what all the bad things they could do if they would understand know and we could say if they would understand what he is writing. He is not yet in danger because nobody really understands what he is. Even we try hard to under really to understand what sh what he is saying. Ja, if I think if y humankind would really understand what is written there and take it seriously like he describes here then it could uh race sam strong friction. Yeah.

Speaker 6: But then you know it can also drive people crazy, I can. So you have to be ready to see this. what you're seeing. I agree totally. But you have to be really ready. I can see why you don't um you don't try to promote reading this or promote Uh, you know, I have people that really want to read this book and I'm going, you know, I'm thinking, why would you? You know? And they're saying, well that they want in Robin's group, and I'm saying You know, it'd be like a massacre because it's that's her first reading with people like this. You know, it's like Why would you want to even after you know all the beauty of the book and the the pr uh pristine language and the understanding of history. Why would you want to go here and have all your illusions destroyed?

Speaker 9: In a way, when we when I follow what how good you've described in the first chapter, what people all would do. It's a little bit like he gives us in the first chapter some psychological uh uh clues or uh or tricks that when you uh raise some interest for something that people then will be interested and when you propose something then Of course nobody uh would do it. So in in this sense when when he says um if they would uh recognize my my uh insult. Then they would

do this and this and this and this. And actually when one would read this, then in a way it is aufgedeckt.

Speaker 5: It is it's open.

Speaker 9: It's in a way not a secret anymore, so it is just something which which is on on which is on the table. And then it's not so easy to do it anymore.

Speaker 8: Mm-hmm.

Speaker 9: Yeah, if many many of the of those um animatizing uh things do they just work because no one really speaks about it and they have a certain secret and s play with this uh hidden fears. But if you um if we um publicly uh speak about those things then these fear have not s d its uh their grip anymore. So in this sense I could also understand

Speaker 3: Mm-hmm.

Speaker 6: You have to really understand the third force in ourselves. We have to understand the third force in ourselves to be able to read this. and be able to go between the three forces as an energy just as an energy you know, to be able to move through these chapters, through this You know, when we first started reading these back in the day, I was reading word for word. Then I started reading with a sense of sentence, grammar, you know, how he's fitting it all together. Then I read it in picturesque. I can picture things. I would take each paragraph and draw something for it. Then now I just listen and then I just go with the energetic flow of the words So I think there is something that transforms people in them each reading. Mm-hmm. I don't, you know, that's my impression of what I do, but I I'm real interested in how other people see each reading. I'm assuming that many of you here have read it more than once or twice.

Speaker 9: You I agree that re just reading, even if sometimes is not really such a revealing understanding also just reading the text and being busy with this is does something. I can agree exactly with this. Sometimes even quite profound Yeah, w without a clear reflection on it. It's just something works inside and Sometimes even an a deeper rooted attitude somehow changed if if there is another perspective given by Gurjiv.

Speaker 6: So I'm not experiment I I chanted I recorded myself chanting A portion of the first chapter I I chanted to myself and then recorded it and played it back to myself. And it was amazing. It's like a chant. His whole writing is like a chant. If you can read it, without worrying about grammatical structure. And I think eventually, if you read it enough, it goes down into the senses that way. Much like uh chanting without music. Oh very interesting.

Speaker 3: Were were you serious, Robin, when you said at the core it's a warning not to talk about the work? These two chapters.

Speaker 2: Well, the first one I think is a warning not to talk about the work. I I don't know, I mean when When I first joined a serious group, I was told not to talk about it because it didn't do any good. And I wasn't told don't talk about it because we'll throw you out of the group if you do. It wasn't that kind of don't do it. It was just a warning. No one's going to take it seriously. Stop talking about this. I used to, I mean at that point in time, I used to introduce work ideas into conversations and see how people responded to them without telling them where they came from because I was curious. as to, you know, the idea that most people are are kind of pretty much automatic all the time and stuff like that. You can say it in ways that not even work ways But nobody ever went anywhere with it because they didn't really want to know.

Speaker 6: Yeah

Speaker 8: It's my experience.

Speaker 9: Or they just don't understand what is made by this. It's my experience too.

Speaker 8: Omar and Mikhailov Ivanov said once that you shouldn't do that because if you come in touch with uh this teaching, whatever teaching, you will have a a little seat and and a little plant in it and if you start uh telling about people they will destroy it. So just when you're very strong in it, but then you stop by yourself telling the people about about what your uh the teaching is or you just do it like Rob and I do as well to to bring some ideas in the conversation without saying where it come from. Some ask where does this come from, but mostly they just let it pass. So

Speaker 6: And every so often you'll hit you'll say something. I say it unintentionally sometimes because I'll get so embedded in some of you know, someone will ask me, Well, how do you stay sane, you know, in this world? I said, I have a discipline. Well, what is that discipline? I said it comes from a long work ethic that I do with a certain discipline in Gerja. And you know, beyond that You know, I wouldn't think that I think it would drive people crazy who Who want to do it? I mean, I see people all the time who want to be where you are and be aware as as you are, but they don't want to work at it That that is, and and when you say you have to work at it, and it's true in psychology, you have to be disciplined about observing yourself. You don't lie to your therapist, you know. It's like you have to have a practice in your body. What is the body doing? You know So Garjav handles all that in his disciplines, body work, you know, the mind, the three centers.

Speaker 5: I remember we we had a movements group in Hamburg for a while and it was a quite stable group and then we decided at one point to do a work week And we made a flyer and I mean we were also a little bit naive at that time, but we the title was Arbeitswoche, which means a week of work. And people read this flyer and they really said, oh, no, I don't want to work for one.

Speaker 9: You should not call it work.

Speaker 5: You should not call it work. And they were in the movements, it was a movements group. No, it was not somet it was for us it was good. We wanted to work for one week together. It was really like the best we could do but even in this setting it was not wanted even the word was too much so

Speaker 9: Regarding the idea of warning not to tell about the work, I think there might be two different meanings. One is outside and one is more inside. And the outside, I think, this has somehow changed. Yeah, I mean in Goldiev's times and also times after there were really things which were dangerous to be to be to be uh publicly said when you uh assigned yourself towards a certain teaching or to a certain group or whatever. So but I think this has fundamentally changed. So in our times you can tell whatever you want. No one is really interested because there is just too much information. So in this sense, in the outside it might have have um tur turned even to to to the opposite. So but when there is some inside meaning, yeah I remember when was what what you said Gwyn or I think even uh Uh Usbensky mentioned it when you uh spread the little knowledge you you you you gather, then it then you lose it or whatever, uh like like this. Yeah, when there is this inside meaning then it is still very uh uh valuable and and we should consider this yeah to to really to be careful and considerate how and what and uh to whom we share something about the work. And not even in the sense of the outer danger that we could be in put in prison prison or w whatever, but more that there is a a certain danger for our personal work uh which could somehow get disturbed us.

Speaker 6: Well, you know, too, uh, Ekon, if you look at in the past, and he was familiar with this,

these ashrams. These monasteries. What he's doing is bringing us to an inner ashram. That's the way I explain it to people. You have to have your own space to engage in the Gurjef work. You have to be able to have your own inner ashram, your own inner church. This isn't an idea That you have to follow it, you have to make it your own. Just like he he was told to make it his own. Just like he would tell his followers to make this work your own. And I think that this is incredible what he's done, given that we've had years of churches, monasteries, ashrams. Uh and and he learned, I think he learned a great lesson at the prairie. You know, I think that how long did that last, Robin? How did how long did the prairie last?

Speaker 2: Oh, from 19, maybe about 21, maybe a little later, maybe 22, but that kind of time, all the way to about 1930.

Speaker 6: But look how much he learned during that time about trying to get people in a group to do group behaviors. Think how many people he sent away basically go find yourself and then come back. You see? I mean did that to a lot of people I thought especially to John Bennett the people like that. So women of the rope, it's very obvious.

Speaker 7: The word you're saying Wayne, I think it's really connected with this. It's not that we always shouldn't talk to people. It's very important that what we're trying inside is not visible from outside. And I have an interesting experience how I first really understood it I was in a working day in the in a house we have in a village and uh we had some problem with electricity so I I need to invite an electrician, somebody who is outside of the group. So he came and I was with him and around fuse box he doing something and one of the members of the group uh older one just passed behind behind us uh very near but he was working and he was bringing something that was self-remembering and just past us without even look at him or saying something. So this man just was really surprised. What is happening here? Somebody is passing and he is doing something very strange. So I understand there how it's important that we outside don't show this inner church which we trying to work what you just said. So it's not only talking about work, it's everything should be outside And there is a interesting story.

Speaker 6: Part of the job of everybody's going to talk about the external. So everyone's going to do that, but to bring the external into your experience. is the key. And so to me, because I do my little Gurjef study group of of Gurjef work They have to understand how to bring that into their own personal experience. It isn't always external because your perception of external still comes from within you. So it's um to me it needs to be integrated in that way in order to get I'm not trying to get people in the work, I'm getting trying to get them to understand the exercises in the work. the actual meaning of walking the talk and being practical. We're no longer in 1949, we're now in 2026. So how do you bring that material forward?

Speaker 9: I would like to bring the attention to a little piece of text on page 95, quite in the middle, where he says Be that as it may, and so on, and then he say First, because you have made me anxious for you, and secondly, because you have laid up for yourself a menace for the future. So he in a way he gives uh an explanation and the main the the first the main The problem is that uh Bilzepam uh is anxious for for for Hassin, which s w which I think it it tells something. Yeah that uh that something about the inner is more important than the outer. Because usually when we would have uh say that he have really committed some crime which is danger dangerous then the n the first uh problem would not be that the grandfather is anxious for him So it's we would look more towards the thing uh which he would have done.

Speaker 6: So the the next two paragraphs explain the why for that The next two paragraphs explain his reasoning. I like see the way he sets that up. Um Not that I understand it, but I do know that he sets up the question, then he answers the question, or he asks us to deliberate the question.

Let me put that. And he does it in the same way. But I don't know if anyone's noticed you brought up the question and the statement. is like if I'm looking at that paragraph Eckan, I'm saying why why is he making this lately? What is causing this? And then the why To my answer is the next two paragraphs. He sets up a lot of his dialogue in Gurja, in the Beelzebub. Where he questions and he answers his own question. But he doesn't answer it in a way that satisfies most intellectuals. He asks it, he answers it in a way that then makes you question everything else

Speaker 5: Yes, and and what I also um see in this part is that our actions are not only our actions. It's not only about me. So It's um I make someone else anxious and I um lay up a menace for the future. So probably also the people who come after me. So there's a bigger responsibility and a much wider picture than just being stupid for a moment. I don't know if but there was something else in it what you saw.

Speaker 2: The original word anathema meant to preach a false gospel. So it's kinda literal.

Speaker 6: So, what do you think he means by the previous paragraph where he's saying, pouring from the empty into the void? I think we've been doing that in in our discussion of discrimination to me at all costs while you're going through all of this, which means inner considering external, considering the whole thing

Speaker 9: And in in this text he uses this expression for a missing of an discrimination. If if I would discri or if they would discriminate But they don't do because they say it is pouring from the empty into the void. So it's has a has a different focus uh than uh you you you mean when we try to to find out some something. So there is a a discrimination which would be if we would decide would be quite important. Yeah, if a boy just in a childish naivety of if someone ha has a certain uh different intention to to insult someone would would would matter in a way.

Speaker 6: But he said you swallow your atmosphere rather than digest it. You you digestion of your atmosphere would demand discrimination and how you assimilate it. I mean it goes into the food diagram just the same way.

Speaker 2: I just looked up the meaning of pouring from the empty into the void. It goes back It's Russian, it's a Russian expression. But it goes back to the fourth, third century BC amongst the Greeks Where the following idea was expressed, from which is supposed to derive. A philosopher called Demonax witnesses a pointless debate. And he tells the disputants, friends, does it seem that one of you is milking a he-coat while the other holds a sieve underneath? Nothing else, Jolly.

Speaker 6: So we need to we need to have our own sieves So when I'm acting out of ego, I need to have an inner presence that can sieve and sift through that ego into real being. So it it really um it really is so uh making one to write my own parable except or my own uh documentation of the doc gospels except that I'm not that interested. I don't hold that much favor with the gospels, sorry to say. Robin, do you have some uh material that you could point me to? uh you can do it in an email um about the 150 years before jesus was born the beginning of christianity

Speaker 2: I've only I over I think it's in Insert Miraculous that Gurdjieff mentions about.

Speaker 6: Okay, but do you have because I know there's documentation about those things. And I'll go look for you.

Speaker 2: If I can find anything, I'll send you some links or even document.

Speaker 6: Okay Elaine Pagles also makes uh she talks about that too, but she doesn't give document her resources. And uh Different people, different writers have dar had said the same

thing. That's why I want to know what the resource is.

Speaker 3: Holy Blood, Holy Grail gives a very dramatic version.

Speaker 6: Well, also uh Gurja brings up the Essenes, and my understanding, the Essene sect was long before Christianity. So maybe, you know, I can't factualize it, but Gurjeff talks about the Essenes in Beelzebub. I can't I don't know where. But I'm very involved with the Eastine uh Daily Diet and the scene that lived in the desert there with John the Baptist and Jesus But I also know that some of the old Sephardic Jewish lines come out of the Essenes as well.

Speaker 9: Interesting notion is if we take it directly and seriously what he says in the first chapter where he describes what finally comes out of all this when they realize that they cannot catch him, that in all the ceremonies people would many or all the people would wish for you in thoughts something like the following and then he describes the uh frightening things they would uh project on him. The question is then what should the thoughts and ideas of others would have of an impact on on me. And this in return we could probably relate to the story of Karapat in the first chapter where he feels bad because people have uh um yeah bad thoughts about his action and the r ringing of the the the pipe.

Speaker 6: True.

Speaker 9: Yeah, because usually we could say what should I care about the thoughts of others about me

Speaker 7: Well I found it different than a story about Karapal because Kanapat was waking people, awaking people and he doing it early in the morning when they are in some kind of uh a different state, much if I understand it, much closer to uh what we call subconscious And here he's making fun, obviously, because at the end he says that he was talking with a smile on his face to his grandgrandson. So he's making joke about this. how people occur with the waking state, what we call a conscious state, it's totally without any force in it. So I don't I I think it's different than Karapat's story.

Speaker 6: Well And then that state you're talking about, you're suggestible and uh able to receive uh uh propaganda type it's suggestibility but it's also productive in that state so I don't know which one of those he's going for you know Because when he's making fun of saying waking sleep He's talking about those people that are just right in that middle zone. And then later on. Oh, okay, Robin. Um later on he um he talks about that state being suggestible in hypnosis. In the chapter of hypnosis. When we do our early morning sittings, it's very important to capture that state and bring it with you to the sitting. to set up your your your sitting form. Or to me it is So that the sitting the intention in the sitting rests in that ability to go forward later, because it's in that part of the brain.

Speaker 2: I think that's correct.

Speaker 7: And even w when we when you was talking about uh how your reading of tales is changing through through time. It sound also like uh it's going more to subconscious, what we call subconscious First we read it with uh front and trying to understand it intellectually, but as we passing by new every new time it's more like you said uh sound and uh what kind of impressions coming to me not Intellectual or less intellectual.

Speaker 6: Well, when I was doing that chanting, I would then I would do it before I went to sleep. And then I would go to sleep, and that affected my sleep in a in a way. So somehow It helps to do that because the message, and I didn't even have a question of where the what is the message. You

know, I didn't even use my brain with it. But something set in me much deep more deeply when I did that. I'm um I'm involved in a lot of different spiritual societies and theosophy and all that, but it's amazing how many of the leaders in that that existed back in the eight uh early nineteen hundreds, how many of them were familiar with Gurdjieff. And they were also familiar with the work. Krishna Murdy being one of them. Osho being one of them So there was this um in fact in one of the the Rajnesh groups, I don't call him Osho, because Osho to me existed in Bhuna and Rajneesh came to you know, he was Rajanish when he was in America the United States, but the work ethic he referred, he has referred to Gurja And I was friends for a very long time with one of his bodyguards that was with him up till death. And uh he said he was very much involved in it So when you start really learning about this and how many people have been informed by Gurjeff that have then been leaders? in spiritual work and in the um in psychology. Um you know, Jung had a real aversion because um uh Maurice Nicole was a Jungian analyst and when Maurice Nicole had been uh Jung had been one of his kids' godfathers. And he bought Burjes teaching to Jung, and Jung did not deny it He said, I'm because Maurice was all involved in bringing him the work to include it in some of the union analysis, which is very easy to do because it's all archetypal. So you can easily do that. But you knew it was out of his element. He knew he knew instinctively that's not where he wants to go. So he stayed with his own it wasn't anti Gurjev. But many people who know that story will think he was not in favor of Maurice Nicole doing that. He said, you follow your path. If that's your path, we follow your path. So all of these guys knew about each other and revered each other in a way that I think is very um um positive in growing, I wish everybody could do that. Respect where the other one's coming from. Just leave it alone. If you don't I can see why I wouldn't want to drag any people into the work, into our work group. Robin, speaking work groups, how is yours doing in Austin? Is it changed format or anything?

Speaker 2: No. Not really. It it's like, you know, there's a core group of six people. Um we just meet and discuss our experiences during the week, really. Do reading. Yeah. But it It it it became difficult after COVID because we had to use Zoom for a while and then it started to get people joining who were ways away, you know, someone from Toronto, someone New York, someone Washington. So it it it remains a Zoom group.

Speaker 6: Yeah. I think that needs some adaptation because it's not that we can't do the work group. I know that Shriver, Russ Schriver. did he does movements on Zoom with his group, but he will meet with the group three or four times a year to do an actual movement class and the whole thing. But um I can see because of Zoom, it's brought more people's interest into it if they don't have to go, you know, travel. So I think your ability to reach Europeans and I know that Sasa helps me, Michelle's helped me in in the Gurj work. In my groups, it's very helpful to have that European flavor. How else can you get them all together? You know, because you need that perspective I mean, I don't want people in a group just so they can agree with me. It's not about that. You know, it's about looking at the work and seeing what we can gain from it. By the way, Michelle, we've changed our time to 10. 30 in the morning, so you might be able to get back on.

Speaker 9: I have s something on page one hundred and one in the middle where he tells us something which is not really a amazing but somehow it is that Where he says the ordinary beings of the said community seeing the fuss made about his this writer became very greatly interested in him. So this gives us in a way and this Description uh uh about uh really strange uh uh strange functioning in the m psyche and of of course the modern psyche of modern men too. And in the following when he explained a little bit more, he gives us in a way a quite clear description about what he later I think calls suggestibility, which is one of the uh big weaknesses of of human psyche.

Speaker 2: This kind of uh lines up with uh I don't know who said it, but I think somebody in the movie business said there is no bad publicity. And it it's almost true. You know, the y you you have to have something really, really negative for it to actually be bad publicity. Otherwise, it's just an

argument between people. And that like gets lots of attention.

Speaker 9: Yeah, and this idea that if someone is prohibited or rejected, that this raises especially the interest of people. This is also interesting. Hi Queen. See you next week.

Speaker 2: Hi Gwynn. We're losing Gwen, that's sad. Um in on page a hundred he talks about Power-possessing beings of that great community in which he existed had just been having rotten luck at what is called Roulette and Baccharat. And this is um this is it got to be a direct reference to a law of accident, doesn't it? These people are living under accident. Mm-hmm. So power possessing, but not exactly holy, I think, is the message.

Speaker 9: I think always when Guldif mentions power possessing beings, he does always speak in a quite uh judging attitude towards them. I d I don't remember anything good he said about power possessing beings. Yeah, nothing.

Speaker 2: No, it's almost like he's using it as a term of um insult.

Speaker 3: Mm-hmm

Speaker 7: When you have power, you have responsibility, bigger responsibility. So I think it's more of that. There is a I don't know in which chapter he's talking about societies which are made to end divorce. And then he says that some of power-processing beings have experience which evoke the conscience. because the he they lost some some somebody in the war and they start with a sincere idea but later others come in and change anything. So I think it's not in itself good or bad but just responsibility or possibilities which these people had.

Speaker 1: Notice that with um the phrase power possessing beings, they're in inverted commas. Now is he suggesting there that these power possessing beings actually don't really have any power at all?

Speaker 2: He's asking you to question the idea, so the answer is yeah, it to some degree is suggesting something like that. Because the quotes always mean something like that. It it can be ironic or it it can be, yes they have power, but not real power, you know, because uh politicians appear to have power, but quite often they don't really have power.

Speaker 4: It's almost um comes true in the story, doesn't it, that they don't have power, that they they want to suppress this gospel, but they fail.

Speaker 2: It's quite interesting actually when you think about it, isn't it? They want to suppress the book But the book itself doesn't actually have any power except to make money. It isn't like uh Tolstoy formed his own religion on the back of the book that he produced. There was a Tolstoyan movement, but that was um Had more to do with pacifism. It wasn't really a Christian-based thing or based on his Christian interpretation Again on page hundred, the ordinary beings of that community at length woke awoke from their usual what is called torpor. Open means.

## Chat Text EU Session

13:31:01 From Vanya & Ekant : "Pouring from the empty into the void" is a haunting metaphor for absolute depletion and the futility of effort. While the common saying is "You can't pour from an empty cup," this version takes the despair a step further.

### 1. Total Exhaustion (Burnout)

It describes a state where you have nothing left to give (the empty), yet you continue to strain yourself to satisfy a demand that is bottomless (the void). It's not just being tired; it's the act of offering energy that no longer exists to a cause that doesn't care.

### 2. Philosophical Nihilism

It suggests an action with neither a source nor a destination. It is the ultimate image of pointlessness: a movement that mimics "giving" or "creating," but since there is no substance to start with and no vessel to receive it, the result is total nothingness.

...

13:31:14 From Vanya & Ekant : 3. Emotional Deadlock

In relationships, it refers to two people who are both emotionally bankrupt trying to sustain each other. Since both are "empty," any attempt to provide comfort falls into a "void" of unresponsiveness.

Summary: It is the poetic definition of giving until you are less than zero, into a space that can never be filled.

13:47:44 From Gwynne Mayer : I have an appointment which I need to make....

13:47:55 From Gwynne Mayer : great group...adios

13:59:07 From Michelle F. : <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chaldea>

# AI Summary Meeting 15

## EU Session

### Quick recap

The group discussed Chapter 11 of Beelzebub's Tales, focusing on how Gurdjieff uses satire and humor to critique human psychology and social structures. They explored the metaphorical meaning of calling humans "slugs" and the story of a writer who creates a gospel that becomes famous despite being publicly anathematized. The discussion touched on historical aspects of Christianity, including the division between Orthodox and Catholic churches, and how Gurdjieff's work relates to other spiritual traditions. The group also discussed the importance of maintaining confidentiality about inner spiritual work and the challenges of adapting group practices for remote participation via Zoom.

### Next steps

- Gwynne: Visit the Greek Orthodox monastery near Kindelia to ask about the differences between Greek and Russian Orthodox practices and report findings.

### Summary

#### Three-Brained Beings and Anathema

In this meeting, Ronald read from Chapter 11 of a book, discussing the dangers of insulting three-brained beings from Earth, whom the narrator called "slugs." The narrator advised against using such an offensive name, as it could lead to severe consequences, including anathema from these beings. He then shared a story about a contemporary writer who created a new gospel, which led to his public anathematization. Despite this, the writer's reputation grew, and his name became known almost everywhere, highlighting the strange psyche of these three-brained beings.

#### Tolstoy's Gospel Interpretation Challenges

The group discussed Leo Tolstoy's version of the Gospels, which the Orthodox Church had condemned. Ronald noted that the chapter title "The First Growl" suggested a series of growls, but he couldn't identify a clear sequence or metaphor. The discussion touched on whether the growl was from a dog, wolf, or bear, and who or what was growling. John suggested that the rest of the book might be a growl. Robin provided a brief summary of Tolstoy's attempt to strip Christianity of its supernatural elements. Rod analyzed the story in the chapter, noting its shifting narrative about the author's intentions and the book's reception.

#### Russian Orthodox Church Practices Discussion

The group discussed the differences between the Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches, with Gwynne sharing her experience of interacting with Russian Orthodox people from Ukraine and Belarus. Robin explained that Tolstoy's fame was primarily due to "War and Peace" rather than his spat with the Orthodox Church. The conversation then shifted to Gwynne's plans to visit a Greek Orthodox monastery near San Antonio to learn more about the Russian Orthodox Church's practices, particularly their use of chanting and lack of musical instruments in services.

#### Orthodox and Catholic Church Comparisons

The group discussed differences and similarities between Orthodox and Catholic churches, with Michelle and Saša sharing their experiences of Orthodox services lacking musical instruments

and being conducted in languages like Greek and Russian. Robin explained that according to Guidu, the Catholic Church degraded after searching for midday at 2 o'clock, while Gwynne explored the historical division between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, attributing it to Constantine's influence and the King James Version's propagandistic nature.

### **Christianity's Political and Historical Evolution**

Robin explained the historical division of the Roman Empire and the emergence of Christianity under Constantine, noting that Constantine's conversion was likely a political move. Gwynne inquired about the origins of monks and the separation of churches, to which Robin responded that the church in Rome and the church in Syria were distinct, with Constantine's adoption of Christianity potentially serving to marginalize political opponents. John asked about the historical existence of two Vatican cities, to which Robin confirmed that there were indeed separate popes, and a third pope was eventually created to unify the church. The conversation concluded with Gwynne and Robin discussing an upcoming conjunction of Neptune and Saturn on February 20th, which they believed would bring truths to light and potentially cause upheaval.

### **Challenges in Transformative Spiritual Work**

The group discussed the challenges faced by individuals who openly engage with spiritual or transformative work, highlighting the potential for misunderstanding and isolation. Robin and Vanya explored the concept of "being in the work" and its societal implications, while Gwynne shared experiences of individuals who struggled with the transition to a transformative lifestyle. The conversation also touched on the controversial actions of spiritual leaders like Osho and the potential for friction when such leaders challenge societal norms. Vanya expressed confusion about Balesabad's intense reaction to a minor mistake, and Robin explained the historical context of similar actions by figures like Tolstoy and Gurdjieff, who rearranged religious texts. The group concluded that while Gurdjieff's insights are profound, they are not for everyone and can be unsettling for those unprepared for the truth they reveal.

### **Understanding Gersha's Writing Impact**

The group discussed Gersha's writing and its impact on readers. Gwynne shared her experience of reading the text through different levels of understanding, from word-by-word to an energetic flow. Robin and Vanya agreed that discussing the work openly can diminish its effectiveness, as people may not fully understand or appreciate it. The group also touched on the importance of keeping the teachings private and introducing ideas subtly in conversations.

### **Challenges in Spiritual Practice Description**

Gwynne and Vanya discussed the challenges of describing inner spiritual work as "work," noting that people often resist the idea of working on personal development. Vanya shared an experience from a movements group in Hamburg where the term "work week" was met with resistance, highlighting the importance of careful consideration when sharing knowledge about inner practices. Gwynne emphasized the need for individuals to create their own "inner ashram" or space for spiritual practice, drawing on lessons learned from historical ashrams and monasteries. Saša added that the inner spiritual work should remain invisible from the outside, sharing an anecdote about an electrician's surprise at observing a group member practicing self-remembering without acknowledging the presence of others.

### **Gurdjieff's Teachings and Modern Spirituality**

The group discussed Gurdjieff's teachings and their relevance to modern spiritual practice. Gwynne emphasized the importance of integrating external knowledge into personal experience,

while Vanya highlighted a passage from Beelzebub's Tales that suggests inner actions have more impact than outer ones. The group explored the concept of "pouring from the empty into the void" and its connection to discrimination and assimilation. They also discussed the historical context of early Christianity and the influence of Gurdjieff's teachings on various spiritual leaders. The conversation ended with a brief discussion about the power-possessing beings mentioned in the text and a story about self-remembering.

## Meeting #015

### US Session Transcript

Present: Robin, Sandy, Stepehn, Derek, et al.

Speaker 1: I couldn't help smiling.

Speaker 2: It might be Freud, but it might also be Tolstoy, because Tolstoy actually did try to write a new version of the Gospels.

Speaker 3: And it is Tolstoy. It's Tolstoy because there was uh he was anathematized. Now I don't know the full details of it, but um the the problem was really Um, more than anything else, his rewrite of the Gospels eliminated all the miracles and all of the um All of the things that would be acts that would be regarded as holy, and it tried to present the Gospels as a kind of rational thing. He just uh he just kind of unhooked all of the um I mean I would say foundations of um Christian belief. So he wasn't he he wasn't popular with the Orthodox Church.

Speaker 4: So did he do it in one book or shared it through many books?

Speaker 3: He did it in one book.

Speaker 4: And do you know the name of that book?

Speaker 3: I can find it out. I shall find it out for you.

Speaker 4: Okay, I saw one, the kingdom of God is within you. I he did write a few that may come to this um reason.

Speaker 5: No, that was the second book. The first one was called The Gospel and Brief. Gospel and Brief.

Speaker 4: Okay. I think we talked about that. Thank you.

Speaker 3: Yeah, they're gonna split brief.

Speaker 6: Oh you're looking, how brief was it?

Speaker 5: How many pages? About a three to four hour read. Relatively speaking, uh read Because there's uh also um I guess what it I was gonna say that uh orange indicated that it was full so I went out and got the uh digital version of that uh document and read through it this last weekend just to say But I'd read it. So I wasn't one of those that uh Georgiev was referring to here that uh had an opinion and never read his work. But I'd also read the uh Kingdom of God is within you when I've I identify with those being uh him uh redressing the Catholic religion And I know that George F was very strong in his religion. So that's probably why the uh head knocking occurred between the two of 'em, but uh Tolstoy's gospel, it seemed to be that it was trying to bring out applying personal knowledge and effort our self knowledge, but more philosophy and psychology than it was to try and say that uh we have to adhere to the letter of the law laid down by the Catholic Church. So Uh it to me was saying, think for myself. You know, just don't take what the church is telling me, but really trying to understand the depth and and what it was was the message And um I think that's kind of why I saw a lot of George F. in those two. Almost saw him like they were kissing cousins or uh similar both Russians both um uh had a personal uh story to tell uh that was trying to influence pretty much um about the same time. So I I felt like they were

uh maybe Comrades in arms, if you will. Maybe not exactly the same uh perspective, but at the same time they were both trying to awaken mankind and not just let 'em sleep long taking what everybody told 'em was truth As being the truth. And that's why each one Tolstoy's gospel came out and really visible I kinda see as a a gospel as well. And that's George F's gospel. So they both had different perspectives, but I I thought that they both had a lot of spiritual value Um and that was um I think part of the reason that I found that um Nasrideen. It was supposed to be uh a subtle humor and childlike teachings. Uh and that's what they were trying to say that Jesus was as well, that he had a lot of humor and childlike teachings, which was his parables And so Jesus was the uh pedagogic teacher or teaching as at the child level and not trying to uh overwhelm us. Uh it I I see a lot of parallels there. I kind of like that uh both men were not taking what everybody was telling them was the answer, but doing their own studies and research and coming up with their own perspectives. So that's my thought.

Speaker 6: What you were saying earlier and what Robin was saying too, I think uh kind of hooked up with what Frederico said too. I I see a connection. Uh if I didn't read the Tolstoy uh gospel and don't intend to, uh, but if it is more directed toward uh an intellectual approach, then it seems to me like there is uh a a connection to the use of psychology as uh a spiritual device, particularly in that era of Freud to Young I might be off there. And I also have uh often thought that a lot of spiritual teachers uh essentially have uh a a way of proceeding and that is to uh find a following and write a gospel. So uh and I'm thinking particularly like Rudolf Steiner and Madame Blavatsky. And uh I originally thought that about uh Gurchiv, as you seem to have also, JD, but I've departed from that. I think it's its own thing and quite different from uh any of the other sacred uh would be sacred writings. So I'm I'm just pontificating now. How do you like that? I'm pontificating. Okay. And I will stop there.

Speaker 1: But Sandy, I just uh you put a smile on my face just now because this is the second time today that I hear the word the name R Rudolf Steiner. And the first time was in a talk show, a totally superficial talk show. They were interviewing some sort of pop musician or something and he said that all his life he had gone to a Waldorf school to a Rudolf Steiner school. And then uh I've spent months, sometimes a whole year, without anyone bringing up Rudolf Steiner. What are the odds? And on the same afternoon. It it happens twice. But uh something I've I've discovered that I that also speaks to me here in this In this portion of the book is, I don't know if some of you have experienced this. There, the moment someone hears that you're in a fourth way group There's a sort of morbid curiosity mixed with respect but trying to provoke and um It it it's it's a it's frightening, it's a bit spooky because one knows how it's going to end They immediately end the conversation or wrap up the conversation comparing with the, oh yeah, yeah, that's what I do with my analyst. And uh I used to when I was younger and more tender, I I used to spend energy trying to make them see. But looking back The more you you try to share and to open up, the more they hate you. Because deep down they know that that you are speaking of a from another level and they think that you are you are placing yourself above them which um I and it used to be many years ago. I used to have that, oh yes, I'm in a gurgish group and you're not. But that was decades ago. And they keep coming at me. And they're they're younger and younger and they still come at me. And uh as if I went about uh ringing doorbells and saying, hey, join the join Robin's group or whatever. So I I totally resonate with this. This man never fails to cheer me up, Mr. Gudif

Speaker 5: And you too, Sandy. People don't like it when you upset their apple cart. And that's what uh happens.

Speaker 3: I think there's an element of this first chapter, the peacant trait, that's a warning to people in the work not to really talk to people outside the work. Because it doesn't take you anywhere, it doesn't achieve anything. And I think you can read it in that way. If you want to.

Speaker 7: I think they're a an interesting pair of chapters, the um a a pecant trait and the first growl. Um it strikes me that um you have this uh anathematization of these beings or of of Hussein potentially if anybody hears about him and uh the writer of this um newfangled gospel um and Um what's why I see them as being connected is that one of the primary messages of the gospel teaching is uh to see one's hypocrisy and primary message, I probably should never say that, but one of the messages in the Gospels is certainly about hypocrisy and about And another side of it is also forgiveness and to allow a person to change, not to allow a person, but to to to to um um to wish that that um oneself or another person can um renounce their ways to change to to to to be like the prodigal son and uh and then to be welcomed and and open and and yet That's entirely missing from the attitude of somebody telling the truth about you. They're slugs. And rather than seeing it as thinking, yes, that's true, that's who we are, instead it's like, how dare you say that to me? And similarly with the the um although although differently with the um the writer of the new writer of the of the gospels um who is um um not forgiven from trying to write um something which would um um be similar to to the gospels, which would of course have to include the idea of um that we're slugs and that um um and the need for and and the and the idea of um of uh changing of mind So I I see that that the two chapters connected in in that way, in that the the um the gospels speak about um something which is not practiced by these hierarchs in the in in their not recognizing that yes indeed this this this this young boy who said this has a has a point you know So there's my two bits.

Speaker 1: I just remember Go ahead.

Speaker 2: Whoever's talking.

Speaker 1: No no no no up to you.

Speaker 2: Oh, well, I just I think you're onto something with with focusing on hypocrisy, uh Richard. I mean one of the things I took away from uh from these two chapters is you know I I looked up the roots of anathema uh and it it it originally came from a Greek word that means to set up a votive offering in a church but it began to mean that you set up an offering to something cursed or something that's antithetical to Christianity. So that you've really committed a very serious offense against religious truth, and to be anathematized was to be excommunicated. basically being told that you were barred from heaven forever. That was not a small thing to have happen to you at that time. So it was a very, very severe uh response to someone and and and and it it struck me that these people would anathematize Hussein for calling them slugs It speaks to the incredible power of internal considering and how it keeps us asleep. It applies even to the way I look at myself. I mean, you know, one of the earliest things this work says is you can't do this work unless you are sincere with yourself. And you know, I've gone along saying, sure, I can be honest with myself. I know my I know my my failings. But the more you look at yourself, the more you see things that really cause you to flinch at times. And um and so you're you you You have to be careful not to internally consider about your own observations of yourself, but to accept them with impartiality. And that's a very, very difficult thing to do, even for oneself And then to do it to somebody else, the fact that you become anathematized, isn't that really the way it is? I mean, it is If you insult somebody in the old days, if you insulted an aristocrat or insulted the king, you could be put to death by saying something that was considered disrespectful about them. Put to death. That's how strong the power of internal considering is. And um so it's interesting. I keep waiting for uh I I'm still amazed that people like Jimmy Kimmel and and John Stewart get away with the things they can get away with. It's the test us to uh To the resilience to the democracy haven't been incarcerated. Because in other societies they would have been silenced long ago. So I don't know, this this really struck me is is how uh vulnerable we are to taking an offense at something that might be true of ourselves.

Speaker 6: I really like your connection of the insult and the uh re in the in the reaction to internal considering uh the slugs being so insulted And uh that they anathematize even a child they would a uh anathematize. And it is it is a it is a warning, I think, as Robert pointed out And I I wanted to ask, uh, on the last page uh of the uh a pequant trait, having finished us, Beelzebub looked with a smile on his favorite. I find that kind of uh odd in terms of uh Here's the horror story and uh I'm smiling at you while I'm telling it, so you know take it with a grain of salt. I don't think he meant it that one. Maybe Maybe he did.

Speaker 3: So Hussein has accidentally insulted these three brain beings. And Bealzebub is about to seriously insult these three brain beings. So there's a kind of irony. He's probably smiling at Hussein to say, they'll not think about you after what I'm about to tell you.

Speaker 8: It's interesting, Steph, in your statement of how hard it is when we see and we flinch things about ourselves And then it made me absorb that, and how long do we stay in the flinch? And when do we begin to laugh? and then change this characteristic about ourselves. You know how how we're s we're prisoners of this, but every once in a while that glimmer lets us see the bars of our ego of who we think we are and who want who we want the world to think we are. We want to be clever. And then I find them the most boring. when I'm trying to be clever, but if I'm just being and expressing my heart. But but the point is is that, you know, how long do I spend in that zone is a gauge on how progress how much progress I've made in dissolving this ego, this false view of myself, this sluggish aspect of my slitherings

Speaker 1: In response to st in the resonance with Stefan, I just remembered the That when they you were walking in the Middle Ages and you were walking in some dark place and suddenly Satan came up to you. The phrase was va de retro. And I'd always understood it as back off. But no, I don't know if it was not one of the writers of the work said, what it means is get behind. Vale Ritra is not back off, it's get behind. I know you're going to be with me. But I'm the boss. I know you you're always gonna be a part of me.

Speaker 8: Um harnessing our awareness. Yeah. We're able to see it. I'm not happening. I'm I'm I'm in the valley there. Echo. Maybe that's not either it's telling me to be quiet.

Speaker 4: John has something to say. I could see that it's on his mind. No? You fooled me.

Speaker 5: Everybody audio same

Speaker 9: I'm sorry, um I'll just be brief because I don't know what's going on with this setup here. But I wanted to um mention Carapat of Tiflis. because of this uh anathema business. It seems to me that Gurdjieff is talking about that kind of a process uh with carapet when he's claiming all these people are saying your mother is this, your father is this, so on. And um there seems to be a range of these things I d I personally don't have a habit of indulging in that, so I don't really understand YouTube where there's a bar fight. And people take these things, you know, uh, um, as if they're sincere, but they're they can't be

Speaker 7: Well, um maybe not following up uh up on what you're saying, but but the carapet of Typhilis is casting a kind of a spell. He's by by insulting the by by by by pronouncing these the these the this these um uh insults, you could say, um, in order to ward off the harmful um um uh backlash from people who resent him um s um blowing the whistle in the morning And it is always so much fun to take a word that I think I know what it means and then to look up what it actually means. And so looking at the word gospel, I know what the gospels are, but I don't know what the word means. So the word means glad tiding announced by Jesus one of the four gospels, literally good spell from um good and spell Um so here we have um kind of a contrasting thing

where where um the the attempt to do something um that's your job to release a steam whistle you have to you you feel sick from it because you realize there's bad vibes coming from the people who are awakened so you you f ward them off with a spell. And I think he was reading a book called Dreams and Witchcraft in order to prevent these bad vibes. And here we have the contrast where you have somebody writing a gospel, the good spell, being anathematized and uh and um uh criticized. So there's something funny happening there. Uh there's also something funny with the with the idea that this book fell into his hand and um that it would have you know this book should have just slipped into the niches of the libraries of the bibliomaniacs there among the multitudes of other books expounding similar truths. But then he's going to be anathematized he's going to be um some propose that he should simply shut up and where there are many rats and lice breed. Others propose to send him to Tembuktu. Now we know yes Tenbuck two means the middle of nowhere, but in fact it was well known um as um Whitke kindly tells me that it was uh well known as a the um a center for Islamic scholarship, an extensive trade network supporting an important book trade So there's this other this other thing happening here as usual with Guratif, which is like, um, I smell a rat. I smell something else happening here. I don't know quite what But um it certainly um deconstructs thinking that I absolutely know what he's talking about because there's Yeah, because of these these these um um other associations that come up when I look up words like gospel or ten book two

Speaker 5: I always thought that too was a word that uh meant it was hard to get to or a long journey. And that was the way it was inferred.

Speaker 7: Absolutely, but it was known to be this place of a book trade from the 12th century, and books were a very important thing in ancient times. We don't appreciate the work that was made to to I mean that they weren't on a they weren't there wasn't a movable press at those times. So so the trade in books was important. So um yes, it was Um as we take it, of course, that expression means that, and we also know the gospels are this book in the Bible But to know what the root is and where it came from is something he's always seeming to to tease us or reward us. Um he rewards me at least with with taking me out of um well someone said the the other day that oh books don't change you. It's like absolutely not. Um Gertje's writings have changed me because it's expanded my mind. It's made me look at a whole world of things I would never have considered. in an ordinary existence.

Speaker 6: I really like what you said about Timbuktu. I think that's an important addition. And I'll bet you Gurchup do that. And uh he didn't just use it the way I would use it, meaning that far-off place that nobody wants to go to. Uh so I think that's a really good one. And I also like John's use of the word uh epithets and the connection to uh character tethless. because uh yeah I would not have thought of it, but it's gonna percolate in my mind that um in some ways uh Kerpet is casting anathemus at the people he's waking up to some extent their uh epithets, but uh in and I like They uh and I like what people said about uh they may not be intentional, but they're received that way as results that draw on uh real anathema. So, uh, how close do you relate a curse to an anathema? I think that's something worth uh considering. Uh also I wanted to ask Robert. Uh he told us about someone who was anathematized. And if you want one more horror story about anathemas, he could give us a good one. If he wants to.

Speaker 10: Uh yeah, that was Barak Spinoza in 1656. The Jews of An Amsterdam anathematized him even before he had published anything. And um they anathematized him i in it's in a document that they said that by the consent of God. They they cursed him with that he would be cursed at night, cursed by day, cursed going out, cursed coming back. And um they did this just horrible thing to him that he um had to leave Amsterdam, changed his name from a Hebrew name to a Latin name, and started grinding lenses and telescopes and developed silicosis 20 years after the anathema. So he from 1650 he died he died when he was 44 and the anathematized him in

when he was twenty-three. So that's where the community expells them. What's that?

Speaker 5: I was gonna say I think the Orthodox Church really anathematized um um Tolstoy as well, um, because it's a gospel that they considered that um They only believed what they invented and what they considered true and to hear something from somebody else outside of their orthodox uh would have made them try and reject his writings Um you know, he told somebody came out saying that uh you should not believe what people say, live in the present, uh beware of the leaven of the Orthodox teachers uh a long lift the materialistics and the rulers. They said no temple is necessary, that the only true temple society is many knighted in love. um the beginning and end of everything is the soul of man, and that his teachings were to awaken in life those that were asleep. a lot of parallels with George F. , but obviously all the things that the Orthodox would have been adamantly against then so the fact that he was ostracized uh in indicates the same thing why th maybe he was using an example uh in this passage that we're reading

Speaker 1: Um in connection with something that that uh Richard was referring to, I just remembered that when when we read we read in the gospels the urge to repent and repent your sins I I know nothing of Greek. I'm just repeating what I read this uh hypothesis that Actually, the term in Greek is metanoia, which means change your way of thinking. And uh I resonate with what Richard said that that the book changed his way of thinking. And in a way, there is a repentance, isn't it? Because we realize that Uh oh, I don't want to steal the phrase, but it's it's like we're born again. Guruji fians. It's as if one had been born again through the the impact of uh of the of the teaching and of the of the the actual book. And there's this story I think it's with not where it not says to Mr. Gujf, oh, I feel so sorry for people who will never meet you. And uh after you're gone and and the Gujiv tells them, you identify with me. No identify with me, identify with my work. One day The book will be read in churches. I'll I'll try to look it up. I don't do much homework, but I I'm gonna start doing it because everyone here is an A student And I'm falling I'm falling behind. Well one of the reasons it'll be reddish. I I'm with a major leagues here. I I I it's this is an AP course. I think I need to be transferred. No, seriously, I'll do my homework and uh if no one remembers where that that conversation happens, I promise I'll I won't rest until I find I'll ask internet uh artificial intelligence.

Speaker 11: Yeah.

Speaker 7: Well, one one of the reasons it'll be read in churches is because they're for rent There maybe not on Sundays, but most of the other days of the week you can certainly rent a hall in a church.

Speaker 6: Uh does anybody know who the ancient Chalchians are on page 102? Everybody today looks on his writings with the same veneration with which ancient ancient Chalchians were listened. as they are listened to the predictions of their sacred Pythonus, which in the 1931 version he calls a Pythias. Pythias rather than Pythonus, so he changed his wording with that predictor. But who are the ancient Chalchans? Anyone know?

Speaker 3: It's probably the Chaldeans.

Speaker 6: Oh, okay.

Speaker 3: And I say probably because I know I'm not sure, but it's the only ancient name that is close to Chaldeans.

Speaker 8: What struck me was when he said that the contemporary people gather all the old books and put them all together. And make a book out of it. So it brings to mind no note has never been played before No word has never been said, no point has them never been made before. It's

a resonance. But um and then also the fact that he was such a devout Greek Orthodox are really heavy duty. into their religion and that he, you know, kind of cast a shadow over it in a way, uh and said, then you stick it in the biblical shelf of the libraries Like it minimizing it. It it's amazing that uh 'cause I I met a few Greek Orthodox and they're pretty steadfast and they don't like to be called slugs. But but the the whole thing from the beginning is that we are. There's an aspect to us that's that But does it make us flinch when we're made aware of that? Let it be that we make ourselves aware of it ourselves as the I. Gets the right glasses to see clearly. And and may I never know what Gajif is talking about. But my forever or even know what the words mean May I always be it be a mystery that I delve into it as I look into the mirror of my own soul.

Speaker 5: Sandy, the the calcan in my nose that I looked up, I didn't know how it really fit into the overall theme of the section, but uh s I came up with drive from Sanskrit for Kalkan, I think which was mentioned, which means foul, dirty, wicked, having sediment or turbid. Hmm. If that helps.

Speaker 3: God, this group is good at research, isn't it? That's wonderful. Means I don't have to do anything. So here's a question that you can all try and answer if you like to. The first growl. Who's growling?

Speaker 7: Well, I I was just gonna say something about growling, um, and that was that it because it means um you know, a rumbling and a sound. And it reminded me of a sort of a coy way or or or a kind of a way of saying um in the beginning was the word. um that it is about the formation of um of of speech um of of of kind of a a reference to that and yeah

Speaker 5: Or meals of bumps through in the growling and he's probably gonna do a whole bunch more before he's done.

Speaker 1: What a a growl is what a dog does when He's angry at you when he's he's warning you to to stay away, I think, also.

Speaker 3: Well, so do wolves and so do lions. It's not it's not dog specific, is it, Growl?

Speaker 9: Doesn't the spaceship growl? Aren't there sort of rest stops here and there where it growls?

Speaker 7: It seems that the grow will be the response to being called the slug.

Speaker 8: So I'll say it. You're all a bunch of slugs. Now, what happens inside of you when I say that? Yeah, yeah, that's what I think it's begging us to do, is these see the sluggish aspect of ourselves It seems to be just drawn towards that. But it makes such a big picture whereas in the second person, the little kid, is saying this, but then he's saying, Well, you're gonna be condemned to to to uh you, your father and me, you know, but we're all he he's saying it. They're not the slugs are us. The slugs arrest. And then he say, okay, you'll be condemned not to be able to go to Slug Heaven. But who wants to go to Slug Heaven anyway? You know, what are we creating, you know, for ourselves now as far as the the redemption and and all of these things of having the like it the person said changing our thinking. Is that where the resumption to to change? You know, are we opening up to that or is our thinking simply trying to know what somebody's saying, what the meanings of the words are, you know, that the mechanical surface of it And not the meaning that resonates in absorbing the very gist of what it is, as opposed to the semantical circuitous route that we can go about as our minds are programmed to want to know as opposed to learning always

Speaker 1: There's something about one's relationship to rules. As I have equal components of uh of uh Latino and and Anglo culture and genes, I can relate to two different attitudes. In the Latino culture The the power possessors are always perceived as the enemies, as uh and as the so then if

Um I remember my mother, God rest her soul, she had to fill in a form to get a pension. in Argentina. And she was missing some years of seniority. And so she uh she had to uh signed a paper saying that she had been a governess for three or four years that she was missing um to a friend of hers. And she said, I can't lie to the government And uh my father convinced her, saying, yeah, yeah, but that's the American government. You you have to lie to the to the Argentine government because the Argentine government lied lies to us. Well okay I don't like it but but she so she did it. And I remembered how I went to the American school in Buenos Aires And uh I remember that how strange it was for me that they used the verb cheating, cheating in an exam. And in Spanish you don't say cheating, you say copying. Oh, I just copied the right answer. I as if uh uh so then they take the the Well, we're talking of the sixties here. I don't know if that's changed in in your culture. Um but but they took the rules as uh they felt they were slugs that they weren't against the rules and uh Whereas in this other culture, uh uh you're smart if you break the rules, because anyway, who makes them? The slugs make them. I don't know. I I'm not trying to come to any conclusion here, but I'm it's interesting to see how different uh reactions to

Speaker 5: I kind of like the use of the word floods in this reading because to me I I've always conceived of that as being a an insult that was used in Russia a lot. that uh people call themselves slugs there quite often. Uh and particularly of uh horners. They call foreigners slugs as well, but uh slugs will eat anything And that's kind of what we do when we're reading and the books that we take. Once it's written down or on the internet, then we eat it up and we think it's true. And unfortunately as drugs just wind up being a parasite that tends to destroy everything good in the final sense of the word.

Speaker 6: The um power possessing beings, it comes up Uh basically on page 102 uh and I think it's pretty important as uh Federico was talking about it. Uh You know, the the power-possessing beings of this community, usually with pockets full of money, still continued in their turn to go to other communities. For a roulette and baccarat proceeded, and we really need to think about what the heck does he mean by why is that important that these gambling games proceeded among the power-possessing banks And carrying on their discussions concerning Tolstoy, they gradually infected the beings of other communities. But they were also trying to get the people that were keeping them full of money. Uh just uh in their place and uh I thought it was in that section, but I was wrong. But anybody have anything to say about uh anything more about the power possessing beings and their intention to keep people down And it backfired on them?

Speaker 12: Well, I I was wondering if um those were the ones that growled. Oh Because they were disturbed of their topor and they wanted to return to their money and their games and to their sleep. And so possibly maybe that's who was growling. They preferred, you know Yeah. I don't know.

Speaker 2: I think I think you're on to something. I looked up uh I looked up the word freak. Interesting. Not what I expected. It uh it has sort of a dubious, I mean it's it's a puzzling origin. But there's a Middle English freak, F-R-E-K, which means eager, zealous, bold, brave, or fierce, not attributes we normally think of as freaks, and in another one. It used in the Scottish freak, it meant a brave man or a warrior, greedy, eager, bold, impudent. fierce. And so uh he could be saying that these power possessing beings and these these three-brained creatures do have a certain fierceness about them if you dare to uh to insult their vanity So there could be I don't know why it's the first growl though. Like you would think the first growl would have come long, long, long ago, but I think you're onto something, Janet.

Speaker 6: I like that too, Janet. And I I found uh what I was actually should have mentioned first. It's actually on page uh 100, I think In the contents of this new gospel also, power-possessing beings found something which also to their understanding might keep the ordinary beings of

their community from hibernating again So that uh contrast between uh trying to keep uh the ones that keep them in power asleep

Speaker 5: Another would refer to the image of a bear, and the bear has always been identified with Russia.

Speaker 12: And I was just wondering, just one other quick thing to add, uh why they have to go to such the extreme to anesthetize, you know, to that That extreme of retribution, if you will.

Speaker 6: Um destroy utterly, right?

Speaker 3: Well, the anathem was normally used to excommunicate people that preached incorrectly, and that's exactly what Tolstoy was doing So to to pronounce an anathema on Tolstoy is not really a surprise at all. It's the way the church behaves. The church had been known to anathematize people that weren't false preachers, but it's really that was what it was for. And just say something about Rulette and Baccharat. That's the law of accident. Of course it is.

Speaker 9: I'd like to point out something on my mind from I got a I got a uh a notice that a friend of mine said something on Facebook and I went to look look at what he said and what other people said. And it just reminded me of a there was obviously a a bunch of

Speaker 10: bunch of people who know like they're shaming some of it, they're also v um getting pleasure out of it. And this word pequant, um It means spicy, but Gurdjieff uses it in the uh meetings with remarkable men where he's uh on a gramophone and he's telling pecant ac anecdotes. to the customers that are on those uh that are getting their shoes shined. And um so Peacant um Uh it's used also in the tales for um the piquancy of the strangeness of the mentation is that they never occur in their mentation the process called to ponder So I I like what you're saying about that. I I wouldn't have mentioned it before. Um but Robin I I I wanted to ask you about the law of accident because he um Gurdjieff says that Hussein should beseech fate. Now fate is the law of accident.

Speaker 3: No, fate is not. No, you got it wrong. Fate is the law of the planets. And it's fate with a capital F, so it absolutely means fate is the law of the plants. Law of accident is law of earth or law of moon.

Speaker 10: Okay. So Robin, is the is the law of fate then the one he's beseeching fate? How can he ask fate to intervene by a beseeching?

Speaker 3: Well I i i if you personify fate, you can ask it to do anything, I suppose. It depends upon what you think fate means. But fate is something that applies to essence and not to personality or to false personality.

Speaker 1: About what John said of the tribes, we do that in sports. um at least uh uh i in Argentina and and Uruguay, um you can see supporters of one soccer team um Anathematizing the supporters of other teams and even violence that ends up sometimes in in in murder. So I would say it's the same impulse that uh when when it that is applied in politics is applied in sports. It's like the the venue is just an excuse. What they need is to be to be a tribe and to go to war with other tribes, I guess.

Speaker 12: David Hawkins goes on at length in this on this topic in his book, Power vs. Force. And he talks exactly about that, where, you know, the force energies of uh tribal connection and affiliation and loyalty. um patriotism, um and nationalism, and he waxes on rather poetic on this in terms of how force calibrates so low on the scale of consciousness, but power ultimately quite

high. And it speaks exactly to those energies that attract people toward those tribal fixed positions. where one certainly does not change one's mind if me mentanoia is is part of the conversation.

Speaker 1: Going back to Rudolf Steiner for the third time this evening, I remember I taught at uh at uh Waldorf school for one year. And uh I remembered that in the country of soccer, they they refuse to teach soccer to their students and to allow the students to participate and it's a big thing in Argentina, interschool soccer matches. Well the Waldorf uh school did not participate. Because Rudolf Steiner wrote that it was a a dangerous sport for youths because the seat of willpower is in the legs. And anyone who practices soccer is going to have an excess, a hyper development of willpower and of trying to impose upon others. Well, it just yeah.

Speaker 6: I want to say, Janet, that was fantastic what you were saying about the David Hawkins book and especially in relationship to what Federico was saying about metanoia, which you mentioned again. That's really something to be pondering this week. So thanks for that. And I do have a question. Uh one of my favorite sayings in this is pouring from the uh empty into the void. I don't think that's original of Gurch Jeff. Use it uses it twice twice in our readings, but anybody have anything anything to say about it?

Speaker 3: There's about seven Russian authors that used it before Gyrj did, including actually Tolstoy. But um also including Dostoevsky, Turgenev, I think, you know, that it it's a common phrase that goes back, it supposedly goes back to 400 BC. Well it it was originally Greek, but you know.

Speaker 6: No, originally Greek, okay.

Speaker 3: Yeah, the Russians picked it up in the end

Speaker 9: I have a thought about that. I always think uh the the that's the negative, but the positive might be a representation of the array of creation Which comes from the empty into the void.

Speaker 12: That's a cool idea. I was thinking something smaller. Um, I thought maybe it was just a way to articulate the mechanical mind, the the whole circle of falsity of that we think we understand something and we're you know we're just pouring emptiness into the void, you know, from the empty empty into the void. Um but that's a cool idea about it being representative of the ray.

Speaker 6: So it's canadical money. And and John I'm going to ask again. I did I just didn't hear what you said about uh the ray. And also just occurred to me, uh Ouroboros, the snake swallowing its tail, would that be a similar symbol or not?

Speaker 7: Yeah, and you could you could take the um the empty and the void um both as dough because you've got absolute in the very beginning of everything and at the other end the um which would include the empty uh and the the very other end you have um absolute um Um the absolute void. So perhaps it is conversations that never get beyond Doe.

Speaker 1: Also, what comes to mind is uh the image of Robin speaking of contemporary science and and astronomy. I think that's a phrase he would use with delight if he hasn't used it already.

Speaker 3: Yeah, pouring from the um empty into the dark matter.

Speaker 4: Your use of the term metanoia took me back to something I had looked at before, and that is an etymology, a freak. At 1560, it was sudden apparent turn of mind, a whimsical quality or disposition. So um anyway, a little connection

Speaker 8: Somehow it seems to denote a nonconformist, someone who doesn't go along with the pack, so they're termed a freak. Because they're not doing what everybody else is doing. But then the other meaning is that they're courageous. It's amazing. And Tolstoy's last words From what I understand from some source, it might not be correct, because I wasn't there, but where were the peasants Where are the peasants in the station where he died? He wanted to be with the peasants. And why did he want to be with the peasants? Because he saw how there. their faith and their their beliefs and how much i but they did not have a good life. And they still uh and then Dostoevsky, his last one was How much darkness can the light of one candle push back? You know, it it's like you you know, this thing you get to the point, the common denominator. And Tolstoy was definitely talking about not being religious but being spiritual embodying what these these words were meaning and not pious and and things like that. So it's it's very uh it's very stirring that uh just like uh Carnegie, you know, he was he was he was a dirty rat. He controlled everything. He hired the Pinkertons to beat up the people to work on the trains. But one day he woke up And then he became a philanthropist. He sold his company to Jay Paul Getty for four hundred million dollars, which must have been billions then, right? And somebody told him uh Paul Getty asked, told him, you could have got more. He said it didn't matter. at a certain point in in life, maybe to get to the point in the void and the emptiness where where's the meaning? And it's not in what usually drives us. you know, the things, the power, the knowledge. Where's the meaning? The meaning is living maybe in a certain way. And that's why Tolskoy he wanted to be with the peasants. Though he had he he was born a privileged.

Speaker 6: Eric, I haven't heard your voice or Kelly's tonight. Got anything to say, you guys?

Speaker 13: Hi Sandy. I of of a few a few people have mentioned um spiritual And uh which kind of confuses me because I heard that your chief was a 24 karat materialist. So like of course to say everything is spirit or everything is matters to say that is to say that everything is spirit and vice versa. So I don't know what people are refer referring to when they say spirit, although I don't mean to be critical because in the tales, Beelzebop refers to life as the spiritualization of beings. But so I don't know what he's uh talking about They're either if it's like certain hydrogen numbers or something. Maybe maybe uh like like JD and uh Sandy and Stefan who were talking about spirituality, if if they could like clarify what they mean by that.

Speaker 6: Not me, I haven't written that book yet. And if I did, I'd be doing like Tolstoy and just borrowing from all the other writers and putting it down and pretending it was original, I'm afraid.

Speaker 8: Maybe it could be an aspect of our being that has nothing to do with anything material uh the spirit uh where what's moving you when you express something uh uh you know spiritual uh uh not necessarily a realm but an aspect within us if we choose to cultivate the capacity to perceive that uh outside of the physical realm totally the spirit, the the what moves us, what moves me. And I like to be more in touch with that because the physical realm is so limited.

Speaker 3: Let's just be completely um clear about what Good you've said about materialism. He said everything is material. So everything that you just talked about, Stefan, that's also material. Even God is material. By material it means it can be weighed and measured. Even God can be weighed and measured. So the idea of anything not being material is excluded from the Gurdjieffian view. So if you're talking about something that's not material, you're not talking about anything in the work.

Speaker 8: Forgive my transgression, please.

Speaker 3: It's all right, you forgive him.

Speaker 7: Well uh uh uh Derek to me one of the things that just a really simple way of for me to think about spiritualized is um something uh having qualities that are higher to which uh that are that are higher higher than which it it it ordinarily has. You could say um a a a tree um or or or or a log um that has been cut and made into um more usable pieces of wood, um two by fours, two by sixes, whatever, has been spiritualized to an extent. It has something higher brought into it And so um it's still material, but it's been it's been worked. It's been it's been infused with something from um that is um sort of not net that not as that raises its state to something higher. Kind of like what you get in in the beginning of the book with the uh with um the prayer to the um the father's son and holy holy ghost or holy spirit you have the active passive and neutralizing so you have the higher matter, lower matter, and then the lower matter being brought up to a higher position. That's my simple way of looking at it.

Speaker 1: I can share, Derek, my experience with uh sitting every morning. And sometimes I don't get past the first, mostly I don't get past the first stage, which is I have the sensation of the body And uh I can see ideas trying appearing on their own, thoughts on their own, and take a tiny distance from them. Now, when I stay, when I I decide to stay for 40 minutes, then at one point There is an experience of first of actually seeing the mind as if That is not myself, that there is a myself that is not has nothing to do with that mind functioning. It's the same as as uh as my fingers And then if I persist there is um I don't know how to call it. It's it's what I would call uh this the spiritual experience which is the it's matter at a at a degree of uh of um Of vibration or I don't know how to call it, but that it it it tastes different from the ordinary And that is, I think, what people say when they say, no, but this I've I'm in spiritual. I'm not this. No, no, no. It says uh I I concur with Robin that that that Gurjef points d don't imagine it's like some smoke that is going to appear inside your being. No, no, it's all But you must have experienced that, Derek. I am sure. You must have experienced that there are moments in which there is something that transcends. the ordinary vibration of of your mind or or whatever.

Speaker 3: Federico, what you're really talking about here is you're talking about the ray of creation and all of the octaves within the ray of creation and all of the octaves and all of the octaves in the ray of creation. And when you talk about a specific state You're completely correct to use the word vibration. Because every substance, as far as we're concerned, from the perspective of the work, every substance has a density and a vibration. And that's how in one way or another they're allocated across various octaves. So when you actually talk about a particular experience as being higher um than usual is probably higher in respect of something else. But it just means it's a higher note in an octave. You know, or that's a way of looking at it. And when Gurdjieff declared the whole materialism, I mean, first of all, he removed all of the superstition completely by making that statement. So when he says angel, he means a goddamn angel. You know, that's what he means

Speaker 8: So Robin, so you're saying it can be measured, in other words, it can be quantified and weighed, but does it have to be used are there different scales? for different ab aspects of its material. This this thing

Speaker 3: The ultimate degree of materiality, the The level of the absolute is indivisible. The only indivisible atom as far as Gurdjieff was concerned is an atom of the absolute. It's not divisible But everything below that is divisible. Everything at the level of the sun absolute, it consists of three. um atoms, everything at the level of the galaxy consists of six and so on. You know, I mean this scheme, right? It should be in everybody's head. You know, Gageev said if you do not understand the work from the perspective of the universe, then working on yourself is a waste of time. You you actually have to see the outs outside outer scale as well as the inner scale. Because if you don't, if you only see one, you have nothing to actually um Model it against. You have no comparison. So you're you're shooting in the dark, really.

Speaker 8: A synonym for indivisible.

Speaker 3: So you want another word for indivisible? Yeah, it's in a book. The word atom, Greek word atom, actually meant indivisible.

Speaker 8: Well, maybe something a little closer to our uh contemporary times, maybe.

Speaker 6: Do you like the idea of unified?

Speaker 8: Yeah, that will do.

Speaker 6: And and I wanted to ask, uh I ran away from that question real hard and fast, didn't I, Derek? I don't want to talk about spirituality. Um and um I wanted to ask you. Well yeah, and I just want to ask Robin real quick. To me, it does relate to uh energy. Vibration and um nope, not at all. But also uh electromagnetism. Yep, all of it

Speaker 3: It's all the same. It's it's like we by what's happened in the past ten years has changed the work completely in terms of your ability to get a reasonable handle upon how it all works because the electric universe theory is how it all works. And you can you can find parallels between the electric universe and between the work that allows you to understand pretty much everything. You know, but the it Gurdjieff didn't use terminology that he didn't know the meaning of. And we, because we are really poor at the use of language And because we don't even have, let's say, a good discipline in thinking properly, we we find ourselves in a situation of using words that we don't actually know the meaning of. Which means we're talking crap.

Speaker 4: So of the word spirit, the etymology is bre bre breath, breathe. The same as inspire or expire. So when we when I sit to focus on my breath is a door opening to something for me.

Speaker 3: Yeah, I mean that's a good way of looking at it. You've got three octaves that you can work with in the outside world and the inside world. And in the outside world, the breath is the atmosphere. And in the inside world, it's the energy. Energy comes with breath. That's where the energy comes from.

Speaker 13: Well that was all very helpful. Thank you.

Speaker 3: Oh really?

Speaker 5: Is there anything I'd ask if you asked a question about uh what my input would be to spiritual or to spirit spirituality. Um I I I tend to see anything that I get from whether they be visionaries or spiritual leaders. Uh they're trying to explain the unexplainable. Uh they don't have the data, I don't have the data, uh, in order to estimate the character of what we're talking about. Uh so we don't know how whether we should reject the message because we distrust it or don't understand it, or we just accept it even if we accept it as nonsense and therefore it's truth. So when you're hitting spirituality, I think you're just saying accept the nonsense as truth and then when you're materialistic then you're saying it can't be measured and I can get the data

Speaker 1: Look what you started, Derek, thank you. You you galvanized all of us.

Speaker 2: You moved, I'll spirit. It's a very interesting discussion, but let me be impudent enough to uh change to s change paths. in our remaining time because something just struck me about this. It didn't the first time. You know, the Beelzebub is saying something pretty serious to Hussein. I mean, he says, be that as it may, you were in any case extremely rash to call the three-brained beings breeding on that planet Earth. by such an offensive name. First, because you have made me

anxious for you, and secondly because you have laid up for yourself a menace for the future. And rash, by the way, originally meant quick, like a quick horse. It meant quick-witted and insightful. Uh and then it took on the the the connotations of recklessness a little later, a couple centuries later, but so it probably means both in this case, because Hussein is insightful. So but he's but he's this is a rat this is a rather stern warning um uh coming from a grandfather, even though he knows that Hussein didn't really know what he was saying and was much too young to understand the consequences And he echoes it at the end of the chapter. He says, after he describes what an athenatization really is, he says, do you now understand to what dangers you expose yourself when you call these remote brain three-brain freaks slugs. So he finishes with a smile. Uh because Hussein is innocent of any malice, but he's also delivering a somewhat stern warning here. And um and why? Because isn't Isn't Gurdjieff doing exactly what he is warning Hussein not to do, which is to say something that might be piquant, that is to say something that might sting people into waking up If you're going to try to wake people up, you will pay the price, and it could be a very heavy price indeed. Why is he s why is he saying this when he himself has just uh written a book designed to destroy everything we think we know?

Speaker 7: Well one of the reasons is because he does it very, very slowly. Um he does it over 1,236 pages. before we yeah you know it's it's a very gradual thing it's not a rash thing as you say um as as as has Hussein um has um has made the mistake of doing It reminds me too that in the Paris meetings, um he he says he makes a comment Um I don't know the quotation, but but he makes a comment um to someone about now I see you So he'd waited long enough with observation after observation of a person and goes, aha, now I understand something. And um so he he himself was not rash in making judgments of people that he had to later on going, I'm really sorry that I insulted you. He's very he's careful about uh uh about it until he knows he can um uh and perhaps anticipate the response and to to be most helpful in a way.

Speaker 1: I was just remembering uh J. G. Bennett uh one of the comments he makes in in his experience as a um right after World War I he was commissioned to Turkey because he he spoke Turkish, he knew Turkish very well, and he said it's it's Incomprehensible to the European mind what it means to communicate with someone in a language where sentences may not have predicates. Um I've asked a friend who knows Turkish. I still can't understand what he means, but I I get the gist. And actually We guys, we we we descend from asterisk. I mean, if you remember the the the cartoon, the the barbarian Visigoths and Saxons and soever who who uh played hide and seek with the Romans But uh Gurjiv comes, so then maybe our culture goes back a couple of thousand years, but Gujiv comes from a culture That maybe is uh six, seven thousand, his language is uh seven six, seven thousand years older than ours I don't know, maybe I'm exaggerating, but sometimes I get that feeling that we're like uh new kids on the block and we think we're the most civilized, but we were just Just holding up about playing games in the woods about a thousand years ago. Anyway.

Speaker 8: There's this been a pleasure. It has been a pleasure. with all the daunting and trying to figure things out. And I must say, uh Gary and Kelly, though you you're silent through your expressions and your participation with from your beings has stirred me and I want to thank you so much and everybody else that has uttered what they think and feel.

Speaker 14: I was gonna ask about what Steven said about the warning And the title of the the chapter, the first growl, if that's the bear waking up. Does that make sense The bear waking up from hibernation. Don't wake the bear up.

Speaker 2: The first growl it makes after it emerges from hibernation. That that's pretty interesting.

Speaker 3: That's all I can think of. Oh, that's excellent.

Speaker 11: I I I wanted to make the comment that I've been I've been noticing um the apostrophes that are just all over the place. And how they are kind kind of expand, they make your mind expand. In other words He writes of uh quote gospels and you you just it your your mind is constantly all the all these words rats and lice are I've got a apostrophes around him and to make you think bigger.

Speaker 3: He he's there there are a number of phrases he uses throughout the tales. Which, um, we'll probably have already encountered them a few times, but we will encounter them again, which is, you know, what they call, what is called, and so on Where he's putting a word up and he's saying, this isn't actually the right word for this. But this is all that these human beings have got to describe it. You know, so he says, you know, frequently comes up with, you know, what is called energy, what is called um There's another thing that he's doing, which I think I referred to last time, which is the the use of noun adjuncts, which is basically to take a noun and use it as an adjective. So he refers to being this and being that. And he puts together these phrases that you've never read before anywhere else, you know, common cosmic harmony. What does that mean? You know, because you've never read it anywhere else, so what's it mean? And this is just a completely correct observation by Gary, is that you have to read this book over and over and over to actually get down to the construction that was made in the first instance because We have, I mean, I know this from a number of times I've read this book. We read past stuff that is a bit too difficult. We don't stop and say, I'll better take half an hour to kind of decode this paragraph. It's no and I'll go back. I'll return to that one day. And and we miss stuff, you know.

Speaker 2: Robin, I'm I'm trying to remember from your book To Fathom the Gist, Volume 1, and and what Gary said about apostrophes. which is like inside quotes. Did you say that if quotes were around a word, it might suggest that he's using that word metaphorically? Like there are quotes around Timbuktu. So he's saying I'm using Timbuktu to stand for something more than just the physical place of Timbuktu.

Speaker 3: Yeah, the the use of they're called shock quotes, aren't they? The use of quotes like that normally means that you can't take the normal meaning of the word. And the the big use of this in English and possibly in American, I don't really I haven't read that much American writing. The big use of this is to indicate irony, which isn't something that's common in America, but it's very common in English writing. So you take in an ironic meaning, you know. somebody treats you badly and refer to it as a reward in you know um in inverted commas um so that's Part of it, but in in every instance he's saying, think about the meaning Now in something, I mean there are things that he does, like for instance, when he talks about slugs, he doesn't mention, he doesn't put the slug in quotes. They should do because he what he means is actually lazy person because that was the original meaning of the word slow. And and i it was applied to a mollusk uh a couple of hundred years later.

Speaker 7: Well no, no, because Hussein is is is is is not using it in quotation marks He's using it as something representing slimy. So it wouldn't be in quotation marks because he means it literally.

Speaker 3: Yes, but he he's all it it's also when you look up the etymology, you also suddenly understand it has a double meaning. Whereas the things he's wrapping quotes around, he's telling you you can't accept the normal meaning here.

Speaker 8: Ah So be in a sense of of of explorative questioning as opposed to just trying to sum it up as you're going through it. To be asking. More than just what the mind basically absorbs through our normal way of ingesting.

Speaker 3: I mean, this is why we have this group, you know. It's like we need everybody in one

way or another to say, this looks very odd to me. Because a lot of this stuff actually is very odd. You know, it's not nobody wrote stuff like this. You never read anything like this. And so, you know, there's a problem of trying to understand. Here we go. Page 100. What they called money. Meaning more

Speaker 8: what their representation of it is and there are others to behold to to absorb to grasp Yeah. It's a whole shifting of the mind and the perception and an absorption

Speaker 3: I mean I've said this before, but I'll say it again because it deserves repeating quite a few times in actual fact. Gyurdiv is trying to change your associations. He's trying to get inside your mind and attach new associations to words that have what you call a concrete meaning for you. He's trying to change that. And he's doing it in various ways. But one of the ways he's doing it is the way that he constructs paragraphs because he doesn't use the normal logical flow. that a writer would normally use to explain something. He goes off in one direction, then in another direction, then in another direction, then comes back. You know, and and that means that your associations can't just squirrel it away. They have to in some way or other follow his path. Or else you can just read past it. Don't make the effort This this book changes your mind. Applies metanoia to you without you actually even wanting it.

Speaker 5: That's kind of what the Australia is doing, is it not? Um It can either be something witty and something wise or it could be something foolish and a joke and you have to determine which. That's kind of the inference I'm getting here.

Speaker 6: Well I just wanted to say toward the end here is this we're coming up on the end and you guys are on fire tonight. I mean this has been one of the best meetings I've Been at in a long time. And thanks everybody for participating. I love the Bears Growl and I love the The the the Pika and Growl and Pika were really something I had never thought about before tonight. And I heard you discussing it. Enderic and spirituality, my goodness. Thank you. Thank you all for that.

Speaker 8: We just getting warmed up and it's time to oh my goodness. One day we'll have a marathon and we'll really wear ourselves.

Speaker 6: Oh those are called those are called Ospiano. And love how is your wife? I hope she's recovering well.

Speaker 3: Well well she's doing okay at the moment. Um I find out in the next few days. She's had her operation. She's got a pin stuck in her spine, so. Will um it it she's gonna have to wear a neck brace for um, I don't know, four four weeks, six weeks, eight weeks maybe. But you know she sh she came Is she at home? No, she's not at home. She's in the hospital. In a bed she's still there. I'm going to find out after the meeting whether she's coming home today, but I don't think so. Because if she was a thing she'd already be home.

Speaker 6: Well the reason I mention that particularly is I want everybody to send her good energy. Indeed. Because I know that works. Yeah, Bobby knows it too. Yeah, my God.

Speaker 8: I was thinking the same thing. So I'll use my spirit to transmit it. May she do well, Robin.

Speaker 3: That's very good of all of you. I mean this powerful set of people, I'm sure that she's going to actually be She'll be looking like she was when she was 30 in a couple.

Speaker 4: I might need that surgery. Okay.

Speaker 5: And then Robin might need eye surgery.

Speaker 4: That's very good.

Speaker 3: Okay, so let's let's close the meeting on that jolly note. Thank you everybody.

Speaker 15: Thank you. Thank you for hosting.

## Chat US Meeting

18:39:02 From Federico Balsa : When Gurdjieff says the word "Angel" he means a godxxxxm  
Angel.

18:39:29 From Federico Balsa : I shall cherish that quote for a long time 😊

# AI Summary Meeting 15

## Quick recap

The group met to discuss Chapter 11 and 12 of Beelzebub's Tales, focusing on the themes of anathematization and spiritual awakening. They explored the concept of calling others "slugs" and the potential consequences, as well as the story of a writer creating a new gospel that was met with opposition. The discussion touched on the etymology of words, the nature of spiritual experiences, and the importance of careful observation and understanding. The group also discussed Gurdjieff's use of language and his intention to change readers' associations and perceptions. The conversation ended with updates on Robin's wife's medical condition and well wishes from the group.

## Next steps

- Federico: Look up and report the conversation in the Gurdjieff text where the character says "One day, the book will be read in churches" (Federico committed to finding this reference).

## Summary

### Understanding Earth's Peculiar Inhabitants

The meeting focused on a discussion about the peculiar psyche of contemporary three-brained beings on Earth, as described in a fictional narrative. The story highlighted the potential dangers of insulting these beings, even if the insulted person is far away, as it could lead to an anathema. A recent example was shared about a writer who created a new gospel, which led to his public anathematization. Surprisingly, this anathema resulted in increased interest and fame for the writer, showcasing the strange psyche of these beings. The discussion aimed to provide a useful example for understanding the peculiarities of Earth's inhabitants and the potential consequences of their actions.

### Tolstoy's Gospel and Secular Perspectives

The group discussed the etymology of words and the significance of Tolstoy's Gospel in Brief, which was a rational rewrite of the Gospels that eliminated miracles and challenged Christian beliefs. Robin explained that Tolstoy's work was not popular with the Orthodox Church due to its secular approach. The participants also explored connections between Tolstoy's work and Freud's theories, as well as parallels between Tolstoy and Georgia's perspectives on religion and personal knowledge.

### Comparing Spiritual Teachings and Perspectives

The group discussed spiritual perspectives and gospels, with JD comparing Jesus's childlike teachings to Beasel Bob's approach. Sandy and Federico explored connections between intellectual approaches to spirituality and the use of psychology, while Federico shared his experience of being misunderstood when discussing fourth wave groups. Richard noted parallels between the anathematization of beings in the text and the gospel's message about hypocrisy and forgiveness, suggesting these chapters reflect on how people respond to being confronted with truth.

### Reflections on Hypocrisy and Democracy

The group discussed themes from their reading, focusing on hypocrisy and the power of internal considering. Stephen shared insights about the Greek origins of "anathema" and its severe historical implications, while also reflecting on how easily people take offense and the importance

of self-honesty. The discussion touched on modern examples like Jimmy Kimmel and Jon Stewart's comedic commentary, highlighting the resilience of democracy in allowing such speech. The conversation concluded with reflections on personal growth and the challenge of confronting one's ego, with Federico sharing a historical interpretation of the phrase "Vade retro" as meaning "get behind" rather than "back off."

### **Insults as Spells and Meanings**

The group discussed the concept of anathematizing people through insults, using the example of Carapet of Tiflis. John suggested that such insults often come from people who are "asleep" and not fully aware of their actions, while Richard explored the idea of these insults acting as a "spell" to ward off negative backlash. The conversation also touched on the meaning of words like "gospel" and "Tembuktu," highlighting how language can have multiple layers of meaning and historical context.

### **Books and Transformation: Historical Insights**

The group discussed the historical significance of books and the impact of reading on personal transformation, with Richard highlighting the importance of the book trade in ancient times and its role in spreading knowledge. They explored the concept of anathemas and curses, with Robert sharing the story of Baruch Spinoza's expulsion from Amsterdam in 1656, and Federico connecting the Greek term for repentance, *metanoya*, to the transformative power of books. The discussion concluded with reflections on the legacy of George F., emphasizing the potential for books to change perspectives and inspire spiritual awakening.

### **Philosophical and Literary Concepts**

The group discussed various literary and philosophical concepts, including the ancient Chaldeans, the formation of speech, and the metaphorical meaning of growling. Sandy inquired about the Chaldeans, and Robin suggested they were likely the ancient Chaldeans. The discussion touched on themes of self-awareness, redemption, and the importance of understanding the deeper meaning behind words rather than focusing solely on semantics. The group explored these concepts through a literary analysis, drawing connections to religious and philosophical texts.

### **Cultural Perspectives on Power Dynamics**

The group discussed cultural attitudes towards rules and authority, with Federico sharing his experience of growing up in Argentina with dual Latino and Anglo heritage. They explored the concept of power-possessing beings in a text, discussing how these individuals continued their gambling activities while attempting to maintain control over others. Janet suggested that these power-possessing beings might be the ones growling, as they were disturbed by their top horror and wanted to return to their money, games, and sleep. Stephen offered an etymological analysis of the word "freak," suggesting that these power-possessing beings might have a certain fierceness when their vanity is insulted.

### **Understanding Tribalism and Social Dynamics**

The group discussed the phenomenon of tribalism and its connection to political and social dynamics, with John highlighting how social media platforms can amplify tribal behaviors. Robin clarified the distinction between fate and the law of accident, explaining that fate relates to essence rather than personality. Federico shared examples from South American sports culture to illustrate how tribalism manifests in different contexts, while Janet referenced David Hawkins' work on the relationship between tribal loyalty and consciousness levels. The conversation concluded with a brief mention of Rudolf Steiner's views on soccer as a potentially harmful sport

for youth.

### **Interpreting Creation and Transformation**

The group discussed the phrase "pouring from the empty into the void," tracing its origins back to ancient Greek and Russian literature. John suggested it represents creation from emptiness, while Janet interpreted it as articulating the mechanical mind's circle of falsity. Barbara shared etymology insights about "metanoia" and connected it to non-conformist courage, referencing Tolstoy's desire to be with peasants and Carnegie's philanthropic transformation. Derek raised questions about the meaning of "spiritual" in their discussions, noting that Gurdjieff described life as the spiritualization of beings, and asked for clarification on the term's usage.

### **Gurdjieff's Materialist Spiritual Perspective**

The group discussed spiritual experiences and their relationship to materialism, with Robin explaining that Gurdjieff viewed everything, including spiritual experiences, as material and measurable. They explored how Gurdjieff's writing style uses unusual language and construction to challenge readers' assumptions, with Gary noting the frequent use of apostrophes to prompt deeper thinking. The conversation ended with updates on Robin's wife's medical condition and the group sending positive energy her way.













































