

The 11th Hour

A video interview series hosted by
Barbara Marx Hubbard and Marc Gafni

The 11th Hour

Chapter 1: The Planetary Invitation	2
Chapter 1.1: The Plotline of the Past 100 Years	12
Chapter 2: Our Crisis is New	18
Chapter 3: A New Dharma: After the Deconstructions: The Great Reconstructive Project: From Tragic to Post Tragic Living	39
Chapter 4: The New Story: Allurement, Desire & Intimacy: The New Holy Trinity	49
Chapter 5: Homo Amor, Part One The Intimate Universe in Person	61
Chapter 6: Homo Amor, Part Two: A Deeper Cut: Vocational Arousal and "The Six Core Human Needs"	72
Chapter 7: Homo Amor, Part Three: Intimacy Creates Obligation: Living Your Deepest Heart's Desire	83
Chapter 8: God as the Infinity of Intimacy, Who Knows Your Name, and Is Your Name	90
Chapter 8.1: How Is There Evil in the Intimate Universe?	100
Chapter 9: On the Evolution of Love: Your Need is my Allurement - From Egocentric to Cosmocentric Intimacy	105
Chapter 10: From Role Mate to Soul Mate to Whole Mate: Joining Genes to Joining Genius	114
Chapter 11: High Technology: Innovation Meets the "Intimate Universe" and "Evolutionary Love"	125
Chapter 12: Towards a Planetary Awakening in Love Through Unique Self Symphonies	135

Chapter 1: The Planetary Invitation

Barbara:

I'm Barbara Marx Hubbard, and I'm your host on the precipice in The 11th Hour.

In some respects, I believe I've been on the precipice, feeling like it's The 11th Hour for most of my life because I was born in 1929; I was a happy child, then in 1945 the United States dropped the two atomic bombs on Japan.

My father was a friend of the Generals and they were celebrating, and I was horrified by this power. I realized, even then, that this was the beginning of much greater power. It's certainly not just the atomic bomb, I didn't know it, but right now we know -- it's the nuclear bomb and it's all the new technologies. I was petrified about the meaning of the power while they were celebrating so I asked myself a fundamental question: *"What is the meaning of our new power that's good?"*

Intuitively I felt that the human species was getting these kinds of capabilities for some good purpose. I thought I would ask the question; first I joined the Episcopal Church and I asked them there, and they didn't quite know. Then I went to Bryn Mawr College and I tried to take a course on the future of humanity and the direction of our power and obviously there were no courses on it. Then I had the opportunity to meet with General Eisenhower, he had just become President of the United States, and I was given a courtesy meeting with him because of my father being his friend, so he was very cordial.

I said to him "Hello Mr. President."

He said "Hello young lady, what can I do for you?"

I said "Mr. president I have a question for you..."

"Yes young lady."

"The question Mr. President, is: what do you think is the meaning of all our new power, [*military, scientific, technological* - power] that's good?"

He was shocked, I could just see his head bowed over, he turned back to me and he said very clearly, "I have no idea."

Here's the most powerful man in the world, with all the power at his fingertips and he has no idea what it's for. I thought inside myself "Well then, we better find out!" That became, in some deep sense, the purpose of my life.

I went to Paris to take my junior year abroad, it was in 1948 and everyone there was pessimistic because they had fought these horrible wars with the powers and destroyed millions and millions of people. As I was going around asking the meaning of our power that's good and getting no idea, I went alone to have lunch in a little French cafe called Chez Rosalie.

It was only big, long, wooden tables. A young man, a very handsome American walked in, he had to sit opposite me. In those days I was having red wine and beef steak for lunch, I said "Would you like a taste of my wine?" And he said, "yes," then I said, "I have a question for you..." I learned that his name was Earl Hubbard.

He said, "yes."

I said, "What do you think is the meaning of our new power that's good?"

He amazed me by saying, "I'm an artist and I'm seeking a new image of man commensurate with our powers to shape the future."

I thought, "Well, I'm going to marry you," and I did. We got married in 1951 and we moved to Lime Rock Connecticut.

This young woman that I had been, with all this quest, suddenly got lost. I remember writing in my journal, you know my name was Barbara Marx, and now I was Barbara Marx Hubbard, and I wrote in my journal in Lime Rock Connecticut, "Where did *Barbara Marx* go?" The old person that I had been, disappeared and the new person hadn't come up yet.

During my marriage, not only did I have five children, but I began to study some of the great teachers of evolution: I studied Teilhard de Chardin, a Frenchman who discovered the whole story of creation. I studied Sri Aurobindo, a magnificent man from India who wrote, "The Life Divine."

I studied Buckminster Fuller, who had the idea that we have the resources, technology, and know-how to make the world work for all. He became a friend of mine. He began to notice that I was trying to build up the story of the meaning of our power, and one day he said to me, "Barbara, I think you should run for president, and if you do that, I will give you a plan." Now this is a very unusual thing to do, I had no relationship to politics.

I had a small meeting with some friends and I said "I'm running for Vice President of the United States," somebody said "Run for Vice President, you'll get a hearing," because it was 1984, the Year of the Woman. Much to the amazement of my friends, I wrote them all a letter and I said "I

want you to give a party for me, I'm running for Vice President of the United States, to put an Office for the Future in the Vice-Presidency to map, track, and connect what's working in the world." You wouldn't be too surprised, it was either amusing or interesting so all over the country, people were giving parties for me.

I, with my friend Carolyn Anderson, would arrive in the town and there was the party, and there were the people. I gave my speech and what happened is they all wanted to build the Office for the Future for themselves, they didn't care if I got to be Vice President; it's a very good idea; in general people don't know what's working in the world.

Anyway, I got to San Francisco and people said "Now honey, don't try to enter the convention. They'll make a fool of you." Nobody knew me in politics, the news would never cover me because I was talking about the good news.

The inner voice said, "Enter the convention."

I was let in and I went to all these delegations early in the morning. Of course, nobody had ever heard of me. You don't run for a Vice President as an unknown woman; you simply don't do it...

I got to South Dakota at 5:30 a.m. and I said, "I'm Barbara Marx, I'm running for Vice President and here's what I'd like you to do for me: I want to have the opportunity to make a speech as a Vice Presidential candidate, on the Democratic ticket, to say the Democratic Party is interested in an Office for the Future and bringing forth what works in the world. If I make this speech, I'll turn my votes over to Geraldine Ferraro," who was the real Vice Presidential candidate.

What happened was; I got more votes from delegations than any other woman. Now that's totally amazing, what it tells you is, people were interested in finding out what was working, and a political party should be doing that.

When I got to make this speech, I had to walk out this long stairway, they looked at me as though I was a shadow, they had no idea who this could be. I get to the top of the platform that we had visualized in all the small churches... and I just say this; because visualization and intention makes a difference folks, and that's what we're going to be learning here, in The 11th Hour. ...As I got to the platform to start to speak the guard came up and whispered in my ear, he said: "Now honey, they won't pay any attention to you, they never do, you're saying it for the universe." I looked out at the delegates, and of course nobody was paying any attention to me among the delegates, lots of speeches were given and they had no idea who I was.

I made the speech: *The democratic party will declare to the people of the world that we will identify and connect what's working*, and the inner voice said to me "Barbara, never fear failure again," because if you do something, which we're going to be inviting you to do during The 11th Hour: If you do something like *give your greatest gift into the world* and you say "Yes" to it. You know what? It turns on the force of creation *as you*.

Now, I'm 90 years old and I am absolutely thrilled and delighted to be working with an evolutionary genius, Marc Gafni. Marc and I have decided to join genius. Joining genius, between a 90 year old evolutionary and a 58 year old evolutionary genius who's written many books, I think the best-known is *Your Unique Self*, [because] he's developed a Dharma, a story of evolution, that I actually believe will get us across the gap from the precipice that we're all sitting on, on The 11th Hour, instead of to the devolution of our species. I actually feel Marc, that what you have to offer us is a pathway, and a story, and a Dharma and ideas that are vital for our evolution now. I, with great pleasure, turn my word to you, Marc, to begin our story on The 11th Hour and thank you so much for joining me...

Marc Gafni:

Thank you Barbara. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

What a delight to be here with you, and what a both, urgent, painful and yet alive and important moment in which we can open our hearts, expand our minds and actually take our seat at the table of history.

History is not fair, history doesn't wait for us.

We're busy running our company, we're busy raising our family, we're busy making ends meet, we're busy getting an education; all the important things that we do. Yet, at least for some of us, we have the privilege to actually step out of the confusion, almost - the tyranny of the everyday and to notice what's actually happening: What's actually happening is significant beyond Imagination.

One colleague talks about this as being, not just an incidental set of fundamental shifts, but a fundamental phase-shift that takes place once in exponentially large swathes of time. Another colleague talks about this being; this moment, this 11th Hour, as being like the shift from single cell to multi-celled life -- what we're about to go through. We need to respond to it in order to avoid virtually unimaginable suffering, we're literally poised between dystopia and utopia.

We have the capacity in a way that we never have before: to create heaven on Earth. And we have the capacity to unleash a dystopian hell in which billions of people, will be, to say *adversely affected* - is to use words in a wrong way, to obfuscate - will suffer unimaginably. Huge swathes of people will die and those that don't will be the privileged, the highly privileged. The masses of people will be, not just exploited, but will become irrelevant and subject to levels of suffering and death that are actually unimaginable.

In this moment poised between utopia and dystopia, we feel this deep silence of presence and out of the silence of presence, out of this deep beingness, a word needs to emerge, and what is this word that needs to emerge?

We're now in Chapter One of *The 11th Hour* together, the word that needs to emerge is not a set of facts; although we're gonna need facts. Fact as our baseline is essential, but it's actually a story because human beings think in stories - not in facts, and that's not an accident.

The intelligent cosmos that generated mitosis and meiosis and photosynthesis manifested a reality in which we think in stories. Stories are essential - there's never not a story, we always live and generate our reality from within sentences and paragraphs, and themes and plotlines of our story and even when the story is unconscious; we're still living and generating our reality from within it.

If we need to uplevel reality, we need first, to uplevel *the story* but in order to uplevel the story, we need first to become aware of the story. So many of us live in the story unconsciously, we're asleep.

As we come to what's been called the *Anthropocene*, you Barbara, have talked about so beautifully for 50 years: *Conscious Evolution*, that is to say evolution awakens. Evolution's always been awake by itself, evolution's always been intelligent, one might say, and some say evolution's always been conscious; but *we* were unconscious.

We're now awakening, we're now realizing that evolution's happening *through us*. We're now realizing that evolution becomes conscious, in a new way, through us, because we actually have enormous impact on the future in a way that we never did before. There's an unimaginable distinction: human beings now directly affect the future and whether there will be a future, and what the nature of the future will be and that's never been true in history before.

To be able to realize "What's the story that we're generating from?" A false story, a corrupt story... a degraded story. A downgraded story will actually destroy us.

Charles Taylor, in *Sources of the Self*, says a human being lives in inescapable frameworks. My framework is my story, it's the narrative I live in, it's the plotline that's guiding the characters in the story, myself included. We're guided by our story personally, in our personal lives then my personal story is part of a larger, collective story. It's the prism through which we see reality. If I'm looking through a red prism I see red but if I'm looking through a green prism, I see green, but I'm not even aware that those glasses are tinted by the plotline of the implicit story that I'm living in, breathing in and creating from.

What we're facing today; underneath all of the crises, we talk about the crises of resources. We are, as you know, beloved Barbara, in Chapter Two of *The 11th Hour*, we're going to list in detail and see the crises and how they work; hopefully in a new light. For now, let's look at the underlying crisis, because the underlying crisis is not a crisis of resources. Although, obviously there's an extraction model. We've extracted in several generations what took the Earth billions of years to produce. Clearly, that's part of the crises, but it's not the core of it.

The core crisis is a crisis of Narrative. We can't imagine our story anymore. It's a crisis, if you will, even deeper than the narrative. Underlying the crisis of narrative is what we might call a 'crisis of imagination' and every real crisis is a crisis of imagination. We can't reimagine our story, we've lost the thread of our story.

There's a beautiful old text which refers to the original human mythologically, mythically, or if you're thinking in more classical, biblical, literal terms because -- everyone's included in this conversation -- you can take it literally if you'd like, Adam. Who's Adam? Before Adam and Eve, there's Adam. Adam is not male or female; Adam is beyond male or female, beyond gender; the source of all. The word Adam, in the original hebrew text, means 'd'mayonn', and 'd'mayon' means 'imagination.' Adam's not merely a *Homo sapiens*. Adam is, if you will, "*Homo imaginus*." It's to imagine -- that's the human capacity, to imagine my story. By imagining a story, we don't mean a child's imagination. We often relegate imagination to the realm of children. We say, "Don't worry, that's just your imagination." Really? Just your imagination...

Al Farabi talked about imagination as the core quality that invokes prophecy which is the ability to see the future. My son Eytan hated to read, it was only when *Harry Potter* came out that I was able to bring him to *Harry Potter* and he devoured the book and then was dying for the next one because it actually took seriously the realm of imagination.

In a crisis of imagination, we need to reclaim that ability to imagine and to imagine *Our Story*. Let's try and understand: What do we mean by "Our Story?" Our Story is a universe story; it's an organizing framework and out of, and emergent from that universe story, and we'll talk more about it, is a Narrative of Identity: "*Who are we?*"

Then, there's a Narrative of Power. Barbara talked about Eisenhower saying "I have no idea what the meaning of our power is." We need a Narrative of Power and we've interrogated power as being negative. We say there's a "power dynamic," meaning there's abuse. Corporations are powerful; therefore they're evil. Well that "*therefore*", doesn't follow... we need to *reclaim* a Narrative of Power.

We need a Narrative of Identity: "I", a Narrative of Power: "What's the Meaning of our Power?" We need to embrace and understand our power.

We need a Narrative of Community, which is a narrative of "We".

A Sexual Narrative: we just went through a 'me too' crisis in the United States; but we actually have no idea. I must have read 4,000 articles on 'me too,' because I'm completing a book on it. My God, there was not one article that actually articulated a Narrative of Sexuality -- that's the fourth narrative.

Finally a Narrative of Success, “What does Success mean?” Barbara, we were together, I was privileged to Co-convene with John Mackey and my friend, Kate Maloney a success summit: Success 3.0, in Boulder and Barbara you gave such a gorgeous talk there. We were trying to articulate a new Narrative of Success.

There's an overarching universe story, then the universe story has subsets: there's a Narrative of Identity, there's a Narrative of Power, there's a Narrative of Community, there's a Sexual Narrative, there's a Narrative of Success. We create, we live, we sex, we despair, we joy from the context within all those narratives. Our future, our response to The 11th Hour is directly about the nature of that narrative. Every move we make, every breath we take, takes place within and out of the context of that narrative.

If we want to understand the challenge at this moment in time we might say it as follows: there's a 'global action paralysis'. A global action paralysis; it's why in Belgium, 35,000 children walk out of school to protest the climate because what they understand is that the adult world has lost its imagination, so we need to reclaim Harry Potter. Then Theresa May in Great Britain says, 'These kids are just being truant, they're looking for a reason to escape school.' She's not catching it; it's why she can't re-imagine a world outside of the *Brexit* British crisis. We need to reclaim a narrative. Theresa May is operating without a story. Just as the United States is operating without a story.

There's a global action paralysis or a global action confusion. That global action paralysis, that global action confusion is rooted in what we might call a 'global intimacy disorder.' What's an intimacy disorder? It means that we don't know who we are. We don't know the answer to the question “Who are we?” we don't know the answer to the question, “Who am I?” “What's a Relationship?” “Who are we to each other?” “What's the good life?” “What's the life well-lived?” so how do we actually get anywhere if we don't know what our desires are: What are our desires?

Buddha is reputed to have said in a more accurate version, the original Pali Canon - Buddha has a bad reputation for being against desire, and desire certainly needs to be clarified; but Buddha actually said “Have few desires, but have great ones.” My desire points towards my future. When I desire something: that's a future. We don't have a shared future. You see, the way we created coherence up till now, has been based on the past and the achievement of the present. The memory of the past has created coherence, but we've actually been iconoclasts, we shattered icons of the past, we've shattered the gods of earlier eras that were actually, in many ways false gods, and cruel gods.

Voltaire begins the Western enlightenment by saying “Remember the cruelties.” The shared memory of the past and the shared memory of one's religion or one's nation's memory of the past is actually insufficient to create a global intimacy, to create a global coherence.

In the present, there's a Capitalist narrative that dominates most of the world which says: *until you actually produce something, you're not worth anything*, that's astounding. Your intrinsic worth is based on what you've produced. What does that mean? How shocking is that? When the gap between the haves and have-nots is so great and the old notion you can just pull yourself up by the bootstraps is actually not true, that's a myth. There's enormous inequality in the playing field and there are billions of people who actually don't have that capacity right now, so what does that mean?

Let's just begin to understand: a memory of the past and the requirement to produce, at this moment is actually part of this narrative, that's destroying intimacy, destroying coherence. What do we need? We need a memory of the future. The 11th Hour is about articulating a memory of the future because hope *is* a memory of the future. Let's understand this together: a memory of the future says "What do I desire?"

There's an important book that was written in 2016, called *Homo prospectus*. It was funded by a five million dollar grant, and written by Martin Seligman, Peter Railton, Roy Baumeister and Chandra Sripada. These are neuroscientists, linguists, psychologists, experts at cognition and learning. They tried to challenge psychology's notion that everything is determined by the past. There's this kind of unholy alliance between superficial psychology and superficial neuroscience which basically says "Everything happened yesterday - everything is a repetition of yesterday."

There's enormous importance in working out and recovering memory and understanding the past, but basically, the book is called *Homo prospectus* and *Homo prospectus* is the beginning of invoking a memory of the future. *Homo prospectus* let's add *Homo prospectus* now to *Homo imaginus*; is a prospector, a gold prospector who's prospecting for gold, and he or she is driven by this desire and it's a desire for tomorrow. Now the desire happens to be narrow and superficial: "Let's find some glittering gold." But the idea, the image is that actually when I move my hand, like every move we make every breath we take, Wow! Every bond we break, every bond we create; all emerges from this memory of the future that's calling us forward.

That's what we need to weave a narrative in which we're actually located. This is where it gets really critical friends: when we lose the thread of the story, we lose intimacy, 'global intimacy disorder,' we lose it personally, and we lose it collectively.

In Kafka's *The Trial* there's this image: the name of the major protagonist is K. and K. doesn't know what's happening. He's accused of this and then he's accused of that and they don't fit together, and then something else happens, then something else happens and as you read the book you're disconcerted and you start feeling more and more dislocated. Kafka was anticipating The 11th Hour: the seeds were already there. In the end, K. is killed; a knife through his chest. That's exactly where we are and what happens to K. is that K. loses the thread of the story, K. is like Theseus.

Theseus who goes in to slay the Minotaur in the famous labyrinth in ancient Greece. He's on the island and he's slaying the Beast; he's consuming, he's producing, he's a technological master. Then he can't find his way back to the light, he needs Ariadne's thread. He needs the thread to find his way back, the thread of the feminine co-creator; the thread of the memory of the future; to find his way out of the labyrinth.

Camus, that great French thinker and his book *The Stranger* opens with a line; something like "Mother died today, or was it yesterday?" What he means is that the thread of the story's been so frayed that nothing matters anymore. We're not sure whether any action should be taken, or shouldn't be taken. Dostoevsky; Raskolnikov kills the old woman in *Crime and Punishment*. Does it matter or doesn't it matter?

We're not living within a narrative in which we're actually inspired to action. That's not technical, it's not a technical problem. We know today in learning sciences, in the memory sciences, and the science of perception and the sciences of cognition that literally: Everything I do emerges out of my desire, which is my narrative, my memory of the future. When we have no memory of the future, when we've lost the narrative, then the emergent is tragic, the emergence is a 'global intimacy disorder' which causes directly a global action paralysis.

At The 11th Hour, the most essential thing that we can do, that we need to do, is to reclaim the thread of the story. It's not a fanciful story, it's not a made-up story, it's not a fairy tale in the negative sense of 'fairy tale.' We're gonna talk about this in more detail in Chapter Three, it's a story that's emergent from the best of the sciences: the interior sciences, the exterior sciences, the best of anthropology, the best of the social sciences, the best of the great traditions woven together into a new narrative. The convergence of all of the best of the past, the best of the present, the best of the future into a *second simplicity* and we'll end with that. We're not looking for a first simplicity, we're not looking for a narrative of dogma.

Postmodernity has correctly said that a lot of the narratives we've had until now are dogmatic: they're *first simplicity*, they ignore the sciences, they ignore the facts, they ignore the information. We're not looking for that kind of narrative. Postmodernity then made a mistake: postmodernity, this emergence of this new movement that's been around in different forms, probably since Kant, but actually came to the fore in the last 30- 40 years... Postmodernity says we're going to deconstruct all narratives, and the only grand narrative: Our story of postmodernity is that there is no narrative, which is one of the seedbeds of this complete failure of narrative.

We need to move beyond postmodernity, again we're going to come back to this in Chapter Three. We need to reclaim a narrative which is rooted in a larger intimacy because it's intimacy that generates coherence, hope: hope is a memory of the future. The memory of the future is the new narrative that's going to take us across the precipice in The 11th Hour.

Barbara, I turn the word to conclude, to you.

Barbara:

Thank you Marc, I just want to add a concept that you and I have been working on called "The Planetary Invitation." As we're going to be telling the new story, what we're really telling is that we're all part of it. Everybody who feels on the precipice and who wakes up to The 11th Hour with us, is going to realize they have a unique gift to give to The Planetary Awakening. The Invitation which I'll just issue for this one minute would be to have an invitation to the planetary community of humanity to join their gifts together and do what nature does: connect what works. We will talk about that later. I want to thank you as your kind-of holy host here, for being the Holy Ghost and being able to give us such a resume.

Thank you, Marc.

Marc:

Thank You Barbara, the planetary invitation is so awesome and we can respond to the invitation when we actually unfreeze the global action paralysis and we begin to live not within a shared dogmatic story but in a shared common language, a shared narrative which allows us to step forward. Amen, Yes. [Barbara: Thank you.] ...Can't wait til Chapter Two; let's keep breathing...

Chapter 1.1: The Plotline of the Past 100 Years

Barbara:

Marc, we're at now, the threshold of a new response to The 11th Hour. It is extremely precious, but in order to do that [new response], we have to look back at some of the older stories before we got here. What are the major stories before we got here that led up to this in some way.

Marc:

That's a great question. I love that question Barbara. In Chapter Three we're going to look at it in terms of the arch of history. Let me look at the last 100 years now in our bonus call and then in Chapter Three we'll talk about the larger arch of history and the stories that led up until now. Let's make one short caveat before. Remember what we're talking about friends. What's our thesis? I'm going to repeat this and Barbara will in her way, all through, because it's the line that takes us through.

We're in addendum to Chapter One. We're telling a story, this is The Great Story that we're telling, and we're talking about this fundamental idea that we create intimacy by being able to locate ourselves in the storyline of our lives, both personally and collectively. When we can't, we go insane. Eric Fromm wrote a great book, remember that book Barbara in the 50s called *The Sane Society*, it was a prescient book where he made a sarcastic comment about the inescapable frameworks of destruction that were seeded in western society that actually led to The 11th Hour and we'll talk about those.

My story, my narrative locates me and we're in this paradoxical moment in history where we're more connected than we ever were and we're less intimate in many ways than we ever were. So the paradox of those two and again, we're going to talk in Chapters Two and Three about the enormous gains of modernity and modernity has made enormous gains and Steven Pinker is not wrong in this book *Enlightenment Now* when he cites enormous possibility and the techno-optimists, like Peter Diamandis, are not wrong when they talk about the enormous power of innovation, those are all at play, but none of them, as we'll see, will be able to take us across the precipice and The 11th Hour. We'll talk about why not.

Right now, Barbara, thank you for allowing me to do a little framing because framing is everything. We really want to get this, we want to land this. We want to get to second simplicity, but we really want to know how we got there, so we're not declaring. In The 11th Hour we're not declaring, we're building together the components, the characters, the plot line of the new story. So Barbara you asked, "What about the last 100 years?" Give us examples of stories. That's been done actually by a number of historians who have linked it together. One of them is Yuval Harari, let's take a look at the last 100 years, what stories do we have?

Let's take a look at 1908 to 1918. In Nineteen O eight, what do you have in the world? You have imperialism. What's imperialism?

Imperialism is: you've got these great nation powers who are, some of them democracies, some of them not democracies. Czarist Russia obviously, not a democracy, you've got Germany the Kaiser, you've got Great Britain, you've got England and these are imperialist powers each in their own way. What they seek to do is enlarge their empires. So, imperialism, in which you have nation states of different kinds, democratic and not democratic, seeking to enlarge their empires so a duke gets assassinated in Sarajevo and off we are to World War I. The intention of World War I is not noble, it's about "let's carve up the world in a new way." There's an aggressive impulse, and human beings are tragically inspired to fulfill their "obligation", their duty, their honor.

Frenchmen and Germans fire at each other across a very narrow line all through World War I, millions and millions of people killing each other in a butchery that's unimaginable because they're living inside of an imperialist story. It's an imperialist nationalist story, which moves people to noble sacrifice, but tragically noble sacrifice for nothing. Which is one of the reasons that post-modernity is so dismissive - narratives can be used wrongly - and went to deconstruct these narratives, as Foucault appropriately pointed out, which were really hidden power grabs.

You've got imperialism as one narrative that's in existence dominating the globe 1908 until, let's say World War I 1918, and then imperialism begins to fade. Doesn't fade completely, it takes a couple of decades and what rises now is fascism. You have fascism through the emperor in Japan, and the Japanese emperor state. Mussolini, obviously Hitler. In fascism, the state is at the center, the state is the glorified object of worship for which we sacrifice all and that's also an organizing framework for people living in a fascist context, and that organizing framework inspired millions and millions of people to go on kamikaze missions of various forms and that launched us into World War II.

At the same time as fascism, you have another story that's emergent. Obviously at the turn of the 20th Century a story which becomes more and more dominant: there's a direct line from Marx and Engels ultimately to Trotsky. Trotsky has killed Lenin, takes over to Stalin, but that story is the communist story. It's an inspiring story in its essence. Remember Warren Beatty, who stars in that old movie from 25 years ago "Reds". You can hear the international. There's a reason why half of intellectual Jewish New York is communist, because students of the Oxford union and students in Harvard and students in the Sorbonne, and in Asia and in China, Mao's inspired them and a little later Che Guevara is going to be inspired in Cuba.

There's this inspired story of the workers rising up. An inspired story of taking back the means of production. It's an inspiring story and it's an organizing framework. Communism is an organizing story for reality. In places we go into World War II you've got communism, you've got fascism, imperialism is fading and of course you have, in the United States and other parts of the world,

different versions of liberal democracy. Liberal democracy is about something else we'll talk about it in a moment.

After World War II what happens? Fascism has been defeated so fascism, at least for a while - it's now coming back, but fascism recedes from the stage of history. Imperialism is now out, officially and now you've got two stories left. You've got liberal democracy and you've got communism. Fast forward to 1988, let's say between 1988 and 1998, as Harari correctly points out, the Gulag is trumped by the Supermarket. For a lot of reasons, the communist story doesn't work. This is not our moment to analyze why that story didn't work, we'll have occasion to talk about it a little bit later. What's left?

Only one story. It's kind of a shocking moment. It's this triumphant moment. There's one story left; liberal democracy. Now, what is that story and why is that story insufficient to take us across the precipice? We thought it was going to be sufficient when Bill Clinton gives a speech in the mid 90's directed at China and says to China, 'don't be on the wrong side of history.' There was an enormous confidence in this liberal democratic story and what's the story about? The story is about economic opportunity. It's about free markets. It's about open borders. It's against an image of walls; the Berlin Wall comes down. It's not about barbed wire fences and moats and walls, it's about open borders. It's about equality. It's about the voter knows best, trust the voter. It's about "trust the consumer", the customer knows best. This notion of capitalism, which means the free markets, taking their course which will somehow self organize and create the most possibility for the most people.

We thought that story was going to somehow make us happy. We thought that story was going to somehow succeed and then that story both failed to make us happy, we'll get to that, but it also began to break down. We began to realize there's something wrong with this story. It comes in increments, but one of the watershed moments is in 2008, we have this international financial meltdown, which we haven't actually rectified in any way, but we've papered over and which we realize that actually all of our markets and all of our currencies are interconnected and when essentially greed runs rampant without an overarching framework to somehow orient the story, the whole infrastructure can collapse.

We begin to realize that the infrastructure of the entire story is fragile, we realize that this system is fragile in some sense. Now, Brexit, all of a sudden the European Union, which was an expression of Eros, [a movement towards union], a flawed expression, but a beautiful expression. A first moment where countries are coming together in a larger framework, we thought this was moving in the right direction, now we have Brexit. The British say "Let's get out of this, there's problems, we don't want to be part of this." We have immigration in Europe, which we'll talk about in Chapter Two - open borders? Well, what about immigration? It actually undermines the structure of the state according to many people, because the immigrants who are entering the state don't share the core values of the citizens of the state.

Let's say the core values are about freedom, of the state itself and about democracy, and the core values of people entering the state, who are refugees are actually about purity and about Islamic structures of law, and a kind of Islamic nationalism which distinguishes between *dar al-Harb* and *dar al-islam*. The people who should be of the sword, that is to say put to death by the sword and those who are actually faithful to Islam. So we have this strange situation. Immigration, how do we deal with that? Is that open borders?

All of a sudden trade agreements are not working and trade wars are breaking out. Why is there starvation around the world? Why is there this ecological collapse? What's happening and why does one huge portion of the world holding a certain structure of consciousness, faithful to the old great traditions in their literal expression look at the West as vapid and want to cut off, as it were, the phallus of the west, which is what happened on September 9/11 at the World Trade Center.

The west looks at the regressive purity, the oppression, the lack of fundamental freedoms in these frameworks and says, "whoa, don't want you with us." Open borders trade agreements, how do they exactly work? It's not clear to us at all. We begin to realize that actually, liberal democracy's not addressing so much that's happening. Who voted on the internet? Info-tech, changing the nature of the world. Biotech, and we're going to talk about this in Chapter Two. No one voted on it, who's driving it? Some entrepreneurs looking for short term financial gain? Scientists looking for particular local breakthroughs? Who's driving the entire story? Actually, we're not sure.

These are local games being run by engineers, scientists and entrepreneurs that aren't, in any way, taking a larger picture into perspective, and we'll get back to info-tech and biotech. Climate change. Who voted on that? The structures of liberal democracy with it's open markets which are run by an unlimited growth spiral, which create an exponential growth curve, unlike any other which ultimately has to collapse on itself are actually what's driving some of the major dimensions of the crisis.

When Steven Pinker tells us in an important book called *Enlightenment Now*, he calls it *The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress*, Pinker has just a short chapter on existential threat and the crises that are facing us, which he fundamentally dismisses as tangential and assumes that somehow it's all getting better and he cites an enormous amount of information that seems to indicate that there's less poverty. There's more, but what does that mean exactly? And there's more happiness, more joy. Well, not quite. Let's check it.

There were half a billion people, 150 years ago let's say at the beginning of the 19th century, now there's seven billion. If there's less poverty, but there's that much many more people, that means the amount of abject suffering is actually increased, Number one. Number two, Pinker operates under what we might call 'The Epcot Fallacy'. I remember going with my parents to Epcot in Florida, which is Disney World pavilion of different countries and different visions of the future and there was this future family sitting around the kitchen table and they were all smiling

and happy and in obvious harmony and of course, what seemed to be causing the harmony was a new oven, new technological appliances and the assumption was that this new sense of mild prosperity could actually create happiness.

Well no, you actually can't buy with indoor toilets, people's most deep and profound yearnings. So, yes, this increased prosperity is wildly important. Yes, the elite that owned all the goods and all the possibility and now we've expanded in creating one of the most gorgeous expressions in history called the middle class; wildly important. All these goods are real and yet, they're not actually bringing joy. We'll talk in Chapter Two about the million suicides a year and we'll talk about the opioid crisis. We'll talk about all the breakdowns.

Actually, as we'll see in Chapter Two, the story of liberal democracy, which on one hand looks so promising, isn't. It's necessary. It's important. We need to build on it. It's a momentous leap forward, but it's woefully and wildly insufficient as the gap between haves and have-nots grows. As the crises multiply on each other and as science exponentially develops and we're going to move into a world which is unimaginable, liberal democracy will not be able to address these crises.

This was a short addendum, we're going to really dive into this more deeply in Chapter Two where we're going to together list the crises and really understand profoundly, we're going to go through 12 and understand why without a shared story you can't address any of them, and liberal democracy is an insufficient story to address the existential threat, the crises that face us. Our major goal here was just to give us all a sense of what we mean by story. Imperialism, fascism, communism, liberal democracy.

I'm just going to add one thing, when one historian I mentioned earlier, Yuval Harari talks about these possibilities in the 20th century, he realizes profoundly what we've been talking about, Barbara, you and I, for so many years: that we need a new story. He has a great realization of that, but then what he does is, at the end of his writing his pivots and says, 'sorry, there is none.' The last two chapters of his book, he makes the Buddhist move, which is an important move and we're going to talk about where it's important and why it's important, but it's incredibly limited and his move is, No Story.

There actually is no story. 'You thought there was a story, ha, there's not.' He goes through, in the second to last chapter of his last book, a series of classical Buddhist dialectical inquiries, which are very beautiful and the conclusion is, there's no story. He begins by saying the *only* way we can get through is the need for a new story. He was interviewed by Sam Harris who is a contemporary cultural critic and after he outlines the problems, Sam says to Yuval, so "we need a new narrative..." and Yuval is honest, he says, 'we do but I don't have one.' Then his pivot move is: there actually is no story.

That's a tragedy. That's a wrong move. We're going to have to understand what's the Buddhist contribution to a larger narrative, but not pivot out of history in the *no story* move. Not a possibility. Let's get back with you, together in Chapter Two.

Chapter 2: Our Crisis is New

Barbara Marx Hubbard:
Our crises are new.

I want to start out, Marc, in a context that our species *itself* is new, one never even thinks of that. As I've said before, we've had five mass extinctions of other species before we got here, and recently the humans got here, from the point of view of 13.7 billions years, and we happen to be at a threshold of a possible sixth mass extinction. That's the precipice we're on.

I want to take us just briefly to imagine the Neanderthal world. There is no homo sapiens, and somehow, we appeared. Now, if you had been around, at the time of Neanderthal and you see us appear out of a cave somewhere, there was probably no way that you could have imagined the difference that homo sapiens, and finally homo sapiens sapiens, would have from homo Neanderthal.

What happened was a real surprise on planet Earth because there had been many species before we got here, and nature does not preserve species, nature preserves purpose - to go to higher and higher consciousness. Let's look at our new species from the point of view of, "I'm a Neanderthal and I'm noticing this homo sapiens is doing things that we have not seen happen before." And what is it that we're doing?

We will not go through human history now, but just mentioning a few immensely important things: language. We take it for granted, but we're speaking and we're writing and we're now communicating, on television, a vast empire of thought. Homo sapiens, because of the development of language, went way, way beyond the Neanderthal world.

Then, they were able to develop weapons. Not just the claws and the teeth - weapons. Simple ones to begin with, and eventually all the way on up to the bomb. This incredible capacity to kill each other. Along with the ability for language, had never been seen before on planet earth. As we're at the precipice moment, that's all showing up. Even 100 years ago people would not have noticed this.

We began to domesticate our own environment, so now we more or less, own the earth, they say. Of course, we're now at the sixth mass extinction point and we could be at the level of climate change of being ruined, but because we own, we cultivate and we preserve the Earth; that's radically new and it brought a new crisis.

Then I'd like to add art, literature, culture, architecture. Our new species, homo sapiens sapiens, suddenly was a magnificent creator of architects and artifacts and religions and gods. An entire empire of creativity emerged here that was radically new and also a tremendous benefit and can create the crises of the precipice. That's something to notice.

We developed weapons, we developed war. Not just occasional fighting here and there. As you pointed out in the various stories, massive empires dedicated to weapons and war. Currently, the United States of America has a defense policy called 'mutually assured destruction,' and we have nuclear bombs, and one "accident" so-called, with a nuclear bomb could annihilate the species.

This is all happening through homo sapiens sapiens right now. Then of course, we know, from our discussion of the bomb, that the genius, let's say of Einstein, to penetrate into how nature and energy works with his famous equation $E=mc^2$. That equation, which the average person would not understand even what to make of, the scientists were able to understand it, and with that equation they built the atomic bomb. Or they could create a world of abundance for everyone. The nature of homo sapiens sapiens and the use of this power is something that we're all having to deal with.

I'd like to add science. Do you know, it wasn't just $E=mc^2$. We began to understand the gene, the brain, the body, the way cells work, and so we took over and could evolve our body and we can extend our lifespan. We can put new genetic codes in our babies. We can affect the body in every possible way.

Then, the computer. As part of the extended intelligence of humanity. Some people say, "Well, imagine the powers of ancient gods." Do you know, we're traveling with the speed of light ourselves? On this computer. We're doing this and we don't even know that we're doing it. The power of the new species is so, so great.

I will conclude this by saying: we are gaining the powers of what our ancient gods used to be described as. We are the ancient gods come alive as the modern humans with the powers to transform the earth, heal the people, or destroy absolutely everything. So the question is, Marc, what are our crises now, that we now can understand we have. And as we go through The 11th Hour, what are our responses as the new humanity?

Marc Gafni:
Fabulous. Fabulous.

Barbara:
To the crises that homo sapiens sapiens brought us to the edge of. So my friend, Marc Gafni, that's a big question for you.

Marc:

Well, that's a big question and you're a big person. That was really, really beautiful, Barbara, and that just opened the space in the way that you're always doing. You've been, yourself, a context for this conversation in such a beautiful way.

I was just remembering, as you were talking, we shared a stage. We weren't aware of each other and we hadn't seen each other's work until years later, but I believe that we shared a stage. Michael Beckwith had invited us both to a conference a decade ago.

When we met again a few years later, which was about five, six years ago, and I looked at what you had done, I hadn't been as aware as I should have. I realized what a context you've been for this conversation, and such a critical conversation.

We're taking it now the next step forward, and what a delight to be in our book, our shared book that's going to be coming out soon, *Meditations on the Intimate Universe: The Next Stage in Conscious Evolution* is going to try and articulate some of this.

There's an urgency, friends. There's an urgency, but it's not a rabid fear, it's not a debilitating, paralyzing effect that we're seeking to generate. We are activating, the entire intent of The 11th Hour is to actually activate us into the possibility, into imagining the next stage. As we said in the beginning, there's a crisis of imagination. We're in Chapter Two of The 11th Hour.

We talked about there being a crisis of imagination which was the source of a crisis of narrative. And we talked about narrative being not a fanciful narrative but the best, post dogmatic story, that we have that draws on the best strains of wisdom in history. We're going to talk about what those strains are in more depth in Chapter Three.

Now let's just locate ourselves.

In our Addendum to Chapter One, we talked about four stories in the 20th century, in response to your question Barbara. In one moment of recapitulation, if you missed the bonus call, we talked about the story of imperialism, the story fascism, the story of communism, and the story of liberal democracy:

We pointed out that in 1908 you had imperialism: disappeared.

Then in 1928- '38, you had fascism, communism and liberal democracy.

After World War II, fascism, meaning Germany in its fascist form, Japan, Italy, had disappeared.

You had remaining communism: China, East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, et cetera, obviously the Soviet Union. Then you had liberal democracy, had the NATO Alliance, the United States, et cetera. You had these two forces, and by the time we got to 1988 and 1998, the Gulag had been trumped by the supermarket and we were in this situation where the only real

organizing story left was liberal democracy. If you want more depth than that, take a look at the bonus call, it's actually really important.

But let's dive in right from here.

When we say liberal democracy, what do we mean? When we say liberal democracy, we mean open markets, we mean open borders, we mean the institutions of democracy, we mean we trust the voter, we trust the consumer. We mean the basic structure of capitalism as being the best structure to organize the world economy. Those are the ideas that are inherent to this notion of liberal democracy.

Now, we thought that liberal democracy was going to take the day, but it didn't.

Liberal democracy, which is wildly important and we're going to talk about why we need to include its key dimensions in Chapter Three, for now, let's understand, liberal democracy makes an enormous contribution.

All of the great religions did not succeed in eradicating slavery. Then along comes versions of modernity which produced, in the end, liberal democracy out of the Renaissance and then post industrial revolution... we get, "wow," we get these new ideas which birthed liberal democracy and then in about a 100-year period all across the world, slavery is abolished.

Human Rights, Reason, third-person science, post-dogma is unbelievably important in whatever new story we're going to articulate in order to take us across the precipice in The 11th Hour.

We'll have to transcend and include the best factors of liberal democracy, absolutely. And liberal democracy is woefully insufficient to take us across the precipice. If we rely on the current system, Barbara, what you've called the win-lose metrics of liberal democracy, we will fail.

What we want to try and understand is, why does liberal democracy not take us across the precipice? What are the crises?

Why does it not heal the global intimacy disorder? It doesn't heal the global intimacy disorder because there's actually no narrative. There's no memory of the future. There's no vision of inspired human action. There's no vision of nobility. There's no vision of honor. There's no vision of all the values, the loyalties, loves, intimacies, desires, that make up the motivational architecture, the existential architecture, if you will, the spiritual architecture, of the human being.

What we need to do is actually articulate a new vision, a new story, based on the best information we have. It's not going to be a dogmatic story, it's going to be an evolving story, and yet it's not going to be merely, "Oh, we're all going to contribute our thoughts to the new story. Won't that be lah-di-dah-dah." No, no, no, that's nonsense. That's based on a of structure of

consciousness that doesn't recognize that there's any authority in anything. There's nothing authoritative. We just make it all up, that's post-modernism.

No one would say, "Let's all just contribute to physics, whatever equations we want to contribute, what the heck." No. We want to draw our shared story from the best validated insights, from all the different wisdoms and all the different periods of history, and again, that's going to be Chapter Three, but we're now in Chapter Two.

Let's look at Chapter Two, this is a hard one. It's going to be a little bit longer than the ordinary ones, but it's really important to get this: really important to understand, in-depth: What are the 12 crises that we're facing in this moment in time?

I want to start from an unusual place. I'm not going to start with climate change. I want to start with the creeping unknownness.

One of the things that's happening in *The 11th Hour* is, it's creeping up on us. We're barely noticing. We're too busy living our lives and we don't notice, for example, that there are school shootings in the United States every two or three days, for the last year-and-a-half.

What does that mean?

A child brings an AK-47 automatic weapon into school and shoots 40 other children. That happens every couple of days. That it happens is shocking enough, but that it's happening regularly is exponentially more shocking, but number three, exponentially more shocking, no one is noticing, business as usual. "Oh, another child walked in with an AK-47 and shot 47 other children." "Oh, okay, how's the weather?"

In other words, the nature of *The 11th Hour* is that the dystopia creeps upon us and we're lost in the ordinariness of our lives and we don't know how to get out of business as usual to handle the genuine and urgent challenge and invitation. This is about urgency, but it's about ecstatic urgency, it's about invitation, it's about planetary invitation.

Let's take a look at what the crises are.

Number one, I'm going to start with infotech and biotech. Because no one even notices, we're not even sure what we mean by that.

We have this sense of populist rage that something's going wrong because when we hear the terms of this 11th Hour: 'machine learning', Machine learning, what does that mean? Oh, 'robotics,' 'Artificial intelligence,' what does that mean? 'Artificial intelligence,' 'machine learning,' 'robotics,' 'augmentation,' we're not even sure what the words mean. 'Blockchain,' 'cryptocurrency,' we don't even know what the terms mean, but what we sense is: it's not about us. And as you're going to see, we're not wrong.

When we saw the posters of triumph and invitation, the posters of protest in the 20th century, whether they were of the capitalist version or the communist version, it was about the *worker* or it was about the *citizen*. It was about the *school teacher*, about the *factory worker*, was about the *doctor* or it was about the *professor*. It was about the *gardener*, it was about the *laborer*.

That was always what the poster was about. Now, there's no posters like that. Now it's about these words that seem to have nothing to do with us and we have this intuitive sense that there's this sense of - no conspiracy, no conspiracy theory. Conspiracy theories are actually horrifically disinforming and actually are false flags, if you will, that avoid the focus on the genuine challenge.

...We have the sense that there's this global elite somewhere in Berlin and New York, and they're not getting together, it's not an organized anything, it's actually a disorganized natural attrition or natural accruing of centralized power to a very small amount of people who have an enormous amount of entrepreneurial discretionary cash who are driving Facebook, Google, Amazon, Baidu, and a series of other companies around the world, and you know all of 20 people own them. Then all of the multiplicative second level, second-tier companies, are driving the same process, and the process is generating this infotech, biotech revolution.

Infotech is the internet, who voted on the internet? That's just one example of the internet. It's access to an enormous amount of information that we never had access to before. Biotech is the ability to augment, to add to our lifespan, to do gene testing, to do an entire series of actions that can actually inform us, change the trajectory of our lives in a very, very dramatic way. When infotech and biotech come together, what happens?

This sounds irrelevant, but no one's voting on it and it's actually one of the major existential threats. So let's take a look at it. There's lots of different views, we're going to give one possibility which is shared by a number of historians and it's a kind of dominant possibility. And just feel it for a second.

Infotech and biotech together have the natural potential, and at this point I would say, based on reading 50, 60 papers, it's actually probable that infotech and biotech will obsolete most jobs in the world.

Whoa! "Good morning, Vietnam!" said Robin Williams. Wake up. Jobs. Jobs are part of our central narrative of identity and we need a narrative story, and our narrative story is part of our identity. Our identity is "I have a job and I earn money, that's how I measure my value."

What does it mean to live in a world in which we've obsoleted most of the jobs? Let's take a look, what's happening?

Since the industrial revolution, we've always talked about jobs are going to be obsoleted but they never were for a good reason: there were always particular areas that human beings could participate in that machines couldn't do.

Machines did the hard, brute, physical labor, but anything that required cognitive analysis, it required discernment, it required judgment, it required access to feelings, clearly couldn't be in the realm of machines. That's no longer true. We're now at a place where artificial intelligence is actually hacking the life sciences and hacking the social sciences, and developing very high level intelligence and very high level cognitive function.

As AI progresses there is a realization that we can actually translate, for example, human feelings into biochemical patterns. As long as we don't have a deeper understanding of feelings and desires, and if we actually reduce human feelings to biochemical patterns, and we hack through enormous data pools, the life sciences. We begin to understand in the AI world, human behavior and human decision patterns, we come within a couple of decades, some 10, 20, 30 years, to replace [workers] all across the planning sector, all across the service sector, all across the communications sector, we replace drivers, we replace bankers, we replace lawyers.

We're literally hacking humans by developing algorithmic pattern recognition. We thought intuitions were a vaunted mystical experience, now they may well have a mystical dimension, but AI is not looking at that. AI is unaware of that. AI is looking at the pattern-recognition, and so AI now will come to a place where we're going to want it to replace humans because it's going to be able to analyze in many situations, better than anyone else can.

Just for an example, let's talk about self-driving cars. There's 1.25 million people killed [in traffic accidents] a year, twice as much as crime, war and terrorism combined. Are we not going to deploy self-driving cars in order to solve that problem?

But it's a bigger issue.

Talk about health care. What's actually going to happen is, we're going to actually be able to recognize by deploying biometric sensors, which are sensors you wear in your body, ultimately, fairly rapidly implanted in your body, which are going to be able to detect cancer through an AI network 10 years in advance. You're not going to want that? Are we not going to want to be able to have a 'healthcare for all' through a universal system of AI doctors?

It doesn't mean that there's not going to be human doctors at all. There'll be some human doctors, but you're going to actually have an AI doctor as two major advantages over human doctors. One is, updatibility. You're automatically updated with all the research in the world to connectivity. You're connected to all the other doctors. No human being can do that. Even if one human doctor is better than one AI doctor, the entire network is going to be virtually unparalleled. As Harari points out, you'll be able to check in to a bunch of AI networks and decide which AI network or which AI doctor you want, so you're a patient in the jungle, you can plug in to your AI network.

Now, if you're not plugged into an AI network you might not get a job. You might not get insurance. You might not get employment.

What's happening is, since AI is getting access, and as it gradually increases its access to larger and larger data pools which allow for the breakthroughs in research, AI hacks more and more of the life sciences and social sciences. Eventually, we're going to get to this place in 20, 30 years, (not 1,000 years, not 100 years) it's the lives of our children, mid-lives of our children, for some of us, in our lives, in which, oh my God, in which AI, robotics, are determining and driving the story.

That's a big deal.

What happens when the majority of jobs are done by machine learning?

If you really want to get this clearly: machine learning, chess is the miner's canary in this world. We all know the famous story of Deep Blue that beat the great chess master Gary Kasparov in the '70s/ '80s.

Now we have this new situation in which AI-driven machine learning chess masters are actually wiping out the best earlier versions of AI chess masters. You have, for example, a match that took place two years ago, between a new chess master called Google AlphaZero, a particular AI machine learning program that was playing another computer program called Stockfish 8. Stockfish 8 had 70 million chess positions per second available to it, and Google Alpha Pro only had 80,000 but it used machine learning. Google Alpha Pro won 28 games, tied 78, lost none.

How long do you think it took Google Alpha Pro to become this great master? Four hours. Four hours of machine learning. If you get, that the miner's canary of the machine learning world is chess, you begin to understand where we're going.

Does everyone get this? I want to just get with you what this means.

What this means is that if in the 20th century the problem was exploitation. Wow, the problem now is irrelevance. What does it mean when the majority of the world has no narrative of identity based on a job?

Narrative of power, my power is based on some relationship to my job. My "we" space is based on my being a provider or protector in some sense, so I've got no narrative of a relationship. You're beginning to see the story?

How do I fit into a community when everything is, "I'm a doctor, I'm a lawyer, I'm a gardener." There's this deconstruction of the very essential fabric of civilization, clearly we're going to need to redefine what a job is. What actually is a job?

The issue is not - we're looking at our borders, let's make sure that the laborers don't come and take our jobs. That is not the issue. Our jobs are going to be taken in a completely different way when we have no matching narrative of identity.

Let's go deeper.

What are the other dimensions of liberal democracy whilst we've got liberty and we've got equality. Let's just first take a look at liberty. As AI develops and as our ability to understand human feelings develops, so also our ability to influence human feelings develops. Already, we're taking away basic human potentialities. We have no idea where we are. How do we know where we are? We put it into our GPS. We're not located in the environment any more, the GPS becomes that which moves us.

How do we research an issue? We Google it. Do you realize what that means? That means we've allocated to Google the decision of which sources we're going to see and those decisions are made by an algorithm engineered by a 26-year-old geek who has no narrative of reality, no set of values that you may be identified with or not identified with, no sense of what any larger story, loves might mean.

How are those algorithms determined and why is it that Google has now completely stood in between most human beings and knowledge? On the one hand, Google's providing an enormous amount of knowledge. On the other hand, Google is actually ranking that knowledge and telling you what knowledge you're going to have access to.

Google's goal, let's be clear, is not just to give you access to that information. Google, in the end, wants to answer everything. That's Google's stated goal. We want to answer all questions.

"Who should I marry?" So I have a biometric sensor inside of me which tracks how I watch movies and when I cry, as Harari points out, it tracks all my other decisions. It brings together an enormous amount of other data that has now been downloaded into Google through the great data collection, through the biometric sensors.

Now when I say, "Who should I marry?" Well, Google is going to tell me. What kind of job shall I have? Google is going to tell me. And I'm not going to not access Google because I want access to the advantage, the competitive advantage in the win-lose metrics of that information.

Wow. You begin to see where the world's heading?

All of a sudden the notion of liberty... Now, let's take a look.

How do I choose? 'The voter knows best.' 'The consumer knows best.'

Who's actually driving the feelings of the computer? In other words, once we're able to access an algorithm to explain and unpack feelings, so our ability to manipulate feelings is exponentially skyrocketed. If today marketing manipulates feelings based on intuitions of a bunch of people sitting around and Madison Avenue-like rooms around the world.

What if we actually have algorithmic information which is precise, which can tell you exactly how you're going to respond to a presidential candidate? Exactly how you're going to respond to a product. Which will create the kind of specialized, customized music which will change your mood in a particular way. Forget about Beyonce. Really, Frida Kahlo? Not interested.

We're going to create art that actually moves you in precise ways because we know how to access and to shift your feelings. You're beginning to know what happens? You're beginning to understand the world? The entire notion of liberty becomes a joke.

Now democracy. Democracy is now going to be determined by voters?

Already we live in a world in which we love Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez because she's likable. Now, it's great that she's likable, and she may be fabulous. Got to read a few position papers to figure that out. We like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez because she's likable, but is likability the standard for a candidate?

The issues that we're facing are infinitely more complex than we're able to understand. We're voting on health care, we have no idea what it means. Again, pointed by Harari, Richard Dawkins says, "Why am I voting on Brexit in Great Britain? Whether it be part or not part of the European Union, when the economic issues are way beyond my ability to comprehend them."

We've got this situation in which, a) voters can be manipulated very, very easily in this AI world, in this algorithmic breakdown of feelings and the way we make decisions, b) the nature of decisions that need to be made are not voted on, aka infotech, biotech, unlimited growth which causes climate change, et cetera. No one is voting on them, and c) the issues that we are voting on are way too complex for us to actually understand.

How's democracy possibly going to work? You understand?

Take a look at equality. Equality means we're all equal, another key idea.

We're all equal? What about biotech? Biotech means, and this is what Harari's book *Homo Deus* was about; an elite were able to biohack their way to some sort of semi-immortality with the powers of the Roman gods, at least.

Who's got access to that? Who's got access to gene testing? Who's got access to augmentation? Who's got access to downloading information? Who's got access to heightened

creativity through very sophisticated regimens of supplements and other forms of CyberBorg intervention? Who's got access to it but the elite? Only the elite do.

All of a sudden, we head towards, very rapidly, a dystopian vision which on the one hand we're globalizing so we're creating this horizontal circle around the world, but we're creating this vertical, huge new caste system of the super-uber wealthy and everybody else. Now, put that together with the loss of jobs, put that together with the manipulation of feelings because we've now turned feelings into pattern-recognized algorithms, you now have vast portions of the world who are obsolete. We're not worried about them being exploited, we're worried about them being irrelevant. Billions of people in the world having no narrative of identity, and being ultimately irrelevant.

You might think, "Well, we might need them as consumers." No, actually AIs can trade with each other. Like trading can actually take place independent of that very poor base of consumers.

What happens now without a shared story? Our colleague, at the Center of Integral Wisdom, Zak Stein, talked at a recent conclave about this notion of 15% refugees in the world who can actually never be reintegrated. What do we do with them?

What do we do at moments of climate change when a billion people are clamoring for resources and wanting to climb over the fences? Who are considered by the standards of capitalism irrelevant to the functioning of the world system?

You're beginning to get a sense of the picture?

We've just talked about the first set of challenges. We've talked about infotech and biotech, coming together to obsolete jobs to undermine the core notion of liberty, and to destroy any notion of equality. What drives all of this is data.

Who are we to Facebook? We're not Facebook's customers. We're Facebook's product. Facebook captures our attention and then Facebook sells our attention to advertisers. But that's only the surface business of Facebook.

Facebook actually has a much more serious business which has a sinister undercurrent. Not that Facebook is evil, that's not what we're saying at all. We're just saying there's an implicit sinister undercurrent which is, Facebook is harvesting data. That's shocking. Do we want Facebook to have all our data? What's Facebook going to do with data?

See, all the progress in hacking a human being, the life sciences and the social sciences, is based on large data pools.

As has been pointed out, the Soviet Union was unable to handle information at its apex which is part of what caused the collapse of the Soviet State because it had centralized control. You actually needed a decentralization to handle and to generate appropriate options to deal with all sorts of scenarios.

What if you have a totalitarian state that is centralized and everyone, in order to get a job, in order to get insurance, in order to be employed, in order to eat, has to put their DNA through biometric sensors, into the overall data stream? Then a country like that or a block of countries like that makes a monumental leap forward in the AI race, and the AI race is on and no one can get out of it because if you get out of it, the wrong person, as it were, might win.

You begin to get the scenario. It's a complex and it's a painful scenario. Who owns the data? Notice, none of these issues can we even begin to deal with unless we have a shared story, a shared narrative of identity, a shared narrative of power, unless we have cooperation.

This is an international problem, it's not a local problem, without a sense of cooperation, which comes from a shared story, a shared set of values. Where you used to have cooperation because we were part of the same nation, part of the same religion, that created a shared memory of the past. That doesn't work any more.

A local nation, or a local religion, can't address what are fundamentally global problems. A local nation, a local religion is based on the memory of the past. We need a world spirituality. We need a world story, we need a world-sense. Not dogmatic; post-dogmatic, an evolving story, but one based on the best information we have.

We need a shared memory of the future. We need to know what our desires are, back to Buddha, "Have few desires, have great ones." What are our great desires? When we don't articulate our great desires then our pseudo-desires begin to take hold and drive the entire story.

That's the first sense of where we are.

Friends, we're now on the third section and this is one part of The 11th Hour we're going to spend some time, so we really get a sense of what's happening. Let's see where we are.

The revolutions, the changes that are most dangerous, are the ones that you don't notice are happening. Notice that the first major threat to the very structure of our civilization is one that no one really understands, in the voter population, and which challenges our basic notion of who we are.

Number one, Liberty:

Liberty is based on this idea of free will. Free will means we can choose. That's why we trust the voter, why we trust the consumer, but when we create this new world in which *free will* basically can't function anymore because we're so expertly manipulating feelings, then voting and making a consumer choice is irrelevant. As Harari correctly says, the drama of decision-making, which defines our lives, disappears. The entire process of decision-making becomes, excuse me, irrelevant.

Now just to say clearly, everybody, the real thing I'm thinking about now is that there's something on my nose. So even as we're trying to solve The 11th Hour, you've got an itch on your nose, that becomes a dominant issue. I think we've got it handled...okay?

Let's catch this, friends, and let's laugh, and let's hold the lightness of this urgency and seriousness. The drama of decision-making, fundamentally, disappears. *Free will* disappears. Equality disappears, as an elite in a dystopian Blade Runner, hunger games vision, the elite bio-hack their way to some form of immortality and everyone else doesn't have that availability.

Even if we have a universal basic income to solve the jobs problem, a person who's getting universal basic income; do they have access to augmentation? Do they have access to gene testing for their children? Do they have access to heightened infotech, biotech information which enhances creativity? Do they have access to all of the sophisticated biotech hacking that will lengthen immeasurably the lifespan? Probably not. Do you begin to understand?

We literally reintroduce a caste system of the worst kind, but a much, much more dystopian scenario because in the "old world", meaning up till today, we at least needed the masses of the population to be consumers. But that will be irrelevant as well, we won't need them as consumers OR as employees. We've obsoleted jobs. At least the majority of jobs. There'll be a pool of jobs available for very, very, very highly skilled people that will be changing all the time.

We begin to get a sense that this kind of naïve techno-optimism: "technology will solve our problems and take us across the precipice," is absurd.

Technology holds enormous promise. Innovation has been radically critical in the 20th century in obsoleting problems. We all thought that there was going to be a population bomb and by this moment in time everyone was already going to have starved. That didn't happen and all the predictions of the '60's didn't come true because this gorgeous modern structure of radical innovation actually changed the way we do farming in a fundamental way. That's beautiful. So techno-optimism is not unimportant.

Clearly, putting together credit technology with cellular phone technology has created a micro-credit system which has allowed many women to step out of poverty in the Third World and create at least a level of basic living-dignity. There's massively important innovations that take place that are critically important. But they're not going to take us across the precipice.

Yes, technology is important. Yes, technology creates enormous good but it also creates enormous disaster beyond measure, all of which we ignore. Yes, we're connected by Facebook, but how many people commit suicide because of, and it's directly correlated, their time online?

What we have to begin to do is understand that liberal democracy based on liberty, based on equality, based on free will, "the voter knows best," "the consumer knows best," all of these are becoming irrelevant in a complexified world in which free will is being undermined, liberty is being undermined, equality is being undermined, and the problems are too complex for the voter to actually understand how to vote anyways.

The options put before the voter will be developed by algorithms, with human beings playing a kind of public face prop-role in an algorithmic world in which Google actually is running your life and the entire notion of existential decision-making is gone.

That's issue number one.

Now, I want to, very briefly, run through, kind of a deeper view, that's just number one.

Number two, look at Addiction:

Addiction is a rampant plague in the world. Addiction means life is so empty that I can't actually be in it. Addiction is not in the "underdeveloped world," addiction is the world which Steven Pinker says is doing so wonderfully and so beautifully. Addiction is rampant. Addiction means the pain of my life is too great to get pleasure from ordinary living.

Why? Because there's no story, there's no narrative that has nobility, honor, dignity within which I can locate my new pleasures and put them in some sort of context. Again, you can't buy the deepest existential soul-yearnings of a person with indoor toilets and a new array of candy bars or great vacations. That's two, Addiction.

Three, Suicide:

Can we kind of catch on to the fact that we're rapidly approaching a million suicides a year?

For every suicide, there's about 25 attempted suicides. Now we're up to 25 million and for every actual attempted suicide, there's probably about 500 where the people are contemplating but don't actually make the attempt. Now we're up to 500 million. Does everyone get that? 500 million, maybe it's 1,000, maybe it's not 500, maybe it's 1,000. What does that mean? We're talking about one in seven to one in fifteen people in the world who - suicide's part of their genuine experience. Do we know that more people die of suicide, obesity and car accidents, many, many, many more people than of violence at this point in the world.

What does that mean? What's obesity? Obesity, which is the fifth cause in the world right now, but 70,000 people last year died in the United States of obesity, just to cite one example. It means I'm trying to fill the emptiness, so I'm just going to eat even though I'm not hungry. We're rapidly approaching the point where people dying of hunger and people dying of overeating are going to actually equal each other. Let's look at hunger.

Number Four, Hunger:

How many people die of hunger a day?

In 2016, '17, '18: approximately 21,000 people a day of hunger or hunger-related diseases.

Steven Pinker says in his book about the great progress we're making, when he says, "We'll never have a perfect world but to find the course of fatalism and reaction we can..." Well, we're not talking about having a perfect world. We're talking about a world in which it's not okay that 21,000 people die a day of hunger and hunger-related diseases because that's more than a slightly imperfect world.

Even though, as we said last time, the statistics are getting better but because the amount of population is getting so vast, that means the amount of people suffering is greater than it ever was in any other point in human history.

Number five, The opioid crisis:

The opioid crisis in America and Europe and parts of Asia, meaning we're using medication and this is a particular subset of addiction, but it's a unique subset where we're actually medicating ourselves to ignore creating a life that's whole in a story that works because we feel fundamentally non-intimate with reality.

The experience of feeling non-intimate is so devastating that actually we create a false sense of intimacy and this pseudo-intimacy is created through the opioid which kills us and which kills our children. We're actually medicating our children. The amount of children in the "prosperous worlds" who are taking Adderall to get through the capitalist competitive win-lose metrics society is beyond the imagination. That's five. Let's keep going.

Six, and these we're just going to touch briefly. Climate change:

We've talked about climate change, and climate change is unbelievably important. Let's just add one dimension to it which is hundreds of millions of refugees. I mentioned earlier in part two that Zak Stein had adduced the information about a 15% of the world shall be refugees who we don't know how to integrate. Whether or not that comes true, let's just talk about hundreds of millions of refugees like in cities. How do you create a city? How do you create a city with hundreds of

millions of people that have no sense of coherence with each other? That have no sense of intimacy with each other? How do you do that? We have no idea. That's number [six].

[Seven, radicalized technology:]

The amount of people that have access to technology that can create a rogue nuclear bomb is thousands more than was ever true. That, per se, is a huge existential threat, but the deeper issue is these people themselves are living out of -- it's not just the one Dr. No, we have a pathology of society in which we have thousands of actors who are highly educated but without any shared structure of a story or without any coherent set of values. Without any shared narrative based on the best interior and exterior sciences about what ethos means.

When you have no shared story, when you have no shared world narrative, no shared prism, you have this radical global intimacy disorder. Then at the fringes of that you have thousands of people who are highly educated but are not part of a shared story, well, then you create a significant existential threat, both of a rogue nuclear terrorist non-state actor and rogue cyber terrorism. Terrorism through the internet that actually affects and can breakdown the fundamental infrastructure of the entire story. That's number seven.

Eight, Slavery:

Look at the slave trade. In America we're used to thinking that Abraham Lincoln, the emancipation proclamation abolished slavery. There are several times more amount of slaves in the world today, labor slaves and sexual slaves, than existed at the time of the emancipation proclamation in the mid-19th century in the United States.

That's shocking. There's about... best estimate, 35-million labor and sexual slaves in the world today.

How does that happen? They're traded across borders. We have open borders, but not just open borders, but we have no shared way of monitoring borders to prevent the slave trade. Again, the liberal democratic story doesn't address this situation.

So far, nothing that we've listed can be addressed by the structure of a win-lose liberal democracy divided into nation states as it exists today. Let's keep going.

[Nine: Inequality]

Get a sense of it; the gap between haves and have-nots in the world is growing so wide and so vast, and the rage and the discontent, so fundamental. It's not just that that can light the world on fire, in a horrific way, but that's just horrible by itself before it lights anyone on fire. It's not just a pragmatic problem.

When you have this huge portion of the world that actually witnesses how the elite is living, not that the elite is bad, the elite is just living their life, generating and being successful, but when in your face you see the elite that's living their lives in an old story, ignoring the plight of the rest of the world and ignoring the abject suffering, ignoring the 21,000 people dying a day, you fuel a rage which is so corrosive and so destructive, and ultimately, of course, will explode in a kind of world civil war. Welcome, Mad Max.

Again, these are all not strange scenarios. These are all the structures of our world today in which the only remaining vision is liberal democracy and when liberal democracy is not in place we don't have any other organizing global vision.

What we have is nationalisms, we have strong men; Putin, Venezuela, Turkey, Chile, the Philippines. Strong men who are emerging, who are creating these retro-romantic fantasies about the great past of their nation which, all of these nations had beautiful and great pasts, but it's actually a kind of propped-up, fabricated story in which we're redrawing lines of hatred.

We're redrawing us-them lines. We're redrawing rivalrous conflict lines in a world in which the conflagrations that can emerge from that are beyond imagination.

As my colleague and close friend, Daniel Schmachtenberger, likes to summarize the literature: in the old world when you had tech and win-lose metrics and rivalrous conflict; you could kill a few people. Then you could kill a few more people, from bows and arrows to spears to gun powder, but now when you have exponential tech, you have 'exponential suck' - Daniel's phrase. Which is absolutely true.

The conflagrations by this redrawing of boundaries and this retribalization of the world because we're going to regressive, old stories because we don't have any new shared narrative in an exponential tech-world, where it creates a threat of really unimaginable proportions, which is why we're burying our heads in the sand, going about business as usual, and not actually imagining it.

In order to respond we need to reimagine the narrative. We need to reimagine the story.

Let's look at Immigration [ten].

How can we talk about immigration? How can you talk about immigration without having a narrative of rights? But what rights do we have and how did these clashed civilizations live together? Western Europe has lost its own sense of narrative. It's now being flooded by legitimate, beautiful, wonderful refugees who desperately need shelter, but who are carrying sets of values that are fundamentally anathema even to the core values of democracy and freedom, to the core values of a shared fraternity. We've got these views, these beautiful people, totally in need to be protected, but are holding fundamentalist values which basically are

at odds with the basic notions, the basic goods, of the Western Enlightenment. Which means you've got a recipe for disaster.

You've got these clashing civilizations. When do we have an obligation to take refugees? Seems like, of course, we do. Well, if we do, do those refugees become citizens? If they become citizens, how much of their old world view do they have to give up? Or if they do give up their old world view, how much time needs to pass to know that they've actually integrated this new world view? Why do we have a right to impose a new world view on someone? You begin to see the problems?

What about the children of the old world view, who are the children of immigrants? Do they automatically become citizens even though they're being educated in a pre-modern, anti-freedom structure in local religious schools?

You begin to see the problem? There's no local world anymore.

Everyone's moving across boundaries. Everyone's moving to different parts of the world. You've got this essential clash of civilizations that's actually going to destroy, for sure, Europe, that's imminent. Unless Europe reclaims a genuine narrative. One of the weaknesses of the European Union is that there's no new narrative. They're relying on the old narrative, liberal democracy that's going to take us forward but clearly, as has become self-evident in our conversation, that model is not going to take us forward.

Sexuality [Eleven]. You've got #MeToo in the United States which has two issues: men acting out, which is a huge issue which needs to be completely zero tolerance, but then you have this new issue which is the basic goods of human rights are being attacked when we say things like, "Let's just believe all women, let's not look at evidence." We use statements like, "Where there's smoke there's fire." "Women never lie." Men's fundamental sexuality is problematized, women's fundamental sexuality is split-off, and fundamental feminine agency and power isn't owned because we don't have a narrative of power.

Let's take it out of the United States and the problems get exponentially more horrific for women, in which clitorectomies, and in which sexual harassment in India's just par for the course. It's absolutely ordinary.

In the United States, the Western democracies have made huge progress but in Asia, in India, in China; rape, sexual harassment, abuse, is just part of the parlance. There's no sexual narrative. The strongest force in human history all of a sudden has no distinctions to actually allow us to engage it. Then we've got infotech, biotech, everything else that we've talked about.

We begin to see, Wow, Wow. There's a global action paralysis and there's global action confusion because there's a global intimacy disorder.

Ok friends, we're now in the last section [four]. What underlies all of this? Where's all this from? The way my colleague Daniel Schmachtenberger likes to summarize literature, he says, "What are the *generator functions* of this level of existential risk?" By generator functions we mean the root causes. What underlies it.

Barbara, you've talked about win-lose for many, many years as a fundamental generator function. You don't use the term generator function but you talk about root cause and win-lose metrics, which Daniel discusses as well, is clearly a root cause. Win-lose metrics means, and this is what we talked about in this conference, Success 3.0, we talked about win-lose in a capitalist system in which you had no fundamental value unless you produced something.

We're not talking about dismantling capitalism. We're saying capitalism is insufficient to handle the challenges that we have today. Conscious capitalism, that John Mackey has articulated, and John was my partner in developing this beautiful Success 3.0 summit, is clearly a step in the right direction but it's insufficient. It's an insufficient story, we need a deeper story.

Win-lose metrics means that success is determined in a classical success structure by me getting ahead and you losing. That creates at the fundamental core of society, rivalrous conflict. In the terms of what we call the dharma, the new story that we're going to try and articulate in the rest of this 11th hour conversation, we say this very simply.

If everyone's inside the circle, then there's this sense of fullness. But if I don't have a sense of fullness, if I don't have a sense of, if you will, Eros, I've got to put someone else outside the circle in order to have the illusion that I'm inside the circle. If there's no genuine sense of intimacy, if there's no genuine narrative, there's no shared story, I only have a shared story by placing someone else outside the story, outside the circle: that's rivalrous conflict. That creates not Eros, not fullness, not intimacy. It creates a kind of pseudo-intimacy, a kind of pseudo-eros, it creates rivalrous conflict at the very, very heart as the basic structure of society.

When you have exponential growth, meaning a win-lose system that's generating exponential growth in which, being part of that growth, being able to consume more and more is the way that you actually achieve status and recognition and some sense of being sated and some sense of addressing the emptiness. Then you drive that exponential growth right off of a cliff which is creating the second core. The second core is what Nassim Taleb called a "fragile system," or what David Snowden calls a "complicated system." I thank Daniel, for the reference to Snowden. A complicated system, which means, Taleb's phrase, a fragile system which breaks down because you've got all these different pieces. Snowden, in a 2007 article in Harvard Business Review, distinguishes between a complicated and a complex system.

A complex system is a system that's self-organizing, a system that regenerates, a system that repairs, a system that takes care of the accumulation of its waste. A system in which a forest, or Snowden's example; a Brazilian rainforest, is a complex system. A Ferrari car is a complicated system and if you're missing one piece it breaks down. In a complex system, the whole is

greater than the sum of the parts. In a complicated system, the whole is equal to the sum of the parts and the larger the system, and the more interconnected it is, and the more complicated it is, the more fragile it is.

Your computer is made in seven countries and they obsolete the parts very quickly, and we intentionally obsolete parts. We create intentional scarcity. We create intentional breakdown in order to drive the growth which drives the win-lose metrics in the system which creates this false sense of Eros, this false sense of intimacy, this false sense of status, and the spiral keeps going until the extraction model extracts all the resources that we need in order to survive. The gap between the haves and the have nots expands and expands and you begin to see where it goes.

These two root causes, this win-lose metrics that Barbara, you've identified. This notion of a fragile and anti-fragile or David Snowden's complex and complicated system, both of which Daniel, in his work identifies as generator functions, summarizing the literature and really brilliantly organizing it in a beautiful way. These are core functions of the core risk that we're facing, but actually, underneath these generator functions is a deeper generative function and that's what we're saying.

We're saying that's what's causing, like the root cause, the root of the root, is actually; there's no new story. The core generator function. The core cause. The root catalyst is you can't have a complex system unless there's coherence. Intimacy generates coherence, and intimacy comes from a shared story, a shared vision, a shared memory of the future. When you don't have a motivational architecture for human life, then the only motivational architecture you have left is a win-lose metric and the result, friends, is that everything is commodified and we have no genuine sense of what our desires are, because, just like there's manufactured scarcities, there's manufactured desire.

We can't access what Buddha invited us to, which are our great desires. "Have few desires but have great ones," because our desires are our very feelings, and are manufactured for us. Whoa! So we can't access our root desire, we can't access genuine intimacy because that's based on a memory of the future, a shared narrative, a shared story, which takes us out of Kafka's trial, out of Camus' stranger, and creates genuine coherence. Now we have a complete, fundamental collapse of coherence.

If you want to say it in one sentence as we conclude. We've got upgraded connectivity and downgraded intimacy. We've got upgraded computers and downgraded human beings. As Harari correctly pointed out, and I'm going to radically disagree with all of Harari's conclusions, some of his analysis is important and I'm indebted to it and I appreciate it. Harari makes the very beautiful point; wild stallions, filled with capacity, filled with possibility. We then domesticate the stallions and they become these domesticated horses with bits in their mouth, serving us and they lose so much of their capacity. We're actually becoming domesticated bits in a data system which is going to produce a digital dictatorship in which there is no free will, there's no

genuine autonomy, there's no ability to access our genuine desires. There's no ability to create genuine intimacy. There's no sense of larger coherence and the system breaks down entirely.

How do we generate an anti-fragile world? A world which is anti-rivalrous? We actually have to generate a new narrative, a new story, a new memory of the future.

Hope. Hope is a memory of the future. And we can do it, absolutely. Not fancifully, not fairytale, but actually gathering the best information available to us and integrating it into a new world spirituality, a new integral wisdom. A new vision. And that's what we're here to do together.

In Chapter Three, we're going to do the last introductory conversation. We're going to look at the stories that lived all through history up till now, then from Chapter Four all the way through Chapter 12, we're going to, for the first time together, and I'm so excited Barbara, we're going to tell the new story.

Chapter 3: A New Dharma: After the Deconstructions: The Great Reconstructive Project: From Tragic to Post Tragic Living

Barbara:

Welcome everybody, to The 11th Hour. We're on the precipice, and we didn't realize it.

We need a dharma.

Now, I didn't ever know the word dharma, much less that I needed one. In my life, once I got the idea that our power ... the question, "What is our power that's good?" I began to get, not so much a dharma, but an evolutionary story.

I want to say a word about how hard it was for a person like me, as contrasted to Marc. I had no lineage. My father was Jewish, agnostic, competitive, toy-maker. His basic assumption was, "Barbara, do your best, and get out there and win." Whereas Marc comes from a beautiful Solomon's lineage that goes way back into Jewish mysticism, that he downloaded in Radical Kabbalah. It's a whole different story if you don't have a lineage, which is true of many Americans. We just don't have it.

What I did discover, I believe that's leading into a dharma is the evolutionary story, and I saw that 13.7 billion years of evolution, always going to higher consciousness, more freedom, and going into me, and you, and us.

I developed a worldview that I called *Conscious Evolution*, that I understand others have developed before me. What I did with it, is I gave my life to trying to understand Conscious Evolution and to bring it out into the world.

It was my offering into this field of no shared narrative, because we do have a shared narrative, everybody does: It's the 13.7 billion years. Everybody is an expression of that 13.7 billion years, uniquely as you, and uniquely as me. Even more than that, everybody's desire to express and create, is the universal evolution-desire desiring, and wanting to create.

I thought I was doing pretty well with promoting the story of evolution, and I also discovered that every person has, within themselves, what I discovered before I met Marc, which I called a Universal Human. The Universal Human is ourselves in the future. I encountered my future self as part of my work. I encountered a being within myself that seemed to hold the frequency of my potential, as an evolutionary woman.

As I incarnated that potential, this essence of my being, it said to me, "Keep your attention on me. I'm coded with your evolution."

In other words, I began to put my attention on the experience of what I was becoming. By putting my attention on that frequency of what I am becoming, I started to become it. I started to become my own future self, you might say. Then I began to realize that everyone has a unique potential self that, when we put our attention on it, it communicates to us the emergent possibility of the evolutionary story.

So I went to my journals, which I have 205 volumes of my journals, started at the age of 18. I started to review a certain portion of the journal, when I had actually gotten in touch with my Universal Self. The Universal Self writes very well in a journal. This is one of the shared practices that I would definitely talk about later, is that if everyone keeps a journal, who's listening to 11th Hour, and begins to write what you're getting that you are becoming, the nature of evolution is: attention creates reality.

I would say that I am that early phase of my own future self. It makes me feel like the emerging human, the new human, the new humanity. I worked pretty well with all this, until I met Marc. Now, when I met Marc, and he began to talk, I realized that I did not have a dharma. I had an experiential knowledge of the evolutionary process from Aurobindo, Teilhard, Bucky, and others, but I didn't have a dharma. I did have a sense of myself becoming something new, but I didn't have a dharma about the new self that I was becoming. So, you can imagine, if we bring together now, in Marc's language, "What is this dharma?"

All of you, whatever level of story you've been able to tell yourself about how you are, and what you are becoming, however you've been able to do it, whether in an existing religion, or in an evolutionary story, or if you haven't done it at all. Let's open our mind to the dharma, as Marc describes it, because as I've said before, he has access to the knowledge of the evolutionary process better than any human being I've ever met. Because of this, we're actually founding here, an expression like an evolutionary university, of what the dharma is.

I turn my word to you, Marc, What is the dharma?

Marc:

Well, thank you, thank you love, thank you Barbara.

What a beautiful introduction, how elegantly and gracefully, and indefatigably, with a kind of indefatigable perspicacity, have you really held, and promulgated, and told the story of Conscious Evolution. I am, and we're all in your debt. With so much grace, and so much honor, and such a delight to be in this urgent conversation, you know, in the holy laughter of it. Not a laughter which is a kind of Nietzschean laughter, which undermines reality, but a laughter that holds the joy, of a memory of the future, and what's possible.

You ask, "What is dharma?" Let me just address this notion of, perhaps, a lineage, for a second, before.

I come from a Hebrew Wisdom lineage, I practice in that lineage. I don't identify with that lineage exclusively. That is to say, I'm a dual citizen, of many lineages. I'm a dual citizen of many lineages and many communities. I study intently in Eastern practices. I study intently, in dimensions of Christianity, dimensions of Kashmir Shivism, particularly dimensions of Buddhism. But also intently in five or six of the eleven major schools of psychology, anthropology. I'm obviously connected to the social sciences, which are unbelievably important. My original academic study was philosophy, kind of the broad schools of philosophy, particularly existentialism. I did my academic work formally in Kabbalah. Kabbalah which is the Hebrew mystical lineage, is kind of my mother's milk.

At the same time, I'm not coming here, and we're not coming here, to present a lineage. I'm not speaking, although I'm informed by the lineages, and my particular native lineages, and all the others that I've been privileged to be a dual citizen of. What we're coming here is to do something else.

We're coming here to take a momentous leap beyond.

Now, let me be careful here. We're not going to take a leap which obsoletes the religions. The religions have an important and critical place. A person can be Jewish, or Catholic, or any other kind of Christian, or any other kind of Muslim, of which there are many, or Buddhist, or Confucist, or atheist in the sense they don't believe in the small vision of God provided by the exterior senses, or agnostic, a person can take ... or native, or any of the multicultural traditions. Drawing from a tradition is unbelievably important, but we need to place that in context, and see how drawing from a tradition informs stepping into a larger shared story.

Let me perhaps start there. What is dharma? Barbara, you ask what is dharma.

Dharma's a formal Sanskrit word, which speaks to a wisdom of living and a wisdom of living which is for realies, which is ontology, which is for real, it's ultimate. Dharma, of course, is a premodern word, which has a lot of limitations. I'm not using the word in its classical form. I'm using dharma in a new way, and I want to try and explain what that new way of using dharma is. It's this new dharma that's going to form the basis of the new narrative, of the new story, that in The 11th Hour, can actually move us forward.

In this short Chapter Three, we're going to talk about what we mean by dharma. I want to introduce three basic sets of distinctions. I'm going to do each one very briefly, and these will be tools in our toolkit in being able to embrace, and articulate, and live into, this notion of dharma.

There are three basic periods of history, and we need to understand basic periods of history because history develops. History evolves, it doesn't stand still. There's not just eternity, there's evolution. In history, let's just very roughly, for the sake of this conversation, talk about a premodern, modern, and post-modern period.

Let's talk about a premodern period that goes the thousand years from the time of Christ, the time of the second temple in Jerusalem, which was about 70 years before the year 1. The temple was destroyed in the year 70, as enormously important things are happening in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world. The birth of Christ, till the Renaissance. Let's just very roughly call that the premodern period.

In that period, there are great religions. Those great religions have an enormous amount to tell us about some dimensions of the interior face of the cosmos. They actually use practices to access interior wisdom. Contemplation, meditation, forms of ecstatic prayer, learning how to taste. We eat so fast, we're on our apps, we're looking quickly. We don't even taste our food, we've lost the ability to taste. Aquinas, the great Christian theologian, said that his favorite verse in the sacred scripture is "Taste and see that God is good." We've lost the capacity to cultivate taste, to access interior sciences.

The great traditions had enormously important interior sciences, and we clearly want to receive those wisdoms and take them with us. That's pre-modernity, but it's not all of pre-modernity, pre-modernity also had shadow. The shadows were manifold. One, only the elite lived with any vague form of dignity. Number two, each one of the premodern traditions thought they were the chosen one, and everyone else was some version or another of damned to hell. Augustine writes, "There's no redemption outside of the Church." Islam talks about *dar al-Harb* and *dar al-islam*, the people of the sword, who need to be put to the sword, as opposed to the people of Islam. Judaism, which didn't have power, and was more benign, therefore, nonetheless talks of a chosen people. Tibetan Buddhism clearly thinks it's the only chosen route to any sort of genuine Nirvana. We go on and on.

All of the tribes thought that the neighboring tribe was subject to predation, to conquest, and to murder, because they were in some sense not subject to the same shared covenant. As our dear friend Howard Bloom points out, there was always an in-group, and an out-group. The out-group always was treated horrifically, in every possible way. All of the ancient traditions, one way or the other, experience themselves as having an exclusive franchise on the interior sciences, an exclusive wisdom. God was their God, who was some form of cosmic vending machine, and in the exterior presentation, where you put in a prayer, you put in some sort of practice, and you got a particular result.

The premodern traditions weren't able to distinguish between their surface structures of ritual, and dogma, which is a claim of truth, not backed by evidence and genuine depth structures of interior knowledge. The result was abject and horrific suffering for most of the people, most of the time. Let's understand that. When we talk about Shamanism, for example, and the New

Age. Well, Shamans were usually at the center of a tribe. The tribe marked their territory from a tree, to a brook, to a mountain, and anyone outside of that defined territory was in the out group. We clearly don't want to regress to Shamanism. We might want to reclaim a new higher level of consciousness around Shamanism and integrate the best of Shamanism, in a new story -- That could be.

What we're going to want to do is take the best intuitions of each one of the premodern traditions, each tradition, Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Confucianism, native traditions, had a particular genius. We want to integrate that genius into a larger new story. Absolutely. At the same time we might want to practice in a tradition and up-level that tradition, and evolve that tradition. Since 60-70% of the world practices in a tradition, and usually in a premodern tradition, which is defining the globe today; evolving the traditions, up-leveling them is absolutely essential for getting through The 11th Hour. That's pre-modernity.

From pre-modernity, we go to modernity. Modernity is Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution. Fabulous, important. It critiques the cruelties of pre-modernity, but also throws out the baby with the bathwater. It doesn't actually interiorize the gorgeous information of the interior sciences, of meditation, of prayer. They view God as a kind of caricature, and don't actually get the depth of divinity that pre-modernity understood. Actually, the public, caricatured positions of pre-modernity, and the premodern traditions, are dismissed, appropriately by modernity. The depth is lost, but modernity ushers in human rights, abolishes slavery, creates the scientific method. Generates through the scientific method, new forms of human rights communities. Feminism steps in. Enormous things happen. Technology explodes into the world. That allows for population explosion, but population explosion is the increase in life, which by itself is gorgeous, and beautiful, and important.

Modernity brings with it enormous dignities, as Habermas points out, and enormous disasters. Our colleague, Ken Wilber has talked extensively about the dignities and disasters of modernity. That's modernity and we want to take with us all of the best of modernity. Steven Pinker who we cited earlier, points to but yet is arrested in, the goods of modernity, and can't quite get beyond them.

We clearly want to transcend and include the best of pre-modernity, in our dharma. The best of the most integrated and validated insights of pre-modernity and modernity need to be in our dharma. And post-modernity.

What's postmodernity? Postmodernity realizes, that modernity's notions, let's say of freedom; Mid-19th century freedom meant, in Great Britain, freedom for white, male, British people. Everyone else was subject to colonial oppression. Anyone who didn't follow the particular modernity sexual story was written out of the story, so lesbians, gays, trans had no place in the story. The notion that post-modernity points out is that lots of people were left out of modernity's story, there was lots of people on the periphery, billions of people actually, who were oppressed

and colonized. Postmodernity says “we've got to reclaim all of those people, and they all need to have a seat at the table.” That's enormously important.

Postmodernity points to the fact that pre-modernity and modernity themselves, didn't distinguish between their surface and depth structures and therefore dismisses all of pre-modernity, all of modernity, calls it all social constructions of reality. And as we said earlier, the only grand narrative of post-modernity is: “there's no grand narratives.”

What happened?

What postmodernity did is throw out all of the validated certainties, the important certainties of pre-modernity and modernity. What postmodernity should have done is thrown out the dogmatic certainties, the certainties that were declared dogma. Postmodernity didn't distinguish between dogma and dharma.

Dharma means I actually do an experiment. I might do an experiment of interior science through mediation, or I might do an exterior experiment using the forms of measurement of the exterior sciences, and I draw a conclusion. Both pre-modernity and modernity had, as Habermas, the great German philosopher, points out ...had legitimate experimental methods to draw empirical, valid data. Interior sciences and exterior sciences, which need to come together to form the basis of our new dharma. What's a new dharma?

A new dharma means we take the best of premodern, modern, and post-modern insight, and we merge it into a new whole, greater than the sum of the parts, and we begin to have a new set of certainties. Not dogmatic certainties. See, post-modernity said, "All you have left is uncertainty." We're saying "No, actually, if we take the validated information of the best strains of premodern, modern, and post-modern insight validated by each of their experimental, empirical, appropriate methods and we weave them together then what emerges is a new set of orienting certainties."

Not dogmatic certainties, but evolving dharmic certainties. We begin to have a sense of the world. We begin to have a sense that the mystery doesn't disappear. The uncertainty doesn't disappear, but we're able to reclaim a very profound level of location in the world. We're able to be intimate with reality again. We'll be able to hold ourselves again.

Let's just add two more pieces, then we got it. Let's explicate something that we just had, and put on the table implicitly. What basically we're saying in dharma is, we're saying there's three eyes. Habermas points to this, and some of the interior scientists do, and integral theory does, but it's three eyes.

There's the eye of the senses, which gathers empirical information. There's always been the eye of the senses in sciences. Mathematics, for example, that would be not the eye of the senses, that would be the eye of the mind, that's the second eye. A FMRI, or a telescope, that's the eye

of the senses. The eye of the senses gathers data. The eye of the mind, using reason, using mathematics, using calculus, gathers a whole other set of critical, validated informations.

Then the eye of the spirit or what the Sufis called the eye of the heart, which is an interior science, it's not mere subjectivity. We call it mere subjectivity; we put "mere" before "subjectivity" because we invalidate interiors, but actually, subjectivity is enormously important: values, loyalty, love, relationship, we-space. All the things that make life worth living. Intimacy, desire, sexuality, Eros, creativity, these are all realms of interiority. We actually gather, we use the interior eye of the heart through its own validated experimental methods.

What is an experimental method? You do an experiment, you repeat it again, you repeat it double-blind conditions. People do the same experiment not knowing each other, all over the world. Then for the first time in the 20th century, we gather the results of all of the experiments, and we realize in the interior sciences that there's validated information that people agreed on all over the world. We call that the perennial philosophy. The perennial philosophy is the shared interior science conclusions.

The perennial philosophy was insufficient because it ignored evolution. It thought that all these conclusions were eternal, but actually these conclusions are evolving. We have a baseline, we have a matrix, and then we evolve. Newness emerges. Whitehead talked about, "The creative advance of novelty." 'Newness emerges' doesn't mean I sit around and say, "Hey, I've got a new idea. Oh! I've got a new paradigm." Five billion new paradigms -- that's not what it means. Newness means I actually checked information, I did experiments in the interior sciences and I developed a genuine new information that I then bring to bear on this evolving dharma.

What's dharma?

Let's put it together, we're just about there friends. Dharma is the best insights of premodern, modern and postmodern knowledge that emerges from validated experiments in the interior sciences and the exterior sciences, each using different validity tests that are actually brought together, integrated together in a new whole, greater than the sum of the parts that doesn't dismiss mystery, that bows before the mystery, that holds the uncertainty, that wrestles existentially with angst and anguish, and yet at the same time, holds the beauty, the goodness, and the truth. Of that which we actually can disclose and can unpack, and can reveal, from the depth, and beauty, and gorgeousness, and wonder that is our universe that has a particular set of directions, understandings.

Now, let me go one last step. With this last step we're going to have dharma, and understand why dharma is the essence, why we need dharma. We need to articulate this new dharma. We might call this a world spirituality dharma, if you will. It's a dharma in which God has a place, but not the cosmic vending-machine God, not the God you don't believe in, that doesn't exist. We'll get to all this. Science has a vaunted place, and all the schools of anthropology, and all the

schools of psychology and all of the information has a place at the table, but it's integrated into a new whole.

Here's the last piece and we're there. I want to make a critical distinction between what we might call pre-tragic, tragic, and post-tragic. In some sense, pre-modernity and modernity are largely pre-tragic. Why were they pre-tragic? Because both pre-modernity and modernity claim clarity. When you have clarity, you're pre-tragic. Even when horrible things happen, you know exactly why they happened. You were punished for your sin, in some way or another, in pre-modernity. In certain versions of modernity if something bad happens, you attracted it into your life. That's a particular New Age understanding. Or modernity attributes some human failure that allows for suffering to happen, but if human beings just used their reason appropriately, there wouldn't be suffering.

Pre-modernity and modernity have their own validated information. They also have their own dogmas so they remain pre-tragic because they've got it all worked out. Then what happens is we explode the dogmas of pre-modernity, we forget about their validated dharmas and we fall into the tragic. Postmodernity is about the tragic, there's a reason why so many of the great existentialist thinkers committed suicide. They committed suicide because they'd moved from the pre-tragic to the tragic, and living itself just didn't make any sense anymore.

In the tragic there's a complete loss of narrative. The tragic is defined by an utter failure of intimacy. For the existentialists that committed suicide, they were in some sense, ahead of their time, they were prescient. They sensed this tragic invasion of lives, and they basically stepped out of the affirmation of life. They stepped out of the great 'Yes,' that's at the heart of the cosmos that they couldn't access. We need to move from the tragic to the post-tragic.

There's a tempting move to go from the tragic to the pre-tragic. To go to a regressive, religious, premodern fundamentalism, or to a regressive scientific fundamentalism. Notice I didn't say scientific, I said scientific, meaning science as dogma. Saying "Science will explain and obviate all of the interior issues in our lives." Having science basically be dogmatic and say "There is no subjectivity, there are no interiors," that's preposterous. Do you get what's happening?

There's fundamentalisms which are scientific, modern fundamentalisms, or there's premodern fundamentalisms that we can actually go back to which are very tempting.

We actually have to evolve, this is an evolutionary story.

We need to create a new dharma, which means we move to the post-tragic. The move to the post-tragic is based on what systems theory calls a minor fluctuation point that jumps the entire system at a moment of disequilibrium to a higher coherence. What is that minor fluctuation point? A new narrative. A new story. Wow.

The new story is post-tragic. We'll end with Yeats; Yeats really points to the post-tragic so beautifully. He says "When such as I cast out remorse, so great a sweetness flows into the breast. We can dance and we can sing. We are blessed by everything. Everything we look upon is blessed."

When I cast out remorse of the tragic, of the cynical uncertainty, of the sense of existential malaise, the sense of dislocation, the sense of Kafka's Trial, and Camus' Stranger, I begin to sense the possibility of ushering in this heaven on Earth. I can do that through this new dharma, which is not dogmatic. It's a karate dojo: anyone can contribute if they become a master, and everyone's invited to become a master. Barbara.

Barbara:

Beautiful, Marc, I just want to go back to relate that to the precipice we're at.

Marc Gafni:

Absolutely.

Barbara:

The idea of a minor fluctuation in the actual nature of reality. A tip of the tipping point looks like a minor fluctuation. It's a precipice, it could go either way from a small amount of effort one way or the other, whereas ordinarily, you have to do huge things to make a big change. If you're at a fluctuation point, like we are on the precipice, what we're saying, and I believe, that this dharma, when contributed into the minor fluctuation point that we're at at the precipice will make a critical difference to how it turns out.

Marc Gafni:

No, that is beautiful love, and I think you are so, as usual, prescient and absolutely right. Perhaps, with your permission, just one key point that we left out that's absolutely necessary.

Pre-modernity has a set of narratives. It has a universe story. It has a narrative of identity. It has a narrative of power. It has a narrative of relationship. It has a narrative of community. It has a narrative of sexuality. Pre-modernity has God's got the power, God's got the creativity, God tells you who to relate to and how to relate. Your identity is you're an obedient servant of God. You can be good, you can be ethical, within the context of your particular dogmatic, ethical frame of your local tribe.

Modernity has its own universe story, which the world is a machine. God's pretty much stepped out of the story in any substantive way. Power shifts from God to the human being. Then, human power, human creativity, free contracts between people, define what the modern set of narratives are. Both about, again, identity, power, we space, community, and sexuality. What happens is, as, Barbara, you've pointed out for all of us, for so many years, modernity comes to the limits of its power. Now you're sitting, twenty-four years old, with President Eisenhower, and

you're saying to him, "What's the meaning of our power?" Because modernity lost a deeper, in-depth narrative of power.

Technology became unbridled, Prometheus was unbound. Actually, these powers brought us to the apex of destruction, and between 1945 and 2019, as we've talked about in Chapter Two, we've exponentialized the problem, we've exponentialized tech, as Daniel Schmachtenberger said, "Exponential tech brings exponential suck." A beautiful several words. Then, post-modernity comes, and postmodernity deconstructs all the narratives of universe story, identity, power, sexuality, relationship.

What we're about to do, to articulate this new dharma, is we're going to engage in this great reconstructive project, which we're going to re-narrate, based on the best validated truths of premodern, modern, and post-modern, a new whole, greater than the sum of the parts which will articulate a new universe story, a new narrative of identity, a new narrative of power, a new narrative of relationship and we, and a new narrative of sexuality.

That's the task before us. It's the delight before us. It's the most exciting invitation possible. Think Da Vinci, this is a Da Vinci moment. Leonardo Da Vinci: the black plague has decimated Europe, Da Vinci can't go with his group of cohorts into every village in Europe and heal people, it's not possible. The renaissance can't do that. How many people were involved in the renaissance? Paul Tillich, the Christian existential theologian and historian reminds us there were about a thousand people involved in the Renaissance. What does Da Vinci do? He tells a new story. He tells a story of modernity which offers these new narratives, which begin to heal, to up-level pre-modernity, but actually create in their wake, a set of unmitigated disasters together with their dignities.

Our response again, to this global intimacy disorder, which generates this global action paralysis, needs to be a higher level of intimacy. A new production of intimacy, if you will. A new emergence of intimacy, which is the new narrative, the new story, the new dharma.

Barbara:
Thank you.

Chapter 4: The New Story: Allurement, Desire & Intimacy: The New Holy Trinity

Barbara:

Welcome again to 11th Hour on the Precipice. This is the universe story presented exactly at the moment of the quantum shift.

I turn it over to you, Marc.

Marc:

Thank you, Barbara. Thank you so much and it's so good to be with you. Friends, we're now in Chapter 4 of The 11th Hour and we're going to begin to articulate the new universe story, out of which will flow a narrative of identity, a narrative of power, a narrative of sexuality, a narrative of WE space, of relationship, a narrative of power.

I want to perhaps begin with a simple sentence. Two sentences which will kind of frame the story. Remember our story can include the best of validated information from the traditional period, or the pre-modern period, the best of the sciences from the modern period, the best insights of post-modernity, but we're going to weave it together. We're going to use systems science and evolutionary science and chaos theory, complexity theory. The great traditions. Psychology, anthropology, we're going to weave it together in a second simplicity. We're not going to be constantly footnoting. We're going to speak not in a first simplicity, but a simplicity beyond complexity, a second simplicity. We want to move from data and information to knowledge and wisdom. Because that's what we need to do to articulate this new story.

Two sentences: We live in an intimate universe. Wow. And the intimate universe lives in us. So I want to talk about those sentences. What do we know about reality? We know there's this dimension of infinity, and we know that infinity desired intimacy. Well how do we know that? Because here we are. The infinite desires finitude. The infinite is in love, says Blake, with the productions of time. That is to say infinity, however we understand infinity, was not satisfied to remain, from a human perspective, from a world perspective, from a universe perspective, un-manifest. The un-manifest, manifested. That's the mystery. And the manifesting is an enormous explosion of radical positivity. The decision to manifest, for the un-manifest to manifest, for the infinite to desire the finite is a radical affirmation of the goodness of reality. There's a radical explosive 'Yes!' at the heart of the cosmos.

The big bang, if you will, and that particular story, cosmogenesis, which is now being developed and unfolded into new possible multiverse stories, but let's just stay with the cosmogenesis story of the great flaring forth and the big bang, that big bang is screaming 'Yes!' If we understand science, we understand that the big bang is still banging, that explosive 'Yes' is ringing, is echoing through the cosmos. Now let's try and understand this in terms of a universe story.

The infinity desired the intimate. The infinity desired to manifest. How did that process happen? It didn't happen with a god force, an infinite force that was purely external to cosmos waving a magic wand and saying, here's the world. That's the old view, that's the weakness of the pre-modern view. Acts that we understand that there's an inherent, ceaseless creativity in cosmos and the divine creativity, the infinite creativity not only holds cosmos, but inheres in cosmos. It's an inherent creativity, there's a creative process. We have a name for that creative process, we call it evolution. Evolution is not a theory, it's a fact. Evolution is the nature of reality. Reality is not only eternity, reality is evolution.

What does that mean?

We think evolution's a theory out there, but evolution's actually telling us something about the nature of reality and, friends, notice if you were with us in Chapter Three, recall we're going to seamlessly integrate pre-modern, modern and post-modern. Reality is evolution. What does evolution mean? Evolution means that reality's not just a fact, it's a story. Reality's not just an eternal fact, it's an evolving story. It's a story means it's going somewhere, a story has a plot line. It has a direction. It has telos.

We're afraid of telos, because a dogmatic, pre-modernity. Each religion or nation tried to hijack telos and say telos or purpose or direction or a goal for the universe was my country, my religion and my nation and not yours and go, literally, directly to hell. Actually there's an inherent intentionality. There's an inherent telos in cosmos.

Step one, the infinite desired the intimate. The un-manifest desired to manifest.

Step two, that's a resounding 'Yes!' at the heart of cosmos.

Step three, the manifestation happens not through external creativity superimposed on a reality, which then needs to be non-creative and only obedient to a divine creativity, but actually that divine creativity is inherent. There's an inherent, ceaseless creativity in cosmos.

Four, the process of that creativity is called evolution.

Five, evolution means that reality's not a fact, it's a story. It's not an ordinary story. As we're about to see, it's a love story.

It's not an ordinary love story, it's not ordinary love in the sense of love that's merely human. A romantic human attachment which so often is for ego, security, status, -- that's all legitimate and good and important, but there's something much deeper than ordinary love. Ordinary love is a subset. A particular, often cultural expression and often a pale reflection of something much deeper.

Reality's not a fact, it's a story. It's not an ordinary story, it's a love story. It's not an ordinary love story, it's an outrageous love story. It's an evolutionary love story. That is to say it's evolutionary Eros that drives the entire story. Wow, that starts to become interesting.

Step six. There is in the language of the great traditions a string of desire in the infinite.

The great traditions access that through the eye of the heart, but science actually understands mystery; reality decides to manifest. Science starts from the big bang. The interior sciences talk about the moment before when no thing decided to manifest, there's this string of desire. Infinity desires finitude. In the moment of the big bang, in the first nanoseconds of the big bang, there is a set of forces, mathematical structures unleashed and inherent forces and cosmos that are unleashed.

One of those forces is Eros. I'm going to talk about Eros in a couple of minutes, but for now, let's just talk about this force of desire and allurement that drive cosmos.

There's a desire, there are elementary particles and they are allured to each other. They have a desire for each other in the first nanoseconds of the big bang. Then at some moment, after all of the attraction, repulsion, annihilation, there are the first stable relationships that are formed that allow evolution to take it's next steps.

This notion of allurement, for example, between electrons, protons and neutrons some 375,000 years later in the process, but again, allurement which brings subatomic particles together 375,000 years later to form an atom. How's an atom formed? An atom is formed because there's allurement.

There's a balance between allurement and autonomy, between attraction and repulsion, both expressions of Eros and this allurement in relationship to the forces of reality actually brings subatomic particles together to form an atom. Atoms then come together, they're allured together and they form a molecule. And then molecules are allured together and they form a complex molecule. Then there's an intensification between the complex molecules of the bonds, the relationship, the intimacies between them and they form and they deepen into what becomes a cell.

There's a structure of allurements in cosmos, a structure of desire. There's desire that lives between electrons and protons and neutrons. That desire allures these subatomic particles to each other.

Now what do they desire? They desire to be intimate. Intimacy means there's a new configuration of relationship between the parts that manifests a whole that's greater than the sum of the parts. That's a new configuration of intimacy.

Intimacy is: shared identity in the context of otherness. Intimacy is not fusion, it's a union. Subatomic particles come together because they feel each other. They're attracted to each other. They want to touch each other. Alfred North Whitehead, the great philosopher of science, he called this 'prehension', which is the proto touch desire, the allurement between elementary particles to form a composite particle. Between subatomic particles to form an atom. But this allurement, this desire for greater intimacy. Always for greater intimacy, always for a new whole, greater than the sum of the parts.

I was talking to an evolutionary scientist not that long ago and I said, "There's telos in cosmos," he said, "Of course there is, cosmos moves from simplicity to complexity. That's the whole story, that's all we know." And I said, "Complexity?" Well, that's of course true. Obviously we move to more complexity, but it's kind of depressing to live in a world whose telos is complexity.

Complexity, I shared with my friend, is actually just a word that's hiding something. Complexity means more and more interconnections. More and more nodes of intersectionality, that's interconnectivity. There's clearly an evolution of more and more interconnectivity, but interconnectivity is an exterior. The interior of interconnectivity is intimacy, so a new protein molecule, for example, that allows us to convert grain into flesh and blood, that's a new configuration of intimacy, a new configuration, for example, of amino acids within the protein molecule.

Every momentous leap in evolution takes place through evolution being allured to a deeper intimacy, evolution desiring greater intimacy. New configurations of intimacy are the mechanism of evolution itself. If we want to begin to understand the telos of evolution, the plot line if you will, of the evolutionary love story, evolution is the evolution of intimacy. Wow. That's pretty interesting.

We're not making this up. It's not a dogma, this is for realies. This is the structure of reality. We live in an intimate universe and the universe itself, the structure, the telos, the direction, the plot line of evolution is evolution involves greater intimacy. Evolution is love in action and love is evolution in action. The movement; allurement is driving the entire story.

Let's begin to see what this means. To begin to realize, just feel your body. How do you feel when you say, "I live in a universe which is going to ever increase in complexity." Or "I live in a universe in which reality is moving through the balance between the dialectical tension, the gorgeous dance between allurement and autonomy, reality is moving to ever higher, ever deeper intimacies." What does it mean to realize that evolution is the progressive deepening of intimacies? Intimacy, desire, allurement are expressions of what we might call Eros.

What's Eros? So here is 20 years for you in about 30 seconds. Eros in its deepest sense, Eros is the experience of radical aliveness, seeking, desiring ever deeper contact, meaning ever deeper intimacy and ever greater wholes. Eros, the core structure of reality, the interior experience of Eros is pleasure. The non-erotic experience is fragmentation, pain, disassociation. The core structure of reality is Eros all the way up and all the way down. God is more than, but not less than Eros. God is Eros because God is reality. All the way up and all the way down, Eros is the movement of reality to ever deeper contact.

That movement is desire. Reality desires ever deeper contact. Is allured to ever deeper contact, meaning ever deeper intimacy and ever greater wholes. A whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

For example, take hydrogen and oxygen. Neither of them are liquid at room temperature. They come together in a deeper intimacy: H₂O, you have water. Take molecules, molecules are allured to each other, they form a complex molecule, then there's a deepening of that intimacy and Voila! Over vast stretches of evolutionary time which are living and teeming with allurements and desire. There's not vast stretches of empty space, that's not true. It's vast stretches of allurements and desire which manifest a cell which is greater than the sum of the parts. Meaning it has new emerging properties, for example, a cell respirates. None of the individual complex molecules that make up the dimensions of the cell can do what a cell does. Intimacy drives emergence, intimacy drives new possibilities.

Every time evolution runs into a block, a crisis; crisis becomes an evolutionary driver. Barbara, you've talked more than anyone, any human being I know, more beautifully about this notion that this 11th Hour; that our crisis is a birth. What's the nature of the crisis? It's always a crisis of intimacy. Every crisis is a crisis of relationship. In order to overcome a crisis of intimacy, what does reality do? It moves from single celled organisms to multi celled organisms.

There's a crisis of intimacy, there's a breakdown, there's an oxygen crisis; that whole story, Barbara, you've talked about in Conscious Evolution and many other evolutionary biologists and cosmologists have talked about. There's this breakdown and then the breakthrough is multicellular life, which is this momentous leap forward which is a deeper structure of intimacy. It's a new configuration of intimacy that then shoots us up the evolutionary chain ultimately to early plant life and to fish and then to plants on land and then all the way up to early animals and then mammals and into the first hominids to human beings.

All of evolution is the progressive deepening of intimacies. From a cosmological evolution, it's not empty and non-sentient or dead in any sense, it's a self-organizing universe driven by allurements, intimacy and desire, driven by Eros. All of a sudden we realize, "Wow, this is evolutionary love we're describing". Evolutionary love is not mere human sentiment, paraphrasing Tagore. Evolutionary love, Eros, is the heart of existence itself. Then I begin to realize that desire that lives in me is not local to me, it's not even local to humanity. We

experience our desire as something local to our particular self. It's not only not local to me, it's not local to humanity, desire is part of the field of desire in cosmos.

Intimacy is not a particular human desire, two human beings trying to figure it out. No, my desire to create intimacy with you is evolution awakening in me. I'm actually accessing the full force of evolution alive and awake, living, breathing through me and we'll talk about how it breathes uniquely through me in the next chapter.

Allurement, intimacy, desire, Eros, these are qualities of cosmos itself and it's one world.

That's what's so exciting. It's one love. Bob Marley got it right. It's one love, and it's one world. That is to say it's not a fragmented, non-intimate, fractured world, but the same drive for intimacy: the same forces of attraction or repulsion, forces of allurement and autonomy that live in the cosmological subatomic quantum world. They operate with different laws sometimes, but the basic structure of allurement that lives in the atomic world, that lives in the molecular world, that lives in the cellular world, that lives in the early plant world, that lives in the amphibian world, that lives in the early animal world, it's all the progressive deepening of intimacies until intimacy becomes conscious of itself in human beings. This is the next step in conscious evolution, this is the beginning of a universe story in which we can locate ourselves.

We begin to realize that we live in an intimate universe. Not only do we live in an intimate universe, the intimate universe lives in us.

All of a sudden we begin to see the problematic nature, the shadow of artificial intelligence because artificial intelligence is intelligent, has raw computational power, but it bypasses all the levels of intimacy: quirks, subatomic particles, molecules, complex molecules, cells, multicellular life and all of the structures of evolutionary intimacy that actually live in the human being. "We are stardust, we are golden, we are billion year carbon." they sang back in the '60s, I think it was Crosby, Nash, Stills and Young, when Young was still there.

Meaning all of evolution lives in us. The intimate universe lives in me. In artificial intelligence we bypass all of the structure of the intimate universe to raw computational power. We clearly need, and we'll talk about that in Chapter Six or Seven, we need to download evolutionary love into artificial intelligence. We'll get to that.

For now let's understand we live in an intimate universe, the intimate universe lives in us and reality has telos.

We don't need to exile telos from reality because it was hijacked in dogmatic ways by pre-modernity. Reality desires, meaning: reality is holding a memory of the future. The memory of that future is to ever deeper wholes, to ever greater intimacies with a 'Yes!' living, a 'Yes!' for intimacy, a 'Yes!' for greater wholes that lives at the very heart of the cosmos.

Now we have the beginning of a universe story, an ontological universe story based on, not dogma, based on dharma. Based on a seamless integration of the best of pre-modern, modern and post-modern.

Now we can breath. Because, here's the last sentence: What is a new story?

We said a new story is the response to the global intimacy disorder, which in turn affects and causes the global action confusion and the global action paralysis.

What is a new story at its core? A new story is a new configuration of intimacy. Because what are we doing? We're taking the parts, the best validated information from pre-modern, modern and post-modern, we're weaving them together in a new configuration of intimacy and then generating this new intimacy which is the new story. The way we respond to the global intimacy disorder is through a new emergent of intimacy. This new emergent of intimacy is the new story itself.

Barbara:

Marc, what is so beautiful about this as the basis of the new universe story is the effect that this can have on society, on planet Earth, on our relationship to all the other species, in our relationship to God, in our relationship to the source within ourselves.

When you say it's a big 'Yes!' I am noticing all the yeses that it affirms. There is a whole hierarchy of yeses that we treated differently when we didn't have this story.

For example, our relationship to nature. Well, we just use nature. Nature's there for us to grow things. Yes, we might have climate change, we'd better take care of it. But the idea of intimacy of the natural world with itself, with all the particles coming together and then with us, gives me a whole view of the cultivation and love of nature.

Then there's the love of animals. You would not eat meat when you are imagining that little lamb locked up for the lamb chop.

Marc:

That is correct.

Barbara:

And you told me this and I've eaten lamb chop.

Marc:

We're going to evolve together, love.

Barbara:

I know, but when I eat a lamb chop, or in the past, I realize that I was not aware of the intimacy. On all levels of life itself. When I ate that lamb chop without noticing anything about intimacy. That changed my behavior and I'm thinking of what this worldview does to change our behavior.

I'm thinking about how we feel about other cultures. We don't really like them because they're different and whatever their worldview is it's different from our worldview. The clash of worldviews has caused probably more pain and horror than any other large clash that there is. I'm thinking of different cultures that I perhaps have not fully aligned with from the point of view of intimacy, including my own culture which I have not fully aligned with.

I'm suggesting that in The 11th Hour, if we can align with the intimacy from the deepest, subatomic particle, to us on this Earth, to the planetary systems.

Let's even take it one more step here, I am intimate with whatever life is beyond this planet. Instead of saying, "Oh, I don't believe in extraterrestrials, oh, that's weird, that's awful." If there are billions of other planets and billions of other galaxies, this point of view simply makes us available for intimacy at whatever level. Whether subatomic or galactic. Wow!

Marc:

That's, yeah, that's totally beautiful.

Barbara:

Isn't that true?

Marc:

That is true and we are going to ... that's gorgeous, love, right? And we're going to, of course, talk...

By the way, for anyone listening, I always use the word love when I talk to people, so I asked Barbara's permission and I talk to men and women, I always say love. If that's offensive to anyone in our world of appropriate political correctness, that's just the word I use and I checked and asked permission before.

If I can, beloved Barbara, let me just respond to the beauty that you just introduced as you began to intuit the implications of the universe story across the board.

We're going to unpack these implications in future Chapters, but this is actually a really critical kind of bonus moment because we really need to apply this. Here's a sentence from Master Dōgen, notice we're always integrating, evolutionary scientists, chaos theory, the great traditions, post-modern insights.

Master Dōgen says enlightenment is intimacy with all things. How beautiful, we might reformulate that and say enlightenment means there are no externalities. Wow. What does that

mean? It means no-one is outside the circle. It means I don't need to use rivalrous conflict in a win-lose metric in order to establish identity - I see everyone's in the circle, no-one's out of the circle of intimacy.

Which means, for example, nature can't be out of the circle of intimacy, as Barbara points out. Another culture can't be out of the circle of intimacy. Shadow parts of myself can't be out of the circle of intimacy. Enlightenment is intimacy with all things. I don't exist without the bacteria in the soil. I die without the plankton in the coral reef in the Indian ocean. We begin to realize the notion of a non-intimate universe is actually, from a scientific perspective, a joke. It's an absurdity.

Now the exterior sciences are validating the intuition, the validated knowledge of the interior sciences. The interior sciences understood that enlightenment is intimacy with all things, but couldn't validate it in the physical world. Systems theory, we might say systems theory, systems science is the science of intimacies. Take a look for one second what the implications of this are.

They're so enormous.

Two examples:

All of a sudden we have the possibility of restoring the dignity of desire.

"Have few desires, have great ones."

A narrative of desire becomes a sexual narrative. Instead of talking about sex positive, which is bland, or sex neutral which is kind of like having lunch, who believes that? Sex negative; it's too dangerous, keep it in the box. Or sex sacred, because sex allows us to create babies. When was the last time you had sex to create a baby?

All of the four sexual narratives: Negative, positive, neutral and sacred don't actually work, they don't meet our sexuality. What if we talked about sex erotic? Meaning sex which is an expression of the evolutionary Eros.

And what if we shattered ethnocentricity with intimacy with other cultures. What if we actually begin to write our own interior work, not as surface psychology, but as an expression of the drive for intimacy in cosmos. We begin to understand that when I realize I live in an intimate universe and the intimate universe lives in me and the telos of reality is the progressive deepening of intimacies, we begin to open up possibilities.

To finish, we've articulated at the Center for Integral Wisdom and the Foundation for Conscious Evolution, which you and I share with so many other great leaders together. We've articulated this point about 100 tenants of intimacy. These tenants of intimacy move across systems science, evolutionary science. They move across physics, they move across anthropology, they move across psychology, they move across city planning, they move across ecology.

You begin to realize, wow, one love: an intimate universe. One world. You can feel it. We begin to be able to locate ourselves in a reality again. That's the beginning of what we need in The 11th Hour more desperately than anything else. We're imagining, through this new integration, this new emergent, a new possibility which is the deepest structural nature of reality itself.

Barbara:

Marc, I just want to read a few quotes from my Evolutionary Synthesis, of scientific views of universe itself that reinforces this.

Marc:

Beautiful.

Barbara:

One from Freeman Dyson, he says, "I have found a universe growing without limit in its richness and complexity. A universe of life surviving forever and making itself known to its neighbors across unimaginable gulfs of space and time." Now we're really talking large.

Marc:

Did you notice, love, isn't it beautiful, he starts with complexity and then he adds in, making itself known to its neighbors which begins to realize this sense there's more than complexity, there's intimacy. Beautiful.

Barbara:

That's right. And then Stephen Hawking who was not much of a believer, he says, "The mind of God is the natural culmination of the evolution of the mind of humans." So he's going the other way. "The mind of God is the natural culmination of the mind of humans and other intelligent creatures throughout the universe whose collective efforts conspire to affect a transformation of the cosmos."

Marc:

This is important here, love. Hawking here is both beautiful and true, but partial and dogmatic.

Barbara:

Right. He is.

Marc:

He's making an assumption which is that the mind of God is the natural culmination of collective human genius and he's making an assumption about the relationship of consciousness too, of interiors and exteriors, this Hawking quote is quoted very often and it's a classical example of scientism. Meaning Hawking is often quoted to say we don't need a God for the world, but he's talking about the God you don't believe in. The God you don't believe in doesn't exist. He's talking about the caricature God of the great traditions. Then he makes a momentous dogmatic

leap, which assumes a particular nature of relationship of consciousness to reality, which is not in any way validated by the sciences.

Barbara:

That's why I read it, because it's not what we're saying, but he's so famous and he's powerful.

Marc:

Right. And it's a wonderful example of how dogmas exist both in science, in modernity and pre-modernity, so it's a great example, so thank you.

Barbara:

I have one more that I want to read from Mark Cummings. "All matter inclusive of living systems appears to be dynamically arising out of a pre-physical substrate or domain of pure potential energy which can be thought of as a kind of pre-energy underlying all material forms. The quantum plenum provides a vibrant, radiant matrix, a sentient of dynamic medium which is the generative source of the mysterious aspects of the subtle emergent forces sustaining all life." These were scientific. I just want to say-

Marc:

Let me just grab, can I just grab one thing here, love, is that okay? Just on the quantum plenum.

Barbara:

Of course, go.

Marc:

The quantum plenum, which he uses beautifully, is often also misused. So, again, I want to be really accurate here in our 11th Hour. The quantum vacuum or the quantum plenum, which is not the same, by the way, as the zero point field although they're often used together inappropriately so.

The quantum vacuum is not no thing. It's not the infinite. It's part of the world of the finite. It generates virtual particles that pop in and out of existence, but it's not the source, at least scientifically, of the particles that construct our reality. What it does is it gives a sense, and often people call it the field of pure potentiality, but they confuse it with the infinite. That's, again, one of those subtle reductionisms that we have to avoid. We've got to be rigorous both in our spirituality and our science. But what he's doing correctly and beautifully is alluding to the fact that there are mysteries in science. That point to, that allude to deeper levels of reality.

From that perspective, as it says in the good Bible, there are sermons in stones and so there are certainly sermons in quantum plenums.

Barbara:

Yes. The last point here is that when I got started on all of this, scientism had precedence over spirituality, and I tried to learn evolution through scientific methodology and the accidental universe.

Now what you are saying is so beautiful in that, by having the basis of reality from which it comes, expressing what we need deeply: is a whole new view of universal reality. That when we have this, I believe that where we're sitting, at this precipice, together; let's say that The 11th Hour is going to help bring forth a major new vision of reality which is fundamental to making the shift.

Marc:

Absolutely. As the Bible says, Halle-fucking-lujah. Amen.

Barbara:

So anyway, thank you all so much. This has been...

Marc:

Thank you, Barbara. What a delight to be here with you in The 11th Hour. To do this together, what an absolute delight and honor.

Barbara:

What an important chapter in our lives. Thank you, thank you. Thank you, Marc.

Marc:

Thank you everyone.

Chapter 5: Homo Amor, Part One The Intimate Universe in Person

Barbara:

Welcome Marc, to Chapter Five: The Intimate Universe in Person, Homo amor.

Marc:

Barbara, Oh my God, here we are. We're in Chapter Five and we're now ready to move towards a Narrative of Identity.

We've established the New Universe Story. The New Universe Story itself, is a new configuration of intimacy. We live in an intimate universe. The intimate universe lives in us. Reality is evolution.

Evolution means that reality is not just a fact, it's a story. It's not an ordinary story, it's a love story. It's not an ordinary love story, it's an evolutionary love story. A story has a plot line, the plot line of reality is scientifically: evolutionary sciences, emergent sciences. The plot line of reality is the progressive deepening of intimacies. Evolution is the evolution of intimacy. Evolution desires, yearns for more intimacy.

Eros is the dialectical movement between allurement and autonomy. The allurement to ever deeper wholes, ever deeper contact. Eros is the experience of radical aliveness. Moving towards, desiring ever-deeper contact, meaning ever deeper intimacy and ever larger wholes.

Intimacy is a new configuration of parts that have a deeper relationship, they are reconfigured. There's a deeper intimacy and a new whole is created, that's greater than the sum of the parts.

We begin to have a sense of the universe and this sense, these tenets of intimacy, several of which we introduced in Chapter Four, work, they move across, they unify the cosmos, as it were. There's a unified sense. There's one cosmos, there's one love. The universe is now becoming intimate.

It's not just the universe moving blindly towards more complexity, a frightening notion and an inaccurate notion, both in terms of the exterior sciences and the interior sciences. The notion that reality doesn't have an inherent telos is scientifically absurd.

Howard Bloom, who wrote a fabulous book called [The God Problem:] How a Godless Universe Creates and of course when Howard talks about a godless universe, he's talking about the God

you don't believe in that doesn't exist. Howard rejects the caricature, cosmic vending machine God who's purely exterior to cosmos and he maps telos, gorgeously. Howard is a mentor to many of the leading scientists in NASA today, one of the great philosophers of science.

After Chapter Four, we've established this new story, this New Universe Story, remember, a Story brings together the best of premodern, modern, postmodern, all of their validated insights, these different parts into a new whole, which is greater than the sum of the parts. Meaning the story itself is a new configuration of intimacy.

Feel the elegance of the cosmos, the cosmos that moves towards more freedom, more consciousness, more elegant order, which are all expressions of more intimacy. Feel the elegance of, we're suffering a global intimacy disorder, which causes a global action paralysis and a global action confusion - it has to be healed, we have to evolve by actually doing what evolution does, by evolving the next emergent of intimacy, by restoring intimacy.

Intimacy restores coherence. When we begin to have coherence, then we can begin to respond to all of the 15 crises, which as we noted in Chapter Two, all of them require coherence. All of them require an inspired coherence of shared action. A shared vision, a shared memory of the future, which is a shared desire. Homo Prospectus is the one who prospectus, hope is a memory of the future. A shared narrative is a memory of the future. Desire moves towards the future and we've reclaimed desire and its inherent dignity.

The desire both of the individual, "Have few desires, but have great ones," clarify desire, I move beyond a pseudo Eros, into a genuine Eros, a genuine allurements. Clarify allurements, but realize that it's allurements that guides my life.

What we're about to see is, as we move now into the Narrative of Identity, we want to fulfill on our promise, we've now articulated the rough outline of a Universe Story. From a Universe Story, we derive a Narrative of Identity. The Narrative of Identity is how does the intimate universe show up in person as you, as me and as We?

Let's start with in person with the individual. To be intimate is to be personally addressed. We begin to understand, we begin to feel the sense of personal address.

There are five selves that we can talk about. When we move through the five selves, we're actually experiencing in our own lives as ontogeny and phylogeny recapitulate each other, said simply, we're experiencing in our own lives the trajectory of evolution. We're experiencing in our own lives, the progressive deepening of intimacies.

The movement between the selves is a movement towards ever deepening intimacy, taking place within the self, which is a capitulation of all of reality. All of reality lives, inheres, in me and I actually can experience, in myself, literally, all of reality is in me. The entire evolutionary

trajectory actually lives in me. That's the exterior sciences. That's an absolute scientific truth. That's not a fanciful claim. That's true.

The interior sciences make from their perspective, based on their validated experimental methods, the same declaration, the same claim, that all of the interior universe lives in me. Interiors and exteriors, all the way up and all the way down. We're beginning to get some coherence.

Okay, that was enough introduction. I know that was a lot of pieces, that was to locate us. For those who are following closely.

Now, let's breathe.

Let's step in.

Five selves: the first self that lives right in the contemporary world today is what we might call the separate self. The separate self is real, it's gotten demonized. Separation exists in the mind of God, if you will. If we can speak in a psycho-mystical perspective. Separation is real, I'm not you and you're not me; there's a deep truth to that. We actually are distinct and we're appropriately distinct, which is why I can't violate your boundaries.

One of the great contributions of modernity is the dignity of the separate self. Human rights is based on that dignity, meaning my value is not because I'm part of the kingdom. My value is not because I'm part of the church. I have an irreducible, intrinsic value in and of myself.

My dignity inheres within my separate self, even if I'm not part of a larger political or mythic religio structure. That was a great breakthrough of modernity, I became in that sense, intimate with self, I wasn't fused with a larger identity. I became distinct.

Remember, intimacy is: 'shared identity in the context of otherness.' In the premodern world the otherness got effaced, the shared identity was emphasized and in some sense, the entire premodern world had a cult-like dimension. There was a fusion, a dampening of individuality. There was a dampening of individual creativity. I was defined only by my shared identity, but the otherness got lost. A cult is non-intimate because it only has shared identity, it doesn't have otherness.

Now, we emerge into modernity and we affirm the dignity of the separate self. That's beautiful.

I'm going to use the image of a puzzle piece; the separate self is a puzzle piece, the puzzle piece is searching for the puzzle. It's not enough to be a separate self. When I'm just a separate self as Putnam wrote in his fabulous book a decade or so, or a little more, ago called *Bowling Alone*, I feel lonely, I feel desiccated, I feel incomplete. I have an urge not only to emerge as a separate self, but I have an urge to be part of the larger whole.

You have the separate self, this puzzle piece, looking for the puzzle but then modernity says there is no puzzle. There's just you, just a skin encapsulated ego, a Giacometti sculpture, a desiccated separate self. The separate self is devastated. The separate self goes almost insane with grief and despair and hopelessness. As George Steiner said, "ennui" .

We need to move from the separate self. Before we leave the separate self, let's just do one more sentence. Remember that principle of intimacy? Intimacy, again, is 'shared identity in the context of otherness'. The separate self affirms the dignity of otherness, the dignity of separation.

That separation, that otherness is in the context of a shared identity. The shared identity is the move from separate self to true self. Now, in between the move from separate self to true self, however, there's one more step called false self.

False self means that you lose intimacy with the integrity of your separate self. Your separate self gets distorted, your puzzle piece gets crumpled up in some sense. It's not just a puzzle piece that's going insane with the delirious pain because it can't find the rest of the puzzle that it has this inconsolable yearning for. It's a crumpled up, distorted version of the separate self.

For example, you might create your false self from within a false core sentence. As psychologist Stephen Gilligan's research pointed out very beautifully, your false core sentence might be: "I'm not enough" or "I'm too much," "I'm alone," "I'm not safe," or "I'm ugly." That would be my first person false self. I might have a second person false self. Let's say my first person is, "I'm alone," my second person would be, "No one will ever want to be with me." My third person would be, "The world doesn't have a place for me."

I generate reality from within a non-intimate sense of who I really am. Now, it gets even worse, the failure of intimacy intensifies, because in order to cover up my false core, I generate a false self.

Let's say my false core is "I'm not safe," I'm living within this false core sentence: "I'm not safe." I might then generate a false self that either refuses to take any appropriate risk or takes excessive and inappropriate risks, in order to cover up the pain of my false core sentence.

Now I've got a false self, which means I'm even less intimate with myself. Even though I might do lots of good things, I'm not grounded in the authenticity of who I am. The false self is a distortion of separate self, which becomes extremely non-intimate with its own authentic nature.

However, there's an even deeper intimacy built into the ground of separate self, which is when separate self becomes, not a partial identity, but a full identity. Separate self is true - It's real, but it's only partial. I actually have a much larger identity than my ego self or separate self, using those terms as synonyms.

I'm actually not just 'other;' intimacy is 'shared identity in the context of otherness.' My shared identity means I'm part of, I'm inseparable from the larger field. That's true both in the exterior sciences, the plankton, the coral reef, the bacteria, all of the systems, the ecosystems and every level of reality actually sustain me and there are no real boundaries. There's no real membranes, all boundaries are permeable.

There's a constant exchange of waves, information, energy on multiple forms, taking place in every nanosecond of reality so the notion, on a scientific level, of me being a separate self is patently absurd. Remember, interiors and exteriors, all the way up and all the way down. In human being as well, in the interior sense, I'm not separate from the larger seamless code of the universe. We call that your true nature or your true self.

Now, the total number of true selves in the world is one. True self is the singular that has no plural. That is to say we all participate in the same true self, in the same field of consciousness, in the same field of awareness, in the same field of allurements. We live in that field and that field lives in us, but that field of consciousness and awareness, let's say that dimension of the field that's been identified by, for example, many, many mystical traditions, both in the West and the East.

Let's take Buddhism, for example, Buddhism focuses on that sense of the, "I Am" the suchness of reality, the Shunyata, in Buddhist terms, the ground of reality which I participate in, which is beyond all stories. That's beyond the story of my separate self, beyond the story of my false self, that distorted story. There's a ground, a suchness, an intrinsic value to my beingness. That's beautiful.

That's a premodern insight located in all the great mystical traditions. It's in Hasidism, it's in Kashmiri Shaivism, it's in Buddhism, it's in mystical Christianity, it's in Sufism. There's versions of it in many of the other great traditions. There's versions of it also in native traditions all over the world. That's a great truth.

But look what my friend and ... blessings to him, we both lived in Tel Aviv. Yuval, you take this moment of the non-story, the self that's beneath and beyond story, which is a beautiful moment. You take that premodern moment and you decontextualize it from all of modernity and from all of evolution and from all of development and everything else we're about to say in this session. And you say: in a world that desperately needs a new narrative, there isn't one.

In the second to last and last chapter of your book, you basically make a bunch of classical, pre-modern Buddhist moves, which are beautiful and appropriate. You've done great Vipassana, but then you decontextualized that and you make that... 'we desperately need a story,' Chapter one. End of the book: 'Ha, just a joke: There is no story'.

Well, no, that's not quite right.

What you're right about is there's a True self that lives underneath, that lives beneath the personality. I need to access and sit in silence, as you do, as I do, in the suchness of reality, in the Shunyata, in the field of being. That's True self and True self is gorgeous, but it's only one piece of the story.

Let's go back to the puzzle metaphor, friends. The puzzle piece metaphor from the true self perspective: there's just a puzzle, there's just one. 'Ah, you think there's lines separating the puzzle pieces? That's an illusion. Meditate, and you'll move beyond that illusion of individuality and you'll deconstruct the skandhas.'

This is where postmodernity and classical Buddhism actually join forces in a somewhat unholy alliance. What do I mean by unholy? They tell too large, make too grand of a claim, which is not validated. They say there is no validity to story. Story is just a grand, constructed, artificial narrative. No, True self claims there's only a puzzle and there are no puzzle pieces, That's not quite right either.

Just like you go completely insane being a separate self, striving, seeking for the larger puzzle, you also go completely insane being just a full puzzle when there's a fundamental denial of the ontology of your higher individuation beyond ego, that's a disaster. We need to move from Separate self to Unique self.

What's a Unique self?

Unique self is a puzzle piece that completes the puzzle and that's located perfectly in its surroundings. You begin to get an image of intimacy. I'm located in a narrative. What's a Unique self? Uniqueness is not separateness. That's a huge mistake.

Both the East and the West conflated separateness and uniqueness. The Western Enlightenment, that is to say modernity said; "the way we move beyond suffering is in the dignity of the separate self." They said, "Wow, separate self," you can't do the Eastern move of moving beyond separation. You need separate self for your dignity and "it's only that separate self and its dignity which will move us beyond pre-modern suffering." That was true, but partial.

There was a confusion between separateness and uniqueness. Now, the East said you've got to move beyond separate self, because locating yourself in separate self is the source of all suffering. The exact opposite.

Eastern enlightenment or classical mystical enlightenment says the exact opposite of Western enlightenment. Eastern enlightenment says move beyond the separate self. That's how you move beyond suffering. Western enlightenment says locate yourself in the separate self, that is the source of your dignity to move you beyond suffering. Both of them fail to disambiguate between separateness and uniqueness.

The deeper reality is, the source of my dignity is not my Separate self. The source of my dignity is Unique self.

Wow.

I want to adopt the mystical Eastern motivation and movement to move beyond my separate self to alleviate suffering from that perspective, then locate myself in my unique self, which is my distinction.

Uniqueness is the unique face of True self. True self plus my unique perspective, but not just my unique perspective; my unique quality of intimacy, my unique taste. True self plus my irreducibly unique perspective, plus my irreducibly unique quality of intimacy equals Unique self.

Unique self begins to now address a new narrative of identity. Uniqueness is the intimate universe uniquely as me, in person. One of the key tenets of intimacy is all intimacy is unique and unconscious uniqueness becomes conscious uniqueness in Unique self.

Let's put it together.

Who are you?

Your unique self, what does that mean, your unique self?

You're an irreducibly unique expression of the love of intelligence and the love of desire and the love of beauty. That is the initiating and animating desire Eros of all that is, that lives in you, as you and through you. That ever was is or will be ever again, other than through you.

As such, your unique perspective, irreducibly unique and your irreducibly unique quality of intimacy come together to foster your unique gift, that allows you to be unique and to give a unique gift, that addresses a unique need in your unique circle of intimacy and influence, that could be addressed by no one that ever was, is or will be other than you.

As such, you literally stand ontologically in the new narrative. Grounded in the sciences, interior and exterior. You stand on the abyss of darkness and the singularity of your light form, the singularity of your intimacy, the singularity of your irreducible unique self has the capacity to speak to a dimension of the world that's non-intimate, that's unloved and to actually light up that part of the world.

Wow.

Well, let's check this for a second. That's gorgeous. So what is your Unique self?

Your unique self is the intimate universe as you in person. It's the cosmo-erotic universe, if you will, Eros all the way up and all the way down. The cosmo-erotic universe as you, in person, but that's not the end of the story.

Your unique self doesn't just live in eternity. The great traditions that did have an intuition of Unique self, which were few and far between, also lived only in the premodern and modern context of eternity. Even Einstein, as he began in 1914, developing the brilliance of his contribution, thought that the universe must be eternal.

When he actually seems to realize that it wasn't; that it was expanding, he introduced a cosmological constant, which was a false dimension of an equation, in order to hide the implications of that fact. He says at the end of his life, that was one of the most fundamental failures of integrity in his life.

Of course other people, Hubble, doing the Hubble telescope and others sensed the problem and pointed it out to him. That he was actually correct. The universe is evolving. It's not just the biosphere is evolving, as we've known for a long time, but Darwin scientifically validated, the cosmos itself is evolving. Reality is evolving.

I'm a Unique self living in an evolutionary context. It's not just that I'm a puzzle piece and I'm intimate and I complete the puzzle, but my intimacy is enlivened and awakened because I don't just complete the puzzle, I evolve the puzzle. I make the puzzle more and I make the puzzle better. That's Evolutionary Unique self.

Once we're talking about Evolutionary Unique self, which is my unique set of allurements, living in an evolutionary context, I realize evolution is not a process out there, evolution is the interiority of my very being. I am evolution. I am a unique configuration of intimacy. I'm a unique configuration of evolutionary love; then the whole story starts to change.

This begins to make sense. The intimate universe appears as you in person and all intimacy is unique. Uniqueness awakens as you and you become not merely a Homo sapien, not merely a collector of multiplied knowledge, who can accumulate wisdom or at least information. Not Merely Homo Prospectus, with a memory of the future.

Certainly, you're not merely what Yuval Harari calls in his second book, 'Homo Deus,' which is a surface human - lacking the integrity of allurements, the integrity of intimacy, the integrity of desire, biohacking their way towards a tragic immortality or semi-immortality, the elite, who make the rest of it irrelevant. Not that dystopian view.

What emerges is Homo amore.

Homo amore is the cosmo-erotic universe in person. Homo amore is the intimate universe, awake, alive in you, uniquely in person.

That's an entirely different world.

Now, let's take a look at what has happened. Homo amore has been born. Now, we have derivative from our universe story, a Narrative of Identity, but not just a Narrative of Identity. Now, I have a narrative of identity. I'm an evolutionary unique self. I'm a unique configuration of intimacy. I'm a unique expression of the love-intelligence and love-beauty and love-desire, with unique gifts needed in my unique circle of intimacy and influence, a unique way of being.

If I don't have a job, maybe that's okay. Because maybe I'm not defined by my job. Maybe I don't need the shadows of a capitalist narrative to affirm my dignity. My dignity is in my irreducible uniqueness and the irreducible beauty and truth and goodness of my uniqueness and the creativity that's emergent from my uniqueness and maybe being a parent is a job. And maybe expressing my creativity and maybe following my unique set of clarified allurements is my purpose in the world.

Maybe all of a sudden we have a vision, a Narrative of Identity that could actually move us into a future. And maybe we need to access feelings and desires, not only as things that can be identified by algorithms, through patterns of recognition, biochemical structures. Maybe we begin to realize that these biochemical structures are exterior expressions of an interior reality. That feelings need to be taken seriously. Desires need to be honored in their dignity.

We begin to have a narrative of identity, and we also have a narrative of power, because what does it mean to be an evolutionary unique self? It means I'm the *personal face* of the Evolutionary Impulse. The Evolutionary Impulse is alive and throbbing in me. The center of my identity is not my separate self, not my skin encapsulated ego, not my ego-self, but the unique expression of the Evolutionary Impulse, which is infinite power, uniquely expressed in me.

I begin to be able to embrace my power.

I begin to have a unique and a new narrative of relationship. You and me is not two separate selves as Heidegger said, hopelessly trying to create intimacy, when it's actually impossible to traverse loneliness. It's a hopeless Don Quixote quest? No. Intimacy is the natural expression of reality.

As we create intimacy between us, we're doing exactly what quarks do. We're actually powered by, we're animated by, we're infused by all of the intimate universe desiring us. All of a sudden, new, huge realms of possibility open. Sexuality, as we've already said, it's not sex negative, sex positive, sex neutral or sex sacred because we're creating babies. The sexual current is sacred, not just because it creates life, it is life. It is the pulse of life, sex erotic, that is to say the evolutionary Eros alive and awake in me.

Finally, to be successful is to actually live the gorgeousness of my Unique self. In relationship to another Unique self, Evolutionary Unique selves, Homo amore is coming together, creating new forms of relationship that we'll talk about in later chapters in the story.

Already we see that this universe story has birthed a new narrative of identity, the beginnings of a new narrative of power, a new narrative of We-spaces, now potentiated and we'll unpack it, a new narrative of sexuality and a new vision of what it means to be successful.

I'm not successful in a win-lose metrics, where I have an artificial job, which actually contributes nothing. I'm successful when I achieve profound intimacy. Intimacy with self, intimacy with other, intimacy with the larger field of consciousness, the larger divine field. Intimacy with, wow, perhaps the whole cosmos.

We begin to see what's possible. We're going to deepen these structures in future chapters. For now, we've got the beginning of a sense of a narrative of identity. We've introduced Homo amore. Welcome, welcome Homo amore.

Barbara:

Marc, I'm really very inspired and fulfilled by the concept of Homo amore. And I want to say to you that in my journey, I found a ladder that didn't fully get to this, but brought me ready to receive it. This ladder was three great human beings. I want to mention them briefly for people who may also have other ladders that wasn't quite yet Homo amore, but Homo amore is a destination of many ladders. That's my point.

Marc:

Beautiful.

Barbara:

The first of the ladders for me was Teilhard de Chardin. He was a Jesuit, Catholic priest, a paleontologist and scientist, who was able to discover in the pattern of evolution; it's moving towards greater consciousness, greater freedom and more complex loving order. His name, toward becoming Homo amore was ultra-human. He thought ultra-human would be when the noosphere, or the thinking layer, now the internet, gets its collective eyes. He foresaw what we are becoming. It's a very big step in my life, because I found meaning.

The second great one that is one of the sages of evolution is Sri Aurobindo, the Indian. In his book "The Life Divine," he with the mother, discovered a new kind of human that we could say is in the ladder toward Homo amore. This new kind of human was the gnostic human.

He believed the gnostic human went beyond physical death. That is to say, it was a new species altogether. It was not just a new, better homo sapien sapien, it was a new species. If you add the full spectrum of AI, artificial intelligence and robotics and nanotech and biotech and

quantum computing to Homo amore, which we'll have to do, because they're all here, Homo amore at the top of this ladder, would be able to infuse that with love.

Marc:
Absolutely.

Barbara:
Which is a huge step forward in evolution.

Barbara:
The last one I want to mention as part of the ladder toward Homo amore was Buckminster Fuller. Buckminster Fuller called this new human the continuous human and he believed that our consciousness would remain continuous as our bodies would be upgraded by the new technologies, including AI.

As I incorporated these and he became a friend and partner of mine, Bucky Fuller did, now, discovering you Marc and discovering Homo amore and realizing that for our generation, the entire pathway including early Christianity and most of the spiritual disciplines, have been going somewhere. I think we can name Homo amore as a destination of a spiritual pathway that so many of us have been on. That then gets infused with the genius of this spiritual impulse of humanity.

Marc:
That's so, so beautiful, so beautiful, Love.

It's worth perhaps saying, as you've pointed to, you and I come from different traditions, which is the excitement of joining genius. We're going to spend an entire chapter, because it's a key chapter in the new universe story, the new narrative of identity is this new possibility, this new narrative of We. We'll get to that in our 11th hour narrative, but just to notice how excited we are when other people actually traversed dimensions of the path, so we're not in a win-lose metrics.

In the academy, when you say something and someone else approximated or headed in that direction, you immediately try and publish before, disenfranchise what they said, show why it's not true. It's a win-lose metrics because the academy lives on that earlier version of identity and win-lose metrics.

When we're Home amore, when we're Unique self, when we're evolutionary unique self, then when I'm living, I realize Barbara's having a reality experience, but actually God is having a Barbara experience. Reality is having a Barbara experience, not just Barbara's having a reality experience. Reality is having a Barbara experience, and that experience is ultimately unique.

Then I get to meet Barbara, I'm in devotion. I'm delighted. Jealousy disappears because, by definition, we're irreducibly unique. When we hear Buckminster Fuller's working with the sciences and integrating them in a particular and gorgeous and original way and Aurobindo is working with Kashmir Shaivism, the early antecedent source of Hinduism, and he is trying to work it in and understand how it relates to evolution. Then we have of course Teilhard, who's a paleontologist, who's kind of working with Christification and science and trying to work it out.

Then all of the sources that I'm drawing on in systems science and evolutionary science, emergence science and the great traditions and we begin to weave all that together. We're not actually being competitive, we're not being rivalrous. We're part of a shared field of intimacy, what emerges is Homo amore. Homo amore, the cosmo-erotic universe in person, Homo amore, the center, the genus, the new human, the new humanity, which begins to birth a kind of cosmo-erotic humanism, if you will, which begins to be that new story.

How gorgeously exciting and I think we're about to end here and go into Chapter Six. In Chapters Six and Seven, we're going to go much more deeply into this figure, this Homo amore genus and into the individual. What does that mean, how does it feel to be Homo amore? What does that mean in your life and in my life? We've got to go deeper into and feel that intimately as the intimate universe unfolds in person through us, in this moment. Thank you so much.

Barbara:
What a pleasure.

Marc:
What a pleasure. Oh my God.

Barbara:
Thank you.

Chapter 6: Homo Amor, Part Two: A Deeper Cut: Vocational Arousal and "The Six Core Human Needs"

Barbara:
The experience of Homo amore is entirely new. But I had some very powerful ladders to move me in that direction, and they are my favorite ladders.

The first ladder, was Teilhard de Chardin. I received from him the ladder that I was going to experience, at some point, a planetary awakening when the Internet came together. That I was going to wake up once the planet began to be connected, which is actually true. Well, the planet wasn't yet connected and it was before the Internet.

When he said that, I recognized that I was on a ladder and I was going to wake up due to connectivity of the whole. That's what he saw.

Another ladder for me was Sri Aurobindo. I woke up with him and with the Mother to realize that I was going to be a new human altogether, the *gnostic human*. I became, through reading him in silence -- I read the Life Divine twice, that's a big book; I became that new human in reading it, even though I wasn't fully it yet. I knew it was coming because he was absolutely logical.

The third one was Buckminster Fuller, he said "The world could work for everyone," I realized in getting to know him as well as reading him that we already had the technology, resources and knowhow. Therefore, I began to feel that it's possible that the world could work for everyone. The noosphere coming together, the new species, the world working for everyone through new technologies and higher consciousness, and the fact that I could do something about that woke me up and got me ready for the ladder of Homo Amor.

So let's bring Homo amore onto the scene.

Marc:

Thank you so much, Barbara.

Before I step into this Homo amore: A Deeper Cut, let me just reflect on the transition into this next stage. The sense of one being addressed by the whole, which we have when the Internet comes online, being addressed by the whole. A world that works for everyone, meaning it's not about an elite. It's about all of us participating together, a kind of democratization. Those two ideas are going to be really core and they're core ladders to what we're about to present. Thank you so much, in this Deeper Cut. Here we go.

Wow.

Where are we? We're in The 11th Hour. We've understood, very deeply, that what we need most urgently to locate ourselves - to be the best versions of the good, the true and the beautiful that we can be, is a new story.

The new story, the narrative in which I live, the inescapable framework that animates our lives personally and collectively is the single most important reality. It's what jumps the entire system to a higher level of coherence.

It's precisely coherence that we need, an animated, inspired coherence to actually come together as one world. Not leaving behind every individual religion, not leaving behind nation states, but coming together in a larger We-space, an Evolutionary We-space in order to realize a potential utopia in which every human being is honored. In which the needs and dignity and gifts of every human-being are honored and avoid a literal dystopia that lurks at the door that we've described in great and unbearable depth.

In chapter six, we're in "Homo Amor, Part Two: A Deeper Cut, The Six Core Human Needs". Let's get a sense of where we are.

When we introduced Homo Amor, we talked about the progression of intimacy from separate-self, false-self and its distortions of intimacy. Then from separate-self to true-self, true-self to unique-self, unique-self to evolutionary unique-self. If you haven't read Chapter Five, I'd suggest and invite you, see Chapter Five before you come to Chapter Six.

Let's feel into it.

Who am I? I am Unique-self, Evolutionary Unique-self.

What does that mean? Evolutionary unique-self means that the Evolutionary Impulse pulses uniquely in me. It means that I actually clarify and access the deepest level of my heart's desire, the deepest level of my allurements, my allurements for more intimacy, for wholes that are greater than the sum of the parts, for deeper contact, deeper authentic contact.

This progression of intimacy that is the story of evolution that awakens alive in me. When I actually experience that as evolutionary unique-self, I become intimate with the whole story. I become intimate with the Evolutionary Impulse, awake and alive, uniquely in me.

What we're describing here is literally a transformation of identity, and that's the particular human capacity. I madly love dogs and I madly love cats, but cats don't transform their identity, dogs don't transform their identity. When you actually look at a snapshot of evolution, when you go from Quark to Atom, and then you go to molecule and you go to cell, but then you move up to plant, and then you go to dog and then you go to human being; you see that there's a plot line, there's a progression in the story. At each level of the story there's more interiority, there's more inner-space.

What we need to be doing now is not just reaching for outer space. We're not going to get across The 11th Hour by colonizing Mars by itself. What we would do is we'll colonize Mars and then reproduce the entire set of problems on Mars.

We actually need to shift the essential narrative. We need to colonize inner-space.

The trajectory of evolution, is ever-increasing capacity in exteriors, ever deeper complexity and interconnectivity, but the interior of interconnectivity is intimacy, so the trajectory of evolution is ever-deepening intimacy.

When I awaken and I transform my identity, that unique human capacity, what I'm doing is transforming to deeper and deeper levels of intimacy. I have profound intimacy with myself. My identity shifts because that's what intimacy is. Intimacy is shared identity in the context of otherness, so my shared identity shifts. I'm no longer identified as a separate-self, I'm no longer a distorted version of that separate-self; a false-self. I'm true-self, I'm one with the field of awareness, of consciousness, of allurements.

Then I'm one with, intimate with the unique expression of the field living in me, as me, and through me, my uniqueness which is beyond my separateness, the unique expression of true-self. Then I'm intimate, not just with my unique gifts, my unique interiority; I actually feel the becoming of all of reality awakening uniquely in me.

I actually feel the impulse pulsing in me. I am the unique expression of the Evolutionary Impulse itself. As such, there's a gift that I can give, there's a poem that I have to write, there's a song that I have to sing. There's a way of laughing, living, loving, being in the world. My unique creativity, my unique presence. All human beings are born uniquely creative, and that's an inalienable human right and invitation.

The Planetary Invitation is to realize *that* identity. That's Homo Amor, that's the new genus.

We're talking about a democratization of awakening, a democratization of enlightenment. A deep integration and synergy of Eastern enlightenment: "I realize I'm part of the larger field," and Western enlightenment: "I realize my individuality," but not just as separate-self, my higher individuation beyond ego, the higher individuation of the field that lives uniquely as me. That's the realization that I'm Homo Amor and that realization changes everything.

It's eminently possible to really understand that: A thousand years ago had we talked about the democratization of governance, everybody would have laughed. "Democratization of governance? Are you for real? People are going to vote and decide, and women are going to vote? No. And decide?" You got burnt at the stake for that. "We're going to make decisions as individuals, one person, one vote?" The democratization of governance was a heresy, it was an absurdity. It made absolutely no sense to anyone and it was the most dangerous thing possible.

We actually realized democratization of governance. Now any seven-year-old around the world has this intuition about democracy and how it works, it's an axiom. And we need to evolve democracy, we'll talk about that, but we're talking here about the democratization of awakening, the democratization of enlightenment.

In that context, if billions of jobs are obsoleted, that's fine. That could be beautiful.

Actually, those billions of jobs that are obsoleted that engage a human being, so often in trivial and meaningless activity, to create values that aren't values and to commodify that which shouldn't be commodified, which are routine and rote. People working today in Amazon, factories around the world, suicide rates, driving up and up and up by doing repetitive, mind numbing, heartbreaking, meaningless work.

We can be freed from that old notion of 'job', and we can be invited to participate in reality as Homo Amor, as unique-self. Living creatively and uniquely, singing the song that only you can sing, playing the music of reality that only you can play.

Giving the gift of your presence and giving the gift of your unique capacity to address needs, interior needs, profound needs in your circle of intimacy and influence, all of the sudden, we have a narrative of identity. We have a narrative of community: unique selves coming together, forming evolutionary We-space, unique "we's," we'll talk more about that.

We begin to see the possibility of inspired action.

Now, let's bring this together and add just one more piece. A human being has six core needs and every human being has some version of those needs.

We have a need to be intended. You don't want your friend to remember your birthday seven days later or two months later. If you have a partner, if you have an evolutionary partner, if you have a wife, a husband, a brother, a sister, a close friend, you don't want them to experience you as an afterthought. You want to be invited to the party. You want to be intended. When there's a big party and you're called up an hour before, "Hey, just thinking about you. You think you could make it over?" You feel like you weren't intended. We feel somehow violated.

We need to be recognized. Human beings are systematically mis-recognized. We have this enormous need to be recognized. You know that image, Barbara, we were talking about the other day, I'm in Times Square, the ball is dropping, it's New Year's Eve. I'm totally alone. Then someone taps me on the shoulder and says, "Hey, Marc." All of a sudden I relax, I'm recognized. There's this moment of intimacy. We have a need to be recognized, but not only.

We have a need to be chosen or we have a need, in some sense, to be the singular one, the chosen one. Which is a beautiful and unique and legitimate need. We have a need to be loved, but not just loved, loved-adored. We have a need to be loved-adored.

We have a need to be desired. That profound experience of being profoundly desired.

Finally, we have a need to be needed. We need our presence, we need our gifts to be needed.

We know that if a partner in a long-term relationship passes and the remaining partner can't find a profound way of being needed, they often pass several months after. The need to be needed is hardwired. That is to say it's the intelligence of cosmos, inbred in our very essence, in our interior, expressed in our exterior DNA. We have a need to be needed.

What have we done?

We've exiled all of these needs to one other person, or two other people. Intended; my partner, my closest friend. Recognized, a couple of people around me, so therefore if I'm not recognized by that person, or by the other person, by those very few people, I'm devastated. Chosen, one person, one person chooses me. If I'm not chosen by that one person or if we split up, we change the locks, get a lawyer and try and destroy the other person.

Because we've exiled our need to be chosen to that one person. Loved-adored, again, we exile loved-adored to a very particular form of, usually, romantic relationship and a very particular kind of romantic relationship and a very particular flavor of romantic relationship.

Desire. We take desire out of cosmos. Desire's no longer a quality of cosmos. It's a human quality only. Then we take it out of being merely a human quality. We exile it to being an only a merely sexual quality. Then we take it out of being a generalized meta-sexual quality, and it means a very particular kind of desire. A very particular kind of aroused sexuality, that's what desire means.

I need to get all of that desire, exiled four times, from one person in one context in one way. If they don't desire me in that particular way forever, I'm devastated. Not only am I devastated, it breaks my interior sense of value and meaning, and all forms of acting out, addiction, opioid, destruction, horror emerge. We've exiled desire four times over. Need, "I need to be needed in a very narrow way by a very narrow group of people," but that doesn't work.

The exile of the six core human needs to limited human cultural constructions of a very particular kind, that worked at a particular place in time but often don't work in all of the old constructs for all people, all the time, just doesn't get us home. It actually builds the social construction that destroys us. That creates a million suicides a year and 25 people attempting for every one, and it creates the opioid crisis, and it creates the obesity crisis and it creates most of the crises that we described.

Now, let's take this home. Let's take them, this is the key. This is the key to the whole thing. So imagine Godfather II, the movie. Don Corleone has seen his father killed, his mother killed, his brother killed, he's devastated. He has no rights, he's powerless. Then in the movie you see this scene. He goes to the United States, he gets to Ellis Island. He gets to Ellis Island, as he lands in Ellis island he's processed and he becomes, automatically, he becomes a citizen. He applies, he becomes, he has rights. His rights are protected. All the rights of the separate-self individual are immediately given to him by the very structure of society.

Now, let's take that deeper.

Imagine the following reality that's literally right at hand, that we can actually make real as we download into culture, into inner-space, this fabric of Homo Amor and evolutionary unique-self. Imagine the genuine realization of unique-self, evolutionary unique-self, Homo Amor, when you realize that all six of these core human needs are met by the structure of the intimate universe itself.

"I need to be intended, you need to be intended. Reality intends me." That's what unique-self says. I have a unique atomic structure, a unique cellular structure that's dazzling beyond imagination that's unlike any that ever was, is, or will be. I'm a complete original.

'I'm an original' means I was intended, I'm not an accident. The amount of synchronicities and precision, is statistically unimaginable, the intentional synergies that were required to manifest, over vast stretches of time, the unique expression that is me.

There's a beautiful movie by Claude Lelouch, the French director, which talks about what it takes to bring a particular couple together. It goes back generations and you realize all the synchronicities that needed to take place to create this apparently chance moment of the couple meeting on the plane. That which it takes for reality to manifest my irreducibly unique, atomic, cellular interior signature is beyond imagination.

I'm intended by cosmos, but not only am I intended, I'm recognized.

When I realize that I'm a unique-self, I realize that I'm held and recognized by cosmos itself in my irreducible and gorgeous uniqueness. Just like I see Barbara, and Barbara sees me, I'm seen by reality itself. My eyes reflect the larger awareness and consciousness of cosmos that see me in every second.

Wow. I'm chosen.

My uniqueness tells me that I'm not just one of a kind, I'm not just part of a genus. I'm not just an extra on the set. My uniqueness implies chosenness, I'm loved-adored.

Love is not just an emotion. love is a perception. To say, "I love you" is "I see you." Love is a unique-self perception. In the realization of my uniqueness, I realize that reality that intended me and recognizes me and chose me, reality actually loves-adores me and, finally, reality desires me. Because actually, desire is what drives the entire process, the molecular processes, the cellular processes, which are all driven by allured desire are all what came together uniquely configuring in order to manifest me.

I'm literally re-expressed in every second by the cellular and atomic structure that's desiring me in every second. That's actually the constitutional interiority of my body, is this experience of the cells, the atomic structure actually desiring each other profoundly in every second. If that desire is absent for a second, then physiologically, I disappear.

Finally the most important, and that's why we needed to get all six of these together, is I'm needed.

I'm actually needed by all that is. There's a unique gift that I have to give, there's a life that I have to live. There's a way of being loving and living that's mine and mine alone, unlike any that ever was, is or will be.

The experience that I'm needed by all that is. The way the mystics said it is, "Reality needs your service." Wow. I'm not just needed by one person here or there. The actual experience of my life is that Barack Obama called me on the phone and said, "Wow, I know you. I've been tracking you. I know everything about you." You talk to Barack Obama for an hour and you realize he knows everything about your life. Interior, exterior. Then he says, "Barbara, I need you. I need exactly the gifts that you have. No one that ever was, is or will be can give those gifts the way you can."

You get off that phone and how do you feel? You feel depressed? Run for an opioid? Do you look for a coverup mechanism of addiction?

No. You're ecstatic. You're delighted. You're located. You feel the intimate universe alive and awake in you. You realize you live in an intimate universe. You've been personally addressed by cosmos. That realization is the realization of Homo Amor, "I am intended. I am recognized. I am chosen. I am loved-adored. I am desired and I am needed." From that place of wholeness, I begin my life.

That's Homo Amor.

You know, Barbara, I was thinking about these last two. This experience that I'm desired by cosmos and I'm literally needed by cosmos. That experience, internally, what that feels like in me, I think is what you call so gorgeously "vocational arousal."

Barbara:

Yes, that's a really good point, Marc.

I totally see that because vocational arousal is a passion to give the gift into the world. When I'm giving it, I feel more needed and wanted and loved because I feel that the gift that I'm giving is of meaning to others. It's not even only that, for me; I don't know what's in me unless it gets aroused.

The arousal of vocation, as you have activated my vocation -- I have to say, Marc, when I first met you and I was about 84. Somebody had said to me, "Why don't you declare victory and retire?" I thought, "Well, why don't I?" I mean, I'd done a lot, so I tried to declare victory, meaning past things that I had done with other people or that I didn't have anything more to do.

If I didn't have anything more to do, I couldn't feel needed, wanted, intended and chosen. It wasn't that anybody was choosing me. If nobody was choosing me and nobody wanted me and nobody seemed to need me, and I'm all there by myself. Then actually what happened is somebody asked me to interview you and when I heard your voice, it wasn't necessarily about me, it was an impulse that awakened in me, what I would call my deeper yearning to be able to give more of myself. Vocational arousal, for anybody, is the way to discover inside yourself that the universe needs you.

Marc:

That's so beautiful.

Barbara:

That it wasn't that I just needed myself.

It was I couldn't get vocationally aroused until I found there was something inside me that the universe needed and that I was particularly able to give. Then the people that inspired me such as Teilhard de Chardin, Sri Aurobindo and Bucky, activated in me a deep intention that really was not activated when I was going to get retired.

I would say this to anybody who feels that maybe you've come to the end of your life, and you're sitting on the precipice. Not only are we on a global precipice but you, personally, don't have much more to give. And you get this feeling that the deeper impulse inside you is profoundly needed, and you turn on. When you get vocational arousal, every cell in your body gets aroused.

I wouldn't be surprised that the cells that got started so many billions of years ago, and created us into these very complex humans with trillions of cells making us up, that when the whole-system-person gets vocationally aroused and feels needed, wanted and chosen, that the cells say, "Okay, let's turn on."

I think through epigenetics that the consciousness of myself as a person, my feeling that maybe I have something to give that somebody might need is absolutely fabulous. Just a last thought, I enter regenopause, which I've mentioned before, regenopause is when the woman is no longer producing an egg, she is the egg. I am on the precipice where I could just fall off and feel that our culture is dying, to be that I'm just being able to give and the actual precipice is an impulse,

so strong, that it totally awakens that egg to say, "No matter what, even if it's not worth anything to anybody else, I am able to give it."

Thank you Marc. That's what it means to me.

Marc:

That is so just wildly beautiful, so let me just ask a question. It's so beautiful, Barbara, the way you frame that and this idea that you've talked about for so many years of vocational arousal. The language of arousal, the language of your cells getting turned on is actually not incidental, but it's actually this expression of the intimate universe. Of this experience of being desired by cosmos and realizing that your heart's desire is reality desiring in you, and at the same time, reality desiring you.

How does a person, are there in your teaching, are there particular steps you take? Is there a kind of process how you begin to access this vocational arousal, which is the experience that you feel inside of reality desiring and needing me? How do you do it?

Barbara:

Well, the way I do it is I have a capacity of journal writing.

Marc:

Oh, wow.

Barbara:

The first part of the journal writing is my mental mind that says, "I don't feel needed. I'm on a precipice and the world is going to hell, and maybe I should die." Well, that's an extreme, but my mental mind is not at all excited. Then I have a system where I stop thinking and I have little double quotation marks and I say, "Dearly beloved, what does this mean?" Now "dearly beloved" is my word for God, spirit, or source.

God, spirit or source is really different than mental mind. God, spirit or source, I've learned to do without thinking, because the thinking is an analytical structure that actually denies me my opportunity. I turn off my thinking mind and I write, not channeled, but simply knowing. I would say what is true for me is that the knowing is in everybody.

Homo Amor would be a person who's knowing comes to the surface easily, so it's as Homo Amor you might feel confused and you don't know what to do next. You say, "Dearly beloved," or whatever word works for you. When you turn on spirit, the amazing thing is spirit is always there, but if it's not noticed ... Now there are people that have meditations, they have many different ways, but I do it in writing. What's good about writing is that then you write it. Because if you get spirit without the written word, it's so easy to forget it, that you don't actually know it.

Then what I do is I go back a day, week-after-week and read a whole week or a whole month. If you get a whole month of dearly beloved, then what actually happens is you can bring dearly beloved to life, even if you're not writing your journal or sitting on the precipice, so that's the way it is.

Marc:

I could not think of a more gorgeous description of Homo Amor. In other words, Homo Amor experiences of vocational arousal and this practice of dearly beloved. I'm actually speaking to the intimate universe that's addressing me, personally. Thank you so much, Barbara. I'm completely inspired. Thank you so much, love.

Barbara:

Thank you. I'm so inspired by Homo Amor. I mean, that's a wonderful phrase. It means, "The person who loves", "The people who love."

Marc:

Thank you Homo Amor, thank you so much.

Barbara:

Thank you. Thank you.

Chapter 7: Homo Amor, Part Three: Intimacy Creates Obligation: Living Your Deepest Heart's Desire

Barbara:

We are offering the realization that it takes a new narrative of our identity to be able to activate ourselves beyond that precipice in The 11th Hour. It depends on who we think we are to be able to have the initiative to take the action that makes the difference. In this chapter, we're doing "Intimacy Creates Obligation: Living Your Deepest Heart's Desire," as a way to jump off the precipice, beyond The 11th Hour into the future, equal to our potential.

I turned my word to you, Marc.

Marc:

What a delight. Thank you Barbara.

Let me pick up exactly from your word. The next tenet of intimacy in this structure of the intimate universe, the universe story, the universe: a love story. Not an ordinary love story, but an Evolutionary Love Story in which allurement guides my life, not ordinary allurement, my clarified allurement. We're weaving together the best of pre modern, modern and postmodern. In a new story, a new synergy.

A new synergy means a new intimacy - a whole greater than the sum of the parts. This is how we're moving to heal the global intimacy disorder, which is the heart of the global action confusion in the global action paralysis. We're in our third take of Homo Amore - the new genesis - the new person - the new human - the new humanity. Moving towards not just a democratization of governance, which we've achieved in the last thousand years but, literally a democratization of enlightenment, a transformation of identity.

Let's introduce two tenants and we'll bring them and merge them together. The first one, I'm going to say briefly, it's wildly important and central. We're going to focus on it in Chapter Eight, but it's also necessary to begin Chapter Seven and then we'll get to our second tenant.

The first tenant is that God - remember the God you don't believe in doesn't exist - not the cosmic vending machine God whose ethnocentric and homophobic and is waiting to burn you in hell because you weren't obedient to a set of strictures that no one possibly could have fulfilled and is owned by your tribe, and no other tribe, and there's no redemption outside of the church. Not that God. Not the God when you were running away from your mother when you were two

years old and she's following you with a paddle and you lock the door of the bathroom and she bangs on the door and says, God's going to get you in there. Not that God, Alright.

God who is the incessant, ceaseless creativity of cosmos, who both holds reality and inheres in reality. God, who's the infinite love-intelligence, love-desire, and love-beauty of all that is.

God is not only the infinity of power, power's important, power's the Evolutionary Impulse moving through you: power is not demonized. God is the infinity of power inhering and holding all, and we understand that through the Eye of the heart and the Eye of the spirit, and it's validated in so many ways by the Eye of the senses and of the mind, the three Eyes that come together to give their validated information to create the new narrative. That's enough introduction, let's just drop in now.

God is not only the infinity of power, God is the infinity of intimacy.

Can you feel the difference? God's the infinity of intimacy. We're going to talk about this more in Chapter Eight but for now, let's put some pieces together. God's the infinity of intimacy that both inheres in me and knows my name. I'm a unique self, I'm an evolutionary, unique self. I'm a member of Homo Amore.

What does that mean to be a unique self? It means I'm a unique quality of intimacy. So God the infinity of intimacy is having a Barbara experience. Reality, God's having a Barbara experience because Barbara is a unique quality of intimacy. Now, when Barbara meets Marc, when Barbara meets Sherwood or Barbara meets Chahat, when Barbara meets Kristina, when Marc meets Barbara; every time two unique selves come together, who are each unique qualities of intimacy participating in the larger field of intimacy - the infinity of intimacy - when two unique intimacies come together they create a new we-space; there's a *new* quality of intimacy.

If I sat together with Barbara in silence, we didn't even speak, there'd be a quality to that intimacy, which would be different than if Barbara sat together with Sherwood in silence, it would have a different quality to that intimacy. When two unique intimacies come together they form a new we-space, a new quality of intimacy, which is a new God because God's the infinity of intimacy. Unique self is the unique expression of the field of intimacy, so when two intimacies come together, ontologically a new god is formed.

When a new God is formed we're responsible, we're in devotion to that God. We're in devotion to that intimacy, that new God is the new quality of intimacy. We're obligated by that God, that is to say we're obligated by that new intimacy. It's gorgeous. When I say it's gorgeous, meaning we have the quality of the beautiful, which is inter-included in the quality of the good and the quality of the true. The good, the true, and the beautiful are inter-included with each other. An idea, when it's true is also elegant, it's gorgeous. Let's feel this together.

The second tenant, which is part of Chapter Seven is: intimacy creates obligation. It's gorgeous. Now by obligation, we don't mean externally imposed obligation by an ethnocentric religion, by a nationalist state, et Cetera. We mean obligation in the sense of, for example, the original Hebrew lineage, which uses the word *ahava* "love and obligation," it's the same word.

Obligation is intimate. It's an intimate expression of my unique quality of intimacy, of my unique self. And then that obligation connects me to the larger field of intimacy. Instead of obligation being a word that we'd cringe at, we've actually restored the notion of obligation, which is critical in a new narrative of identity and in a new narrative of the universe.

Intimacy creates obligation, obligation: *ahava* the same word in some of the original languages. Let's begin to understand that we need to reclaim the notion of noble action, honor, duty, radical responsibility, obligation. Without those, we can't construct a narrative of identity that's equal to our experience, that's equal to our power, that's equal to our deepest heart's desire, that's equal to our deepest longing and yearning.

Let me try and articulate for just a couple of minutes how this works; How do we reconstruct what are actually the principles of obligation? There's a fivefold understanding, a fivefold axiom of obligation in this new narrative, in this understanding of Homo Amore. I'll give you an imaginary scene...

You're with Mother Teresa and you're shipwrecked on an island.

Now, Mother Teresa was a wonderful woman in the sense of the great good she did in the world. But if you read her biographies, she was difficult, right? You don't go into the Catholic Church and create a new order because you're just a sweet, lovely old lady. She was a powerful being and not easy.

You're there, this is a theoretical scenario, let's make it a little bit funny:

You're shipwrecked on an island, you're a doctor. You know theoretically, you're never going to be found. So you're there on the island til the end of your life with Mother Teresa and she's driving you out of your mind. It's like fingernails on a chalkboard, every word she says reminds you of your difficult relationship with your mother.

She talks 17 hours a day, 10 years have gone by, you are worse than one who's been Chinese tortured for ten years; you're about to kill yourself. You can't even imagine the state of distress you're in. Then she goes scuba diving. Why is she scuba diving? Because in your shipwreck there was some scuba gear leftover, and you know, in this scenario, Mother Teresa happens to know how to scuba dive. She goes scuba diving, she breaks both her arms. Remember, you're a doctor and our makeup scenario, so you set both of her arms and her arms are now set straight-out with splints and she can't feed herself.

Do you or don't you have, now stay with me on the precise word, an *obligation* to feed Mother Teresa?

I've asked this question to thousands and thousands of students at the best prep schools in America and western Europe and at the best universities. Now, I want you to get this. Right? Ninety-five percent of the people said, you cannot actually say that you have an obligation to feed mother Teresa. That is the collapse of narrative, that's shocking. Of course, you have an obligation to feed her, but they said you can't say you have an obligation because you can't be obligated. The best and the brightest among us; because there's no narrative of self, there's no universe story, so there's no narrative of duty and honor and obligation. Of course, you have an obligation, but why? Five reasons:

One: There's a need

Two: It's a legitimate need

Three: You recognize the need

Four: You have the capacity to meet the need, and

Five: You're the only one that ever was, is or will be ever again that can meet that need intimately, uniquely in the way that you can at that moment in time.

That's the fivefold understanding of intimate need. Let's catch this together. This is the actual experience of Homo Amore every single day. Every single day the Evolutionary Unique Self, Homo amore aligned with the Evolutionary Impulse experiences:

I am evolution. I'm the leading edge of evolution in this moment. And in this moment, the expression of my intimate relationship; the intersectionality, (Let's reclaim that word) the intersectionality between me, my unique self, and this unique moment in time creates my unique obligation. I have a unique ability to address a unique need in my unique circle of intimacy and influence that cannot be addressed by anyone in this moment in time, that ever was, is or will be other than me.

Let's just take this the last step: What is intimacy? Intimacy is shared identity in the context of otherness that expresses itself in the mutuality of pathos. Part of the definition of intimacy is a mutuality of Pathos which means an intimacy; I feel you and you feel me. Second loop even deeper, I feel you feeling me. Third loop. I feel you feeling me feeling you.

There's this ever deepening pathos and at a fundamental level, when I have a unique capacity to address a legitimate, unique need in my unique circle of intimacy and influence, when I know there's something that's mine to do that can't be done by anyone that ever was, is or will be, then I actually claim with radical joy the felt sense of responsibility because that's actually my

heart's desire. That becomes my heart's desire. I'm aroused to my heart's desire. Accessing my deepest heart's desire as an expression of me being a unique expression, a unique incarnation of the field of intimacy is what it's all about, because who are you?

You're a unique configuration of intimacy desired by all of reality and needed by all of reality. That is the beginning of this deeper understanding of Homo Amore. Homo Amore אהבה love and obligation, or one experiences obligation as Pathos, as feel me feeling you, as the deepest expression of my deepest heart's desire.

Barbara, you've done so much and we've talked about heart's desire being so central in this new narrative, and you've articulated this gorgeous process of actually taking people into and accessing this obligation of the deepest heart's desire. So with so much desire and love, I turn the word to you.

Barbara:

Thank you Marc, this supports so deeply what you're saying.

What I've noticed, on the very personal level is my deepest experience of intimacy is the awakening inside myself of what I call the deepest heart's desire. The way I experience *deepest heart's desire* is: it's an expression of the larger impulse of creation in each person become personal. We incarnate the impulse of evolution personally. The way it shows up in each individual is desire. Deepest heart's desire is to find your unique expression of love and your unique expression of life purpose and your unique gift to give into the world.

There is a wonderful inner, you might say, inner pressure within all individuals to be able to identify their greatest gift to give, which turns out to be their heart's desire. When you activate your heart's desire, you're not just activating on behalf of somebody else; you are doing it on behalf of Mother Teresa, but your experience of yourself doing it, meaning when it is uniquely yours, is not imposed on you, when it is deeply yours, you are empowered by spirit. You're empowered by vocational arousal. You're empowered, you might say, by the genius of evolution itself, that shows up in each of us as our deepest heart's desire.

The closer you get to feeling that you're expressing and giving and responding to your deepest heart's desire, the more you serve, the more you are able to reach each other's needs. But you're reaching each other's needs in a very personal way. That's unique about the relationship of deepest heart's desire; to fulfill it, you need to be tuning-in to the way you can offer what you want to desire into somebody else's heart in such a way that that somebody else is responding to you and is being given a gift through you.

To conclude, you can hardly give a gift to yourself; you can hardly respond to your own deepest heart's desire, unless you're finding somebody else's deepest heart's desire that you are responding to, who then responds back to you and it turns into a mutuality of love.

Marc:

Gorgeous. It's so exciting.

We're going to get, in Chapter 10, to "Joining Genius," but this is just one of those places where we've been able to do that. We'll talk about it more in Chapter Ten when we place desire at the center of this new universe story, then we are able to articulate this notion of: when you access your deepest heart's desire, that's the desire of evolution. All of a sudden, "I'm not experiencing obligation as a burden imposed by a non-intimate Cosmos violating my essential nature, but actually it's my most intimate experience of my deepest self is in those particular places where my unique impulse can address this moment. I feel it; It's felt."

Obligation gets translated into deepest heart's desire and then we begin to have a new scripture. We begin to have a new code, a new vision of how to live reality. I have one question: Is there a particular process? As we've talked about desire together and in a number of your courses, you've actually activated a process of accessing your deepest heart's desire.

Do you have a moment to say a comment or two about that?

Barbara:

What's been happening out of my courses is small groups are forming of people who are seeking their deepest heart's desire. Not by each person then joining with the others into one desire, but it's the support of each other to notice when you are and when you are not realizing your deepest heart's desire. In other words, it's a self-generated intelligence to help you and you help each other because everybody's heart's desire is unique and most people don't know what it is.

It's very helpful to have a small group and to place your small group in the heart of the Evolutionary Spiral so that everybody gets The Power that their deepest heart's desire comes from source of evolution itself: "I am evolution, uniquely as me," but I'm not like my neighbor. I'm not *necessarily* going to help my neighbor. My neighbor may not want to be helped [by] the other neighbor.

We're really there in a kind of support system for the uniqueness of each person's heart's desire without taking it: "Well, I want you to help me," which often happens in small groups, most small groups are about self help, the whole group. But we have found that the deepest heart's desire groups really support the uniqueness of one another. That people then actually take the time to go within and they're seeing themselves, you might say, at the very Heart of Evolution. It's a very potent thing to have a group that helps you do that.

Marc:

Thank you. Absolutely.

And just to share as we conclude, one of the visions that we have, beloved Barbara; and to share with people who are with us, is to actually activate through this 'Joined Genius' and this *meme* that we've been able to express together, which is: '*placing desire at the center of the evolutionary spiral*'. To activate heart's desire groups emergent from the Center [for Integral Wisdom] and the Foundation [for Conscious Evolution] in which there's a set of guiding principles and this is one of the core technologies that we can operationalize to cross the precipice in The 11th Hour. Heart's desire groups, which are forms of radical empowerment are utterly essential in the dignity of heart's desire.

Thank you so much, beloved Barbara.

Barbara:

Just to comment on 'How will that help us getting across the precipice?' Because that's a huge concept from a very personal concept; if deepest heart's desires groups replicated en masse, let's see: almost everybody wants to realize their deepest heart's desire. If they did form groups around it and were actually empowered to realize their deepest heart's desire, what would happen is we would overcome 11th hour. We would be in the new culture because the reason that we have a precipice and we do not have a new culture is: most people are not living their deepest heart's desire. As you've said, many times they're usually in jobs or in particular functions where they don't go anywhere near their deepest heart's desire.

We're saying a very deep thing is that is: in order to serve society and in order to get across the precipice as well as to serve yourself and one another and your friends and colleagues, you have to be able to access your deepest heart's desire. In conclusion, it so often feels that you need to sacrifice in order to serve others and the deepest heart's desire. Ultimately, that's not the way it is.

You may have to do that sometime, but basically the way you can serve the other is to realize your deepest heart's desire in a way that helps realize their deepest heart's desire. That's the best of all.

Marc:

Amen. Amen. Thank you so much.

Barbara:

You're welcome. Thank you. Thank you, Marc.

Chapter 8: *God as the Infinity of Intimacy, Who Knows Your Name, and Is Your Name*

Barbara:

Hello, Marc. We are in Chapter Eight, and our subject is *God*, and since we're heading for The 11th Hour, the subject of *God* is extremely pertinent.

We're not talking about God tomorrow, we're talking about God today.

Would you speak to me, Marc, how do you experience God, particularly in relationship to where we're going right now?

I turn it to you.

Marc:

Thank you, thank you, beloved Barbara, and it's so good to be with you in this set of conversations. These 11th Hour conversations are so important to take us through the precipice.

I know that in one of our bonus calls that we're going to talk about, and it's a funny sentence to say, in one of our bonus calls, but I believe that's what they're called, we're going to talk about *Evil*. That's not our topic now, but I want to just begin before we enter this conversation about God by saying there are places in which there's a void. The great teacher Luria, the great teacher Nachman of Breslav that Franz Kafka loved so much, talks about the reality of the void.

There are some realities that are so profoundly, infinitely painful that in those moments, it's difficult to talk about God.

How do you talk about God in the face of burning children?

How do you talk about God in the face of Rwanda, 800,000 people butchered in 100 days?

So we have to be careful that when we talk about God, we're not talking about a small God, we're not talking about a cosmic vending machine God, we're not talking about a God who allows us to have the kind of faith that is dogmatic; that is what Abraham Cook called *faith which is heresy*, and it's heresy because it's wrong, it violates the very mystery of cosmos.

When we're talking about God, we're talking about something much larger, infinitely larger, infinitely deeper, infinitely more mysterious. I want to talk from that perspective, and we just

need to begin by saying that the God who's used as a way to make human suffering okay, 'you attracted it into your life, it's punishment for sins,' that's not the God we're talking about. The God you don't believe in doesn't exist. We need to go deeper.

At the same time, Barbara, as you and I have talked so many times, we're not alone in The 11th Hour, and that's critical to understand. We're not alone in The 11th Hour. God does speak to us. God speaks to me. I speak to God. God speaks to you, Barbara. Both of our personal experiences of direct intimate contact with divinity and feeling that force of divinity, guiding and moving us, are essential.

Let's try and create a framework for the conversation. Beloved Barbara, I think you're going to talk more personally about your experiences, so perhaps here I won't talk about my experiences, but let me try and set up the conversation.

When we talk about God, if you look, for example at *The Zohar*, a 13th century mystical text from Hebrew wisdom, or you look at some of the key texts from Kashmir Shaivism, or if you look in contemporary terms at variations of this adopted from these older texts in modern forms like Integral Theory, we talk about three faces of God.

The Zohar says "Ani, Ata, and Hu"; 'I', 'you', and 'it.' Or said differently, there's a first person God. There's a second person God. And there's a third person God. We need to get this or we can't have the conversation.

First person God is the Ashram. The first person God is the god who lives in me. Tat tvam asi. *Thou art that*. That experience of divinity awake, alive in me, that I can actually access when I unpeel the layers. When I strip away the onion, beneath and beneath and beneath; there is the spark of the divine. There is divinity that is and animates the human being.

That experience of divinity as God in the first person, which *is* the mystical experience, the core of mysticism, takes place in the monastery, the Ashram, and in the Yeshiva. The mystical experience is accessing God in the first person. That's critical.

There's also God in the third person.

God in the third person is the Evolutionary Impulse. It's the impulse that pulses through creation, or it's the incessant, ceaseless creativity of divinity.

We used to think about creativity as being on the outside. There were, in some sense two circles and one said 'God' and the other said 'world'. Then the question was, "Well what's the connection between the two circles?" and, "Can prayer traverse the connection?" That's how we used to think about God.

We now realize; no, no, there's actually these three faces...

The first face is the divinity that lives in me, as me and through me; I am! In the terms of Buddhism. Or Ani, the Ani: 'I' that is 'I-ing' that is infinity. The Tat tvam asi that we talked about earlier. That's God in the first person, the first face of God. There's also God in the third person, which is the Evolutionary Impulse, which pulses throughout all of reality. Those come together when I experience that Evolutionary Impulse pulsing in me: the third person of the Evolutionary Impulse all of a sudden is actually living, awake and alive in me. That's the third person, the third face of God.

Now the infinite, wildly beautiful dazzlingly complex billions and billions and billions of light years. A hundred billion galaxies, and a hundred billion stars in one galaxy -- that notion of that infinite expanse. That's all expressions of God in the third person. That's the third person of this infinite creativity pulsing and manifesting and substantiating in ways that are beyond imagination. When you think about a hundred billion galaxies and a hundred billion stars in each galaxy, you get the vastness of God in the third person. But that's not enough.

There's also God in the second person. And God in the second person is absolutely essential in The 11th Hour: We're not alone.

When Rumi talks about *falling into the arms of the beloved*, Rumi is not talking about the Evolutionary Impulse and he's not talking about a Buddhist notion of Tat tvam asi - a mystical notion of 'God who lives in me,' although Rumi is aware of both, though he doesn't use terms like the Evolutionary Impulse and he's before evolution, he's aware of third person and first person, and that's not where he lives. Like the Hebrew lineage mystics, and [Panhus 00:08:06], from whose milk I was nourished. My actual living experience is God in the second person; is not the infinity of power, which is God in the third person, but the Infinity of Intimacy.

In terms of this vision of the intimate universe, we're unfolding here the tenets of intimacy, this tenet of intimacy is critical.

God is not merely that which lives in me -- God does live in me as a unique quality of intimacy, that's one tenet of intimacy: "I am God's unique intimacy, a unique quality of intimacy of divinity lives in me," because God is not merely the infinity of power (third person), God is the infinity of intimacy. The infinity of intimacy that knows my name, that's intimate with me, that desires me, that hears me.

Men may live lives sometimes, of quiet desperation, but actually, for realises, ontologically, in the depth of reality, there's never ultimately lonely desperation because we're never alone.

Always, the infinity of intimacy walks with me, knows my name, embraces me, holds my holy and broken Hallelujah, and to be able to feel that and know that is *realization*.

I remember talking to John Welwood who was a friend, a great man, who passed away just a couple of weeks ago, and he expressed this notion of “Wake up and Grow up”, these two different notions of enlightenment. He wrote incredibly important books on the psychology of awakening and really was a trailblazer, and a great Buddhist teacher. Barbara, you've seen many of his books, he was a wonderful figure.

He said, "Marc, I've heard good things about you, but then somebody told me that you believe in prayer, that's ridiculous."

I said, "John, what do you believe in?"

He said, "Well, I believe in meditation."

I said, "Why?"

He said, "Because meditation brings you to awareness, prayer is a dogma."

I said, "No, no. John, Prayer is a realization, just like awareness is. Prayer's a realization of God in the second person."

I told John, and I shared with my beloved friend Ken Wilber, this story at a key moment in our conversations when I was trying to transmit and share this notion of God in the second person with Ken back in 2003. This is an amazing story about a master, who's trying to make a blessing, and the blessing's [foreign language 00:10:38]. Blessed are you, king of the world. So the master would say, Blessed are you. You. You! You! You! You! You! You! ...and would faint in ecstasy.

That realization of *You*; he wasn't fainting in ecstasy because he encountered a dogma. He was fainting in ecstasy because he had a lived realization of God in the second person.

What I'd like to do is turn it over to my beloved partner Barbara now. Then, Barbara, after you share your experience, I'll suggest one exercise for people to be able to access God in the second person.

I turn my word, with delight to you, Barbara.

Barbara:

That's awesome, Marc.

I think I had an experience of God as evolution, inside me evolving, which is a very interesting view of God...

I first studied the evolutionary story 13.7 billion years from that Big Bang into the quarks and the electrons and the protons and then the single cells and the multi-cells, and I read Teilhard de Chardin. And then [I thought], "Well, who am I? ...I am that -- in person." Now, that's between first person God, second, and third, to be that *Evolutionary Impulse*, that was my, "Ah-ha."

Then because I became a student of evolution I realized that the intelligence of God inside me is very, very specific. I mean, God was able to create protons, neutrons, electrons.

"What can God create through you? Barbara?"

What can God create through me? And even more important, if we understand evolution, what can God create through *us* in The 11th Hour?

I want to say The 11th Hour for me is one of those moments in evolution when the system could go quickly downward toward a devolutionary cycle. Not just climate change, but many other factors. What's equally true, as we've said before on this show, it could also jump forward to something new. So I began to experience the jump forward in me and I became what I call a *Conscious Evolutionary*.

I was able to experience the impulse of evolution going toward fulfillment, of the connecting of the separate parts, as me, expressing to awaken in others the same thing. The way I did this for so many years, really since I was 18 years old, was my journal. I want to just state this methodology because it really works to get this aspect of God as Impulse of Creation, as you.

In the journal, I had two ways of doing it. One, I called "mental mind". Now, there was no God there; "I have just noticed this isn't going well. I am not happy about X, Y, and Z, and someone did something to me that..." Whatever.

Then I learned how to say, "Dearly Beloved," with double quotation marks, turned-off mental mind, which is really interesting, and Dearly Beloved was the Evolutionary Impulse of creation. I would say that's God in second person, that does to this day, start brilliantly to describe to me the way that God in second person sees this: Why it's happening to me, What I'm to learn from it, What God is teaching me by the particular incident that I'm in, the journal goes like that. Then, mental mind can come back in and say, "But God! I don't understand that. I'm very irritated." Then Dearly Beloved comes on.

The interaction between mental mind and "Dearly Beloved", or the second person of God. I would like to say that I have, as a woman, that I'm calling myself an evolutionary woman; I feel that each one of us in this series can incarnate the impulse, say 'Yes' to it, and begin to hear specifically what it needs for us to do. And the next point is, "Then do it." When you do it, it's different than a prayer for God but it is a 'Yes' to God in person, as you, as me, Dearly Beloved turned on in this moment.

When I turn this back to you, Marc, I'm speaking to you as Dearly Beloved, who also can answer mental mind, "Hey, how do we use this, God, in The 11th Hour, Beloved?"

Marc:
Beautiful.

We absolutely pray with our feet, we pray in action. We'll talk about, as you know beloved Barbara, in Chapter Nine what that might mean and how we enact that prayer. But for now I want to just maybe, in the last section of this Chapter Eight, to really focus on what you just talked about and take it the next step, with your permission.

What we're really understanding here, and what we're doing together here on The 11th Hour, it's not a casual conversation, we're enacting and activating the world story that we need, which is the story of the intimate universe, with nothing left out. We're going to talk about, "How's there evil in the intimate universe?" in a special section, because we have to talk about that.

We're talking about the intimate universe. We're talking about a universe in which we realize, and it's one of the principles of the tenets of intimacy, that evolution reaches for more intimacy.

That reality's not a fact, it's a story.

It's not an ordinary story, it's a love story; that's what evolution means.

It's a love story, meaning it's reaching; it has a plot line. The plot line of evolution is *the evolution of intimacy*, and intimacy means "wholes that are greater than the sum of the parts that yield newness." That's our premise, these are the tenets of intimacy we've set up.

To remind us where we are, one example, Barbara, I was reading the other night in Systems theory, this very simple, beautiful example. Sugar: Hydrogen, carbon, and oxygen, these three elements. None of them are sweet, but when they come together they generate this new property called sweetness. That's intimacy. Intimacy means parts come together to generate a whole that's greater than the sum of the parts. That's the core structure of reality.

Reality reaching for intimacy is actually the expression of the infinity of intimacy driving reality. The Evolutionary Impulse is not blind, it drives towards it, it has telos, it has direction, it moves towards ever greater complexity which really, in its interior, is greater intimacy. The interior of complexity, interconnectivity is intimacy.

In that context we say, "As a unique self, I'm a unique quality of intimacy. God's the infinity of intimacy." What we've done is reclaimed the personal. That's what really Barbara and I are talking about here.

The personal is not before the impersonal. The personal is not just the separate self. It's not just the personality. It's the infinite personhood of cosmos. What Barbara is saying so gorgeously, is that she's turning to the Evolutionary Impulse and saying, "Dearly Beloved." The Evolutionary Impulse is infinitely personal and in *The 11th Hour* we need to know we're not alone. We need to be able to access directly the infinity of intimacy, the personal beyond the impersonal, the infinite-personal that lives in us.

How do we actually approach the infinity of intimacy? This is so crucial for our lives.

We can't live in an intimate universe and not be able to approach the infinity of intimacy. On the one hand, the infinity of intimacy lives in us, and Barbara, you'll talk about it as we conclude. We've talked about it so many times before, the infinite allurements that hold us together which is divinity in us. The infinity of intimacy is evolution driving towards more intimacy. There's the Dearly Beloved, the dearly beloved, the beloved that Rumi falls into her arms. Every place we fall, we fall into her hands. How do we approach? How do we speak to the infinity of intimacy? How do we speak to the infinity of intimacy? That's not meditation.

That's not the practice of meditation, meditation accesses God in the first person. And it's not affirmative prayer which has become very popular in the New Thought movement where you affirm that the impulse is moving in me and it's already so.

It's prayer.

We need to reclaim prayer as an evolutionary practice, but not prayer to the ethnocentric, homophobic, cosmic vending machine God. Not prayer to the God you don't believe in that doesn't exist. Prayer when I turn to the infinity of intimacy.

How do we know? How do we know that this infinity of intimacy hears prayer? Let's say it really simply. If I would turn to you, Barbara, and say, "Can you hear me talking?" Do you hear me?

Barbara:

Yes.

Marc:

Yes, you hear me.

How does Barbara hear me? Well, she hears me with her ears, but it's not just her ears. It's not just a physical structure. There's a vibrating, pulsing intelligence which is Barbara-ness that hears Marc.

Let's see how this works. Barbara hears Marc. Now, Barbara is undoubtedly, as has been evinced so gorgeously throughout her long career and in this series, Barbara's wildly intelligent.

Now, Barbara, don't get upset with me here, is Barbara the most intelligent person in the United States? Maybe, but you know, there's some competition. The most intelligent person in the world?

When we say Barbara's intelligent, we mean not that Barbara's the ultimate intelligence or even the most intelligent. We realize that Barbara's intelligence lives in a larger field of intelligence. So if Barbara's intelligence can hear me speaking, is it possible that the infinite field of intelligence can't hear me speaking?

Wow. Now you get what we just did? That's not a logical structure. That's what's called in Tibetan Buddhism 'a pointing-out instruction.' We pointed towards something.

We don't find prayer through logical proofs. Prayer is an interior truth validated by lots of exterior scientific information which validates the infinitely intimate gorgeous structure of cosmos that we point towards. Just as Barbara's intelligence hears Marc, Marc's intelligence hears Barbara, but Marc's intelligence is not isolated. It's not a monad, it lives in a larger field of intelligence. How can it be that Marc's intelligence can hear Barbara talking, but the field of intelligence can't? It's absurd. That's what we mean when we say, "God, the infinity of intimacy," hears prayer. That's what Rumi's about, it's what's Hafez is about, it's what most of the erotic mystics and Hebrew wisdom are about. It's the realization of turning to Christ.

When we turn to Christ, beyond the ethnocentric narrow idea, we're saying, "Christ's consciousness is the infinity of intimacy." It is God in the second person.

Let's see if we can access it a second time. We've now pointed towards it, pointing out towards the realization, the enlightenment of God in the second person. Let's see if we can do it again.

Shut our eyes for a second, (if you're driving, don't shut your eyes) but if you can, shut your eyes and imagine the infinity of complexity, the infinity of power. What we've called God in the third person.

Billions of light years, a hundred billion galaxies, a hundred billion stars in a galaxy, vast space, complexity that's dazzling.

All the supercomputers in the world couldn't even approximate a bare fragrance of the complexity of the process of photosynthesis let alone mitosis and meiosis, all of the molecular structures, all of the mathematical equations. Dazzling beyond: our mind just breaks, falls in rapture. We can't speak, we're utterly completely mute, before the infinite grandeur of... the billions and billions, and hundreds and... 37 trillion cells just dancing uniquely in one body.

All God in the third person.

Imagine all of that God in the third person, all of that sitting in a chair next to you. All of God in the third person sitting in a chair next to you, looking at you, madly loving you. That's God in the second person.

"Wow!" We'll finish with this last piece of the meditation, if you want to know what's God's interior experience? How does God feel on the inside? Mystics were able to, and as a mystic I'm able to, and you're able to if you access the practice of mysticism, you can actually enter into the interior of divinity because the mysteries are within us. It's the anthro-ontological method, Ontology, the realness of reality lives in us and the interior sciences and many voices across all traditions know this truth.

What is God sitting in that chair feeling?

Access your own experience, access your deepest experience of intimacy in your life. Find first the most tender experience, the most tender infinitely quivering tenderness which you might have felt for another person, a beloved, a child, a friend, a partner, and then magnify, double that experience and then triple that experience then quadruple it and then times 10, times 100, times 1000. Now, exponentialize it, that infinite quivering tenderness wanting you, to hold you, to nourish you.

Then access what a friend of mine calls *the wild stallions*, the eros, the pulsing urgency of reality. The ecstatic. That other dimension of reality. The ecstatic urgency of reality moving through you and desiring that other form, that other quality of desire.

Put those two together, put the ecstatic urgency, now double the ecstatic urgency, triple it, quadruple it, times 10, times 100, times 1000, times a million. Exponentialize it, and put together exponentialized quivering tenderness with exponentialized ecstatic urgency. Merge them together like two forces of light, and you'll actually feel what the infinity of intimacy is feeling for you sitting in that chair.

That's the inner truth of the intimate universe and it's directly available to the eye of the heart. That's the practice of interior sciences.

Rumi knew it. The great persian poet Bar Yochain knew it. Jesus knew it. In every tradition. Abhinavagupta knew it. I know it. You can know it. That's what we need to know that we're not alone in The 11th Hour.

Barbara, I turn the word to conclude to you in whatever way you see fit in this sense of this intimacy in the first person, second person, and third person. Give us the word, Barbara.

Barbara:

Thank you. Thank you, Marc.

I would like to just contribute the idea of the intimate universe being every single particle inside of me is attracted intimately to every single other particle, to make my eyes, and my ears and my everything. So I realize that the intimacy that you're speaking of is actually happening particle with particle with particle with particle, and then when I get up to myself with you, I have these almost infinite numbers of particles making me up and I'm attracted to you who are an infinite number of particles being attracted to each other.

I will just conclude by saying God is attraction to connect in love such that you make something far more than the sum of your parts, and for 11th Hour, if we can be attracted to each other, to join our genius together toward the next stage of evolution, you know what? The particles will say, "Yes," to all of us and we will come through as new. Thank you.

Chapter 8.1: How Is There Evil in the Intimate Universe?

Marc:

What we've been talking about here, friends, Barbara and myself, is how we respond to this moment of existential risk, what we might call *the second shock of existence*. The second shock of existence, a term actually coined by an old colleague, Mauk Pieper, is a very beautiful phrase.

My friend wrote a book called *Humanity's Second Shock of Existence and Your Unique Self* after I taught in Holland the core structure of what I've called unique self or unique self theory, which is the emergence of the new human and the new humanity.

The second shock means that just like the first shock of existence is the appearance of death. So in the dawn of human society, when the human being emerged to the beginning of self reflection and we realized, oh my God, the skull is grinning at the banquet, we are going to die.

The realization of personal death, the response to death was actually an unleashing of spirit, of Culture, of spirit of religion, of depth. All of human society and all of the gorgeousness of humanity emerged as a response in some sense to death. Now, of course, much emerged that it wasn't gorgeous. There was an Eros that emerged, a creative Eros that emerged in response to death, but there was also a pseudo-Eros what my colleague and friend Ken Wilber calls an *Atman Project*, I'm calling it pseudo-Eros, meaning a project to cover up the emptiness, what Ernest Becker called the denial of death.

Now we're at a different moment.

This is the moment of the second shock of existence. The second shock of existence is the realization not of the death of the human being but the death of humanity. Now in response to the second shock of existence, we need to unfold an entirely new level of consciousness, an entirely new level of culture and an entirely new new level of spirit. A new human, literally a new humanity, a new story for humanity. That's what we've been talking about in this 11th hour.

This is an offering into the very heart of culture. This is an offering into the "One Love, One Heart," which is the lifeblood of culture. This is an offering into the source-code of culture to create the framework of a new story.

It's not a world religion, within the new story there's room for everyone, for the unique self of every religion, but there's a framework, there's a context that we share together and that context, that evolving perennial context and that is the news story that I've called cosmo erotic humanism. That we've called the *Universe: A Love Story* that we've called *Homo amor*, but we need to talk in that context about evil.

How is it that in a universe which is a love story, we have evil and how do we have suffering?

Isn't the evolution of love a world in which more and more love is present and available? Well, yes it is.

We've talked in great depth about the evolution of love and how love moves and deepens and the circle of love widens from egocentric love to ethnocentric love to world-centric love to Kosmo-centric love. When each one of those expansions, my felt sense of care, concern, commitment, devotion moves from me and my people - egocentric, to my nation, my tribe - ethnocentric, to every human being on the planet - world centric and ultimately to the planet itself and to all being all the way up and all the way down, Kosmo-centric.

There's clearly an evolution of love, but at the same time, the capacity for suffering increases.

Every new evolutionary term brings new challenges. Every new technology brings new potential beauty and new potential beastiality, brings new gorgeousness and new potential devastation.

We have today exponential tech, but exponential tech is much different than a tank. A tank can cause much more devastation than a bow and arrow, but a nuclear bomb and rogue nuclear drones can cause exponentially more devastation than all of the previous technologies.

Technology both opens up possibility of goodness, truth and beauty. And technology also opens up new forms of devastation.

It's not only technology, every new structure of society and opens up new possibilities for beauty, for love, and new possibilities for ugliness, for brutality. So that's one.

In the evolutionary line, the more complexity, the more connectivity, the more that we're in community and larger and larger frames of community, of mutual interdependence, and ultimately of love and support, the more room there is for pathologies in all of the lines of development.

Let's go deeper.

How can we actually have, there's a word my grandmother would use or my mother Chutzpah. Chutzpah means the audacity, the temerity to talk about the universal love story. In a world that's filled with so much pain, in a world that's filled with children who are starving. In a world that's filled with brutality in a world that's filled with a level of alienation in a world that's filled with so much that is outrageously painful.

How do we talk about the Universe: A Love Story? Is that a joke? Isn't that absurd? Isn't there something grotesque in it?

Do you remember Dostoevsky, in one of his classical novels, *The Brothers Karamazov*, has Ivan and Ilyusha having a conversation. Ivan says to Ilyusha the priest, "I don't want to be there," it's after this horrific scene in which a general's dog rips apart a poor village boy.

Ivan says, I don't want to be there when Jesus and the village boy and the dogs and the general all hug and embrace and kiss each other. He speaks of the utter evil, the utter horror of this scene that leaves no room for a God, that leaves no room for talk of a *love story*, that leaves no room for the talk of an *intimate universe*.

Are we being Pollyannish? Are we being relentlessly positive and actually ignoring the pain and suffering that is so deep and profound in reality? Is there something obscene in us talking about the Universe: A Love Story? That's what I want to talk about very briefly cause it's very direct, it's very clear.

The great question of suffering, what religion called Theodicy, which is a particular version of the question of suffering, it's the version that takes place in theism. How can a good God allow for suffering? How can a good God who knows everything that's going on and was all powerful allow for suffering?

That question or the secular humanist question or the *Kashmir Shaivite* question, from the Hindu tradition, or the Vajrayāna question within Buddhism or the Sufi question or the Confucian question or that native Indian question or the aboriginal question or the Taoists' question.

Whoever's framing the question, the question is: "Oh my God, In a world which is supposed to have some form of elegant order, which is supposed to have some form of benevolence, which we're claiming here, audaciously based on an enormous amount of evidence, the universe is a love story. What do you mean? Marc? Barbara? Are you so hopelessly lost in your own naivete, Marc and Barbara, that you could talk about the Universe: A Love Story in a world of such abject suffering and outrageous pain?"

If you can open your heart for a second, this is so beautiful. It's so sweet, it's so stunning.

You see, when we cry out "It's not fair." We cry out "It shouldn't be this way." When we cry out the great question of Theodicy, the great question of suffering; the question itself only makes sense if the universe *is* a love story.

Did you get that?

It's only in the context of an intimate universe that we can actually even ask and formulate the question of suffering. It's only when we're deep in relationship.

When we're deep in relationship and I feel violated by you, I say, "Oh my God, why are you doing this to me?" Right? Because there's intimacy between us. So then I view you're turning away. I view your indifference. I view your allowing me to suffer as a violation of our intimacy.

But if there's no intimacy between us, then who am I turning to? We can only scream out the question if there's a universe that hears the question. We can only scream out and protest suffering if there's a context in which that protest makes sense.

The only context in which the protest, the cry against suffering, Ivan's cry in brothers *Karamazov*; the only context in which that cry makes sense is within the context of the intimate universe, because evil, suffering at its core is a failure of intimacy. But if we don't live in an intimate universe, what else would you expect? Why would you expect it to be any different? If we're not in relationship, then you can't turn away from me because there's no intimacy between us. And if we're not in a relationship then why would I expect you to take care of me?

If we live in a world without relationship, without intimacy, if we don't live in the Universe: A Love Story why would the failure of love be a problem?

Paradoxically, there's no answer in a formal structural sense. People are suffering because they sin: wrong. That's obscene. People are suffering because they attract it into their life. That's the new age version of the old, classical theodicy, of the old religions where people are suffering because they attract it into their lives. Nonsense. There's partial truth in both of those, but fundamentally those are obscene responses at their core.

When we ask why are people suffering? We don't know. There's a mystery of suffering. We have to actually bow before the mystery. But we know one thing: the question only makes sense in the context of the Universe: A Love Story, in the context of the intimate universe.

When I cry out, "why?" Within that crying out of *why*, is the ultimate intimacy with the universe that understands the question.

I want to conclude this with the teaching from mysticism. This particular teaching comes from one of the figures that was beloved of Franz Kafka, Nachman of Bratslav, a Hasidic master. A couple of generations after the Baal Shem Tov, the master of the good name, that Martin Buber wrote about, who was the initiator of the Hasidic movement.

In this teaching, Nachman of Bratslav, this master cites a biblical text which says "*Ayeh mekom kevodo?*" The prophet cries out, "*Ayeh mekom kevodo?*" "Where?" "Where is the place of your *Kevodo* -- of your honor -- of your involvement in the world? Where are you, God?" And the word *ayeh* is *aleph-yod-hey* in the original Hebrew. Three letters: Aleph like alpha (A), yod (Y), hey - which is like an H. So Aleph-yod-hey, Nachman says: these are the three highest of the 10 spiritual emanations within the system of Kabbalah.

In Kabbalah, there are ten sefirot, there are ten spiritual emanations. Nachman says, in ordinary life, as we pray, as we do goodness, as we engage truth and beauty, as we study, as we give charity, as we're activists -- everything we do in our life actually allows us to access the lower seven divine illuminations, but the top three, we can never access, we could never touch divinity that high. We can never touch God that deep, that's God who's on the inside of the inside. But

Nachman says, the only time you ever touch God so deeply is when you cry out, “*Ayeh - Aleph-Yod-Hey.*”

Aleph-Yod-Hey, that word: “Where is God?” He says, *Aleph* is the highest emanation, it's called *Keter*: the ultimate divine crown. Yod, the second letter, Yod he says, is divine ultimate wisdom: *Chochmah*. The last letter, ‘Hey,’ he says is the third emanation *Binah*: which is the higher goddess.

What Nachman is saying, and I'm using a particular language here from Hebrew mysticism, but we could use it from many other places as well. I'm borrowing a particular mystical language to transmit a particular gorgeous, I mean stunning insight of enlightened understanding.

Nachman is saying: the only time you can transcend the seven divine emanations, what I would call the ordinary god of the religions and access the deepest, the inside of the inside, the holy of holies, the the sanctum sanctorum of divinity, the deepest of the deep is when you actually cry-out and challenge God and protest and challenge the universe itself if you're not using a god-language and say, “Why is it this way? It shouldn't be this way. It's wrong that it should be this way, I say no, I scream in protest against suffering - an agonizing scream, and that's my question.” And that question itself *is* the ultimate intimacy because the question only makes sense if we're deep in intimacy.

If you're walking on the street and I grab you and you don't even know me and I say: you're a complete idiot. You just, I don't know, you walk away, you call the police, whatever you do. But if we're deep in a relationship and I call you out, oh my God, that's the deepest calling-out what we're in relationship. We love each other madly. We're intimate. So now I'm saying, oh my God, what kind of person are you to abandon me? So the question itself is the answer.

No, we don't have easy, fast-style, pseudo spiritual, pseudo religious, pseudo new-age answers to the question of why people suffer. But what we know is that the question itself is the ultimate intimacy. That the question of suffering only makes sense in the context of the Universe: A Love Story in the context of Homo amore, in the context of the intimate universe.

Thank you.

Chapter 9: *On the Evolution of Love: Your Need is my Allurement - From Egocentric to Cosmocentric Intimacy*

Barbara:

Marc, we're entering Chapter 9: Cosmocentric Intimacy.

What is that, really, in a way that we can feel it? As you do that, then I will describe how I've already felt it and we'll see how others are feeling it for The 11th Hour. So Marc, give us that incredible concept of Cosmocentric intimacy.

Marc:

Thank you, Barbara. Beautiful.

What an invitation. Cosmocentric intimacy, a beautiful word.

Cosmocentric intimacy is in some sense, the single most important quality of consciousness that the world itself needs to cultivate for The 11th Hour. It's a new emergent, remember when parts come together to form a new whole that's greater than the sum of the parts, the new whole is a new emergent.

One of our tenants of intimacy, the tenants of the intimate universe is *intimacy drives emergence*. Emergence is always about a new emergent of intimacy because remember, evolution *is* the evolution of intimacy. Evolution is a story, it has a plotline: the plotline of the story is the evolution of *love*, the evolution of intimacy itself.

Now, we've talked about it somewhat on a molecular level, cosmological evolution; how we move from quarks to subatomic particles that come together, parts and a new whole called an atom. Atoms come together and form molecules, and molecules come together and form complex molecules, and complex molecules, deepen their intimacy and awaken as cells. We move from single cell to multicellular, and we go all the way up to the first algae and then plants and then early amphibians, and then animals, and then early mammals, then hominids walking on the Savanna.

We go all the way from cosmological evolution - the first big bang, to biological evolution, all the way up to when the hominids walking on the Savanna awaken as human beings. There's this deepening, there's this momentous leap and cultural evolution begins.

Let's chart for a second, the evolutionary story in that spectrum. The evolution of intimacy in cultural evolution in the human story. I want to begin Barbara, with a kind of left field opening and that'll take us at a very good place.

We mentioned before in our conversations the really important work of Kohut, and Fairbairn, and Winnicott leading to attachment theory. Martha Nussbaum's written from University of Chicago, really important summations and critiques and unpackings of these schools in her book *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. It's the basic notion that human beings have core needs, food and touch are our primal needs, and all of us are in some way humiliated in trying to get our core needs met. That's an essential understanding.

We're humiliated very early. In all of our lives in some sense, unless we're able to transform and to liberate ourselves, is this continuing trajectory in which we're re-traumatized. The original humiliation in getting our basic needs met is recapitulated again and again in our relationships with our father, our mother, early caretakers, teachers, friends, we keep redoing, reenacting, that same humiliation.

Now, how do I heal that pain? How do I heal that humiliation? The only way you heal that humiliation, is when actually, you have the experience that your beloved says to you, whoever your beloved is, whatever form of beloved, but your beloved says to you, "Your needs are not a burden to me. You don't need to be humiliated in asking for your needs, and you don't need to be humiliated by your desire. You don't need to feel humiliated by your dependency on others to have your desire met."

Desire implies need and need implies desire. You don't need to be humiliated because actually your beloved says to you, "Your need is my allurement." Reality is allurement, all the way up and all the way down. When allurement awakens in me, as me, and through me, that God force in first person in me, I turn to my beloved and I say, "Your need is my allurement."

Now, that is the one way that we heal that humiliation of basic needs. One arena in which that can happen is sexing. Sexing is an arena in which a person's needs are not actually humiliating. The lover turns beloved and says, "Your need is my allurement." That's why sexing is subversive, but the sexual models Eros, and Eros lives in all the nonsexual dimensions of life and all of life. Our beloved turns to us and says, "Your need is my allurement."

Now, let's go deeper.

Usually, we can only turn to maybe one person, maybe a couple of people, maybe my children. I say to my children when there's a genuine relationship, when children and parents honor each other deeply, they can say to each other, and that doesn't happen in many families, maybe even not in most families. But when family works the way it should, children, parents say to each other, "Your need is my allurement." When we're not in Cain and Abel, brothers say to each

other, "Your need is my allurement." Evolutionary friends and partners say to each other, "Your need is my allurement."

We have this first level of intimacy where we say to the people that are in our ego-centric circle, now I'm not using ego negatively here; ego as in separate self - the people that I interact with regularly, and I say, "Wow, your need is my allurement. If you're suffering, I'm suffering. So, your need, my allurement" and we heal the humiliation of getting our basic needs met.

Friends, getting our basic needs met, when you can't finish the month and pay your rent, when you're worried about how to take care of your kids, when you have primal life worries the humiliation of getting those basic needs met, which is the experience of most people in the world today, is profound.

Even beyond survival needs, at all levels, lover says to beloved, "Your need is my allurement." When we say that to a small circle of people, we call that ego-centric intimacy and it's beautiful, it's gorgeous, it's stunning.

Then intimacy evolves.

The evolution of love at the level of cultural evolution and we expand the circle of intimacy. We expand the felt sense of love, care, and concern. We expanded the 'your' in the sentence, your need is my allurement, from ego-centric to sociocentric, we might call ethnocentric, which means I say to my whole tribe, to my whole nation, maybe to my whole religion, to my whole larger circle, people I don't even know directly, I say "Your need is my allurement."

I say to my whole tribe, my whole nation, my whole people, whatever *my people* happens to be, I say, "Your need is my allurement." That's what patriotism is. Patriotism, in its noble form, is "I'm willing to die for my country." That's intimate. There's an intimate connection to the larger field, to the larger tribe. Of course, it has shadows in xenophobia, it has shadows in fascism, but at its core, it's gorgeous.

We get excited about our sports team, why are Boston Red Sox fans excited about the Boston team? It's got nothing to do with them. They've done nothing, you can barely bat a ball, you can't even catch anything in your mitt, but you're wildly excited that your team won, because it's a sense of "Wow, Boston." America at the Olympics, sports teams is one of the fragrances we still have a healthy notion of a kind of ethnocentric intimacy, but it's gorgeous and it's important. It's critical, I'm held by this larger circle, so I've expanded my sense of felt love, care, and concern. I say to my entire tribe, "Your need is my allurement." But then it happens again. Then love evolves again.

Evolution evolves again to a higher level of intimacy.

I move from ethnocentric to world-centric. Lionel Richie and Michael Jackson, 1985, they write "We Are the World." If one person in the world is hungry, then I'm in pain, I'm hungry. We say to every human being in the world to every child in the world, to the 21,000 children who die everyday, today of hunger and hunger related diseases, when we say, "Your need is my allurements."

That's not ego-centric, that's not ethnocentric intimacy, that's world-centric intimacy. Intimacy means, remember, a sense of shared identity. Intimacy equals shared identity plus mutuality of pathos. I feel you, you feel me. So I say, "Your need is my allurements," not just to my tribe, but to every man, woman and child in reality. I feel you, you feel me. We have shared identity.

Then we move to Cosmocentric intimacy.

It happens again. Evolution jumps again. The evolution of love takes a momentous leap forward. The evolution of intimacy, complete jump, radical jump. Cosmocentric intimacy means I'm identified with all of the cosmos, not just with every human being, but with all of the cosmos, interior and exterior. Exterior; with every fish, with every animal, with every species, with the planet itself, with the cosmos itself, with the Evolutionary Impulse itself.

I am evolution! I'm identified with the Evolutionary Impulse. That's Cosmocentric intimacy.

I'm identified with God. God and I are not separate in that first person, so I have a sense of intimacy equals shared identity. I have a shared identity with the divine, with the Evolutionary Impulse, and I feel the Evolutionary Impulse and the Evolutionary Impulse feels me. I feel God, God feels me. There's divine pathos, there's human pathos and they meet, that's Cosmocentric intimacy.

This is the democratization of enlightenment Barbara, that we've talked so much about, that every human being at this moment in time can awaken to Cosmocentric intimacy, and that's actually a genuine realization that's available.

Just like we democratized governance, we can democratize enlightenment, but enlightenment is not just "I am." It's not just awareness. It's actually the evolution of love, the evolution of intimacy. When I actually attain it and move from ego to ethno to world to Cosmocentric intimacy. Barbara, with such delight, from this place of Cosmocentric intimacy that we share, I turn to you to find for us your special and gorgeous path to this realization that lives in you of Cosmocentric intimacy.

Barbara:

Thank you Marc.

It's a very unusual thing, I'm going to say is how this happened to me, from my Jewish agnostic, materialistic background. I saw a beautiful image of the cross at Mount Calvary Monastery and I began to have an inner experience.

Here's how it started. When you love God above all else, which would be this infinite cosmic universe. When you love God above all else, you love your neighbor as yourself, and you love yourself, Barbara, as a natural Christ. Now, I was not Christian, but I knew what the story of Christ was.

Love yourself as a natural Christ. Well, I thought, "I better go into the monastery and check in for a while and see what that could mean." I knocked on the monastery door, a priest answered, I said, "I'm Barbara Hubbard. I'm a futurist, can I come in?" He said, "I'm having lunch. Could you please come back?" So he wasn't all that excited about me, but I did register the next week.

I began to read the New Testament with evolutionary eyes. You could do this with all the great traditions, but I happened to get, "you are a natural Christ." As I was reading the story of Christ, the most amazing thing is everything that he said he could do, he said we could do. I began to read it with evolutionary eyes; the loaves and the fishes, all the miracles that one person they told the story about, actually we are learning to do almost all of it, but without the natural love of infinite love that you're talking about, infinite allurement.

One day I was taking a walk and as usual I'm asking questions. I asked this presence of the Christ, I asked in the universal language, "They really wrote a good story about you in the Bible. What story could we tell that would be as important as the story they told about you?" And here's the answer I got, "Barbara, go tell the story of the birth of humanity as a co-evolving, co-creative species, go tell that story."

Then what happened to me is I literally laid down on the grass and I had the experience: I am the story from that origin of creation all the way through just as we've been saying, and then I emerged as somebody who was infinitely attracted and loving in the model that I had read about. I had never identified myself that way.

I want to conclude by saying, when we tell the story of the birth of humanity from the origin of creation, through you and me sitting here and everybody listening, what's coming through everybody is the entire story of creation. And yes, it's true, we can do the works and far greater works than we've ever known we could do when we love one another as that impulse of evolution and that allurement.

In this interaction Marc, we're bringing forward this allurement as a gift for each one of us in the new story of evolution for all of us.

Marc:

That is so, so gorgeous, Barbara. I mean, so gorgeous. I mean, yes, yes, yes, yes.

Perhaps just the last words that just take this word, this new human and new humanity that we talk about, that you just talked about.

What is the new human and the new humanity?

It's the one who's able to say to my beloved next to me, my ego-centric intimacy, "Your need is my allurement." Barbara, your need is my allurement.

To my whole tribe, "Your need is my allurement." To every human being in the world, "Your need is my allurement."

To God and cosmos, to the Evolutionary Impulse, "Your need is my allurement," from a second person perspective, from a God perspective, "I'm your partner, God, your need is my allurement." To evolution, to the Evolutionary Impulse, "Your need is my allurement."

What we begin to realize is, and here's the last principle of this section with which we'll close this Chapter 9. What we realize is not only do we live in an intimate universe, but the intimate universe lives in us. As the universe living in us, this new emergent of intimacy, Cosmocentric intimacy, emerges.

Barbara:

Marc, "your need is my allurement" on a cosmic scale when I'm taking that intimately, cosmically, which is a very interesting relationship between the intimacy of myself and my Cosmocentric humanism.

What I realize is the reason I can feel that so deeply is *I am evolution. You are evolution.* Everybody listening to this on The 11th Hour is evolution going through The 11th Hour.

The 11th Hour is the time when evolution itself is confronted with the need either to let this species go for a while or to take this jump. When I realize that I am evolution and I'm able to embody the allurement within me of Cosmocentric humanism, this *I am evolution*, has grown inside me to be an awesome proportion for every new human. With that Marc, just go deeper into Cosmocentric humanism such that we can feel it personally.

Marc:

Fantastic, that's great, Barbara, I love that. I love what you said and I love the invitation.

First, let me just distinguish between terms. There's a phrase we use, which I want to be precise about it for everyone, we call it a cosmo-erotic humanism. Cosmo-erotic humanism means it's

an intimate universe all the way up and all the way down, it's a cosmo-erotic universe. It's a beautiful phrase. In some sense we call the meta, the overarching vision of the intimate universe, this school of thought we're forming, which is really what Barbara and I call the next step in conscious evolution, is cosmo-erotic humanism.

Now a quality of the new human and the new humanity in cosmo-erotic humanism, is Cosmocentric intimacy. Cosmocentric intimacy is what Barbara, you just described as *I am evolution*. As Barbara said so beautifully, the same intimacy that lives in me on the interpersonal, ego-centric level, ego-centric in the best sense of the word, I turn to my son, my daughter, my beloved, my evolutionary partner, and I say, "Your need is my allurement."

The evolution of love, the evolution of intimacy is: I turn to cosmos, I turn to the infinity of intimacy and I say, "Your need is my allurement." When that happens the basis of "your need is my allurement" is shared identity and mutuality of pathos, shared pathos, we can feel each other.

Now, Barbara asks to unpack this a little more, so a couple of more words are important here, and I appreciate the invitation.

All four of these levels; ego-centric intimacy -- ego-centric consciousness, ethnocentric intimacy or ethnocentric consciousness, world-centric intimacy or world-centric consciousness, Cosmocentric intimacy or Cosmocentric consciousness, they all live in the world today.

Your average American today lives at the level of ego-centric intimacy, at best, meaning a healthy, psychologically sound person who's really developed intimacy, because we've talked about this global intimacy disorder which affects the personal so many people live without intimacy.

A healthy American today, most healthy liberal Americans at least don't have a genuine sense of nationalism, they don't really have ethnocentric intimacy. The liberal world has lost that to a great degree but there is ego-centric intimacy, there is to my spouse, my beloved, my partner, I can say, "Your need is my allurement."

At the best of the liberal world and the best of the conservative world in America and across the world and nation states there's a sense of ethnocentric intimacy. My people, my country, there's also shadows of it, fascism, which are emergent in many places around the world in Turkey, we're seeing strains of it, in Venezuela, or in the Philippines, in Russia, et cetera.

We have strains of it in America, a kind of *Make America Great* sense, the unhealthy form of make America great. The healthy form of make America great is great ethnocentric conscious, ethnocentric intimacy. Then we have world-centric intimacy, which is the sense that many people have at the leading edge that we're not just part of a country, it doesn't feel right to us, it doesn't feel right for me to identify myself only as American. I'm American, but I'm also a citizen

of the world, every human being is my brother and sister. There's a genuine sense at the leading edge, there's a center of gravity for the first time post World War I, there's a genuine center of gravity which is world-centric.

There's a great movie Barbra, The Red Baron, it's about the German Ace who shot people down in World War I who was the prize of Kaiser villain. At some point, he writes a book in World War I, this Ace, when he realizes this is nonsense. I'm German and I'm an Ace in the sky and the people that I'm shooting at, and we actually see each other, these were my friends in the Sorbonne, these were my friends in London. All the aces were from the elite families of Europe, why are we shooting each other? He realizes that ethnocentric intimacy and consciousness is ridiculous, absurd, horrific.

Post World War I, this world-centric intimacy emerges in consciousness. Still, most of the world today is either ego-centric or ethnocentric with, for the first time, a center of gravity at world-centric, every human being but we need to go to the next step. There's the leading edge of the leading edge.

The tip of the tipping point is actually Cosmocentric intimacy. It's actually this awakening to the consciousness that I am evolution. *I am evolution* is not a declaration, it's actually a sense of intimacy with the cosmos, of intimacy with the Evolutionary Impulse, and I'm identified not just with my egoic structure, not just with my tribal structure, not just with every human being - shared identity, I'm actually identified with the Evolutionary Impulse. The locus, the center of my identity is the Evolutionary Impulse, unique, intimate expression of the Evolutionary Impulse of the infinity of intimacy that lives in me.

What Barbara and I are saying, the planetary invitation that we're trying to articulate and I'll turn it to Barbara to close, is the invitation, but the demand, the urgent necessity, the ecstatic urgency, of the evolution of love, the evolution of intimacy which is a full and a real possibility.

It's not a fairy tale. It's not pie in the sky. It's not this unimaginable---. It actually is the natural course of evolution. That's the good news here.

This is where evolution is reaching for. Evolution *is* the evolution of intimacy. In the new evolutionary intimacy is this Cosmocentric intimacy, which is now, for the first time waking up in us and *now* this needs to become the social virus, which infects the human being, the old homo sapien and ushers in the new homo amor, the new human and the new humanity.

I turn beloved Barbara, to you to close us in Chapter 9.

Barbara:

Marc, I am actually feeling this.

Marc: Yeah

Barbara:

That on the most intimate level, every particle in my being is attracted to every other particle to make me as a person. I am infinitely wise because I'm all of that. Then there's my relationship with you and others that are bringing all of that person with person, and then if we keep going all the way up to cosmic, Cosmocentric human, cosmo-erotic humanism. I just want to conclude with what kind of human I am, if that's so.

Marc: Please.

Barbara:

I would like everybody listening to go within for a moment and see if this reality can be felt.

When it's felt we are able to express ourselves in such a way that we will go through the 11th Hour and become the 12th hour, which would be the new humanity. That's what I see from what we're saying, and thank you so much and good night.

Marc: Hallelujah. Amen.

Chapter 10: From Role Mate to Soul Mate to Whole Mate: Joining Genes to Joining Genius

Barbara:

Welcome, everybody, to The 11th Hour.

This is Chapter 10 of The 11th Hour, and a most exciting chapter it is.

We will be discussing relationship and the evolution of relationship as we're facing possible devolution and disaster *OR* evolution and something more. The evolution of relationship is coming right at that epic moment of change.

I am delighted to announce to you that our theme is From Role Mate to Soul Mate to Whole Mate: Joining Genius instead of Joining Genes. Joining genius to create more, rather than joining genes to procreate more.

I'm delighted to introduce my partner Marc Gafni for Chapter 10 to start us off, Marc.

Marc:

Barbara, beautiful, and that's what we need to talk about now.

We need to talk about this vision of the intimate universe. We live in an intimate universe, and as we've seen, the intimate universe lives in us, and we're each unique configurations of intimacy. Evolution itself is the evolution of intimacy.

The evolution of intimacy begins with cosmological evolution as the configurations of subatomic particles, atoms, molecules, cells each evolve getting more and more complex, more and more interconnected, ultimately, more and more intimate.

The interior of interconnectivity is intimacy, and we begin to realize that the evolutionary process, from strings, quarks, whichever one you want to understand as kind of the core structure of reality, all the way up through the atomic world, through the cellular world, through the plant world, the animal, amphibian, mammal, human world, this entire process from what seems to be inanimate but actually is quite alive and sentient, that cosmological evolution, the emergence of the entire physical substrate of reality all the way through the biosphere, and all the way up through all the living systems and all the life forms.

It's all about the evolution of intimacy in which parts come together to create new wholes that are greater than the sum of the parts, that are emergent. Every time there's a new configuration of intimacy, intimacy drives emergence. We begin to realize, wow, we live in an intimate universe, and there are tenets of intimacy, and that's essential to the new story.

The new story is that reality is evolution, and evolution means that reality is not just a fact, it's a story and the story has a plot line. That's what we've been talking about. The plot line is this evolution of intimacy as we've described it; intimacy being shared identity in the context of otherness. This is the context.

This is the new world story. It's a world story that's not fanciful. It's not a conjecture. It's the best take on reality we have today. It's the best dharma we have today. Dharma, if you remember, is the best integration of the validated insights of premodern, modern, and postmodern thought integrated, again, parts coming together in a larger whole into a new configuration of intimacy that's greater than the sum of the parts.

What we said at the outset is that the new story itself, which responds to the global intimacy disorder which causes the global action paralysis, the global action confusion -- this new story is the new configuration of intimacy. It's parts coming together in a whole greater than the sum of the parts, and so there are Chapters in this story. Each chapter up to now we tried to identify a particular dimension of reality and see how the new story transfigures that dimension of reality.

Now, we're going to do the same thing in regard to relationships.

Again, the 11th Hour, this series of 12 with a couple of bonus calls is just the beginning. We need to run an 11th Hour series just in economics, and an 11th Hour series just on medicine, and an 11th hour series on what education needs to be in the 11th Hour. The 11th Hour series that we're hosting now is an overarching framework, and our hope is, in every field to host an 11th Hour series to see how this new story, this new configuration of intimacy, the new narrative, the universe story with its subsets and narratives of identity and narratives of power, narratives of sexuality, narratives of community, that expresses itself in every sector of living, in every dimension of society, interior and exterior.

For now let's turn to relationships. Let's see if we can get a couple of things clear. If reality is evolution, evolution means there's a story. The story is about the evolution of, the evolution of what? ...of relationships.

We know two things about reality. We know that reality is evolution but we also know that reality is relationships. *Reality is relationships* is a core principle of the nature of reality. We use object, we call reality is: made up of objects, billiard boards, little tiny specs of sand and that's actually a metaphor.

What we now understand in terms of the best of science that reality is not a machine made up of distinct separate objects that are linked together in a particular way, although there's a dimension of reality that manifests that way. At the core of things reality is a series or a system of relationships. If I actually get that, if I get that, let's say, in subatomic physics reality is probability patterns but it's not probability patterns of objects: it's probably patterns of interconnections or of relationships, of intimacies.

Reality at its subatomic level is actually probability patterns of things that is interconnections, which then point to probability patterns of other interconnections, and it's interconnections, it's relationships all the way up and all the way down.

Stay with this, okay?

We're trying to touch the structure of things now. We don't want to say something glibber, facile. We don't want to sloganeer. We don't want to do dogmatic sloganeering in the old religions or in the new age religions. We're looking at the ontologies, the deeper structures of reality.

Let's say it again. Reality is evolution. Reality is relationships. Therefore, reality is the evolution of relationships.

What drives the emergence of new relationships, which in effect means new configurations of intimacy, or we might call it new contexts for relating?

New relationships are created by new configurations of intimacy, new contexts for relating. What drives that?

First, an inherent desire in reality to create deeper intimacies, greater wholes. That's an inherent, ceaseless creative drive of reality itself all the way up and all the way down like a great chain of being, the evolutionary chain.

The second driver is crisis. A crisis in relationships, a crisis in intimacy generates a new level of intimacy, a new level of relationship. Barbara, you've talked, along with Elizabeth Satoris and others, in a beautiful way about the image of single-celled to multi-celled life at the origin in the primeval dawn of reality as a moment where there's a crisis and that crisis generates what we're calling here a new configuration of intimacy, a new structure of relationship.

The same thing is true at the human level. The same thing is true at the level of cultural evolution.

We want to look at a particular snapshot, let's look at the last thousand years. The last thousand years we see that there's an evolution in the context of relating, which has particularly accelerated in the last 50 years, 60 years, 70 years. For the most of the last thousand years the context for relating would be what we would call Role Mates.

Now, Role Mates have a shared identity. They're intimate with each other, and hence, they have a shared identity. The family, the nuclear family, the husband and wife and the nuclear family have a shared identity. Whatever language they're using, whatever the society was, there's some version of Mr. and Mrs. Smith in the last thousand years. There's a shared identity. 'Mr.' and 'Mrs.' came later, and the shared last name came later but the basic idea of a shared identity is clear. There's otherness but there's the shared identity. It's the shared identity of what we might call Role Mates.

Role Mates has many permutations around cultures, but just very generally, what my friend Ken Wilber likes to call an orienting generalization. Very generally, Role Mates come together not to create emotional intimacy, not to talk about their wounds, not to talk about the deeper eddies and brookes of their souls, not to contemplate together the beauties of nature. They don't read Walt Whitman together necessarily, but they're Role Mates, they've got roles.

The roles are minimally, to survive, hopefully to thrive. Generally that involves procreation, creating children, raising the children together is a shared destiny, it's a shared obligation, it's a shared responsibility. They each have roles; to be a good man or a good woman is to fulfill your Role Mate responsibilities. Even if emotional intimacy is not happening and there's not a deep soul connection, that's okay, often.

My friend John Gray who wrote Mars - Venus Series tells the story at the beginning of one of his books about his father, married to his mother, who was having a series of affairs. John wrote it in a public book, so it's of course appropriate to repeat. His mother would say about his father, *He was a good man*, and she meant it. He was a good man because he was fulfilling his Role Mate responsibilities. It would never occur to her to leave the relationship because there was some soul dimension that wasn't being met.

That was the Role Mate world. That's a particular configuration of intimacy. By *intimacy*, we're not using it in its narrow ... Intimacy as an emotional soul contact, that's one dimension of intimacy. Intimacy means shared identity in the context of otherness, in which a new whole is created that's greater than the sum of the parts. That's the family, that's Role Mates.

But then there's an evolution, there's an evolution of intimacy.

There's an evolution of intimacy because people are not satisfied because the age of the individual emerges and we get more psychologically astute and more sensitive, and we have a desire to be met, and we have a desired to be recognized, and a desire to be heard, and a desire to be seen, and a desire to be empowered. Those are all good. Those are momentous evolutionary leaps and the affirmation of the goodness of human beings and their intrinsic right to be validated and recognized and creative and fulfilled.

All of this emergence demands a reconfiguration of relationship, of intimacies, so we move from Role Mate to Soul Mate.

Now, that didn't happen in one moment. Of course the troubadours talked about great love, and Jacob and Rachel in the biblical times were a model of great love, so it's not that great love just emerges in one moment fifty years ago but it wasn't the center of gravity, it wasn't the prerequisite for relationship. The prerequisite for relationship was much more connected to socioeconomic status, Role Mate capacities, general compatibility, familial background, cultural background, religious background.

The notion that we marry purely for love, primarily for love, that it's the *soul attraction* that defies everything, well, it didn't work in Romeo and Juliet but it comes to the fore in the last 50, 60 years in a kind of raging volcano eruption.

Now think about 1963, *Fiddler on the Roof* on Broadway, the great *Fiddler on the Roof*, and Tevye sings to Golde; "Do you love me?" *singing* (As you can see, I didn't try out for the lead role in that musical.)

"Do you love me?" Golde looks at him and says, "What are you talking about? For 25 years, I've washed your clothes, I've darned your clothes." She goes through a list of things she's done, meaning, "I've been a great Role Mate. What are you talking about, *do you love me?*" He keeps up: But do you love me? She says, "For 25 years, I've washed your clothes, I have darned your clothes," until they both look at each other, and they understand there's something new here. She says, "Yes, I suppose I do." This is the emergence of Love, it's the emergence of Soul Mates.

Seven years later it's 1970, remember *Love Story*, that great movie *Love Story*? If you don't, get it on Netflix. It was this epic movie which is about Love. It's about Jenny and Oliver and they defy their socioeconomic background, they don't play classical roles, they're Soul Mates. They want to look deeply into each other's eyes. They want to work out their emotional traumas with each other from the past. They want to heal old wounds.

All the scenes in *Love Story*, the first meeting scene, the first sexuality scene, the death scene - because Jenny dies, if you look at all the scenes, they're all revolved around them somehow working out and solving the pain, and trauma, and the wound of life in the nectar, in the sweetness of Soul Mate connection and Soul Mate authenticity and Soul Mate recognition and Soul Mate love.

There's nothing Soul Mates love to do better than looking deeply in each other's eyes and that's gorgeous, and it's beautiful. Soul Mates is all about personal fulfillment and if I'm not getting personally fulfilled, which means emotional intimacy and communication, we break up.

Which is why all the books in the '70s, '80s, and into the '90s, remember the '90s, What were the books? They were about Five Love Languages, Venus and Mars, which was a communications couple. My friend Harville Hendrix writes another book called 'Getting the Love You Want: A Guide for Couples.' The title of all the books is ...*languages, communication, emotional intimacy*, that's the discourse of Soul Mates.

Then something happens. Then for the leading edge at the tip of the tipping point, that's also not quite enough.

There's a certain point in which there's a heresy that begins to emerge, that you're not allowed to speak, which is that looking deeply in someone's eyes for personal fulfillment, at some point as our consciousness evolves is no longer personally fulfilling, or at least not sufficiently to hold a relationship.

As we begin to emerge, not just as separate self, but as we talked in one of the earlier chapters, but as Unique Self, a unique expression of the seamless code of the universe, and as Evolutionary Unique Self, a Unique Self in an evolutionary context. Feeling the personal face of the Evolutionary Impulse, rising, pulsing, beating in me, knowing that I've got a unique contribution to make that's needed by all that is.

All of a sudden, the kind of fixation or focus of just looking deeply into the pools of someone else's eyes becomes insufficient and at a certain point, becomes even self-absorbed, somewhat narcissistic, somewhat occluding of the larger picture, somewhat dissociated from the larger reality. Now, you're not allowed to say any of this, but at some point, that intimate relationship of emotional intimacy is insufficient, and then something happens.

We move as it were from *Love Story* to *The Matrix*. Now, we're in *The Matrix*, late '90s, early new millennium. We have Neo and Trinity. Neo and Trinity, in their first meeting, their first meeting is not about looking deeply in each other's eyes. Their first meeting is, *Why are we meeting Neo to Trinity?* Because we're both asking the same question. We're both looking in the same direction.

We're moving from Soul Mate to Whole Mate

A Whole Mate both has a sense of, first off, interior wholeness and therefore, not looking to the other to fill them up, at least not in a way which is not healthy. There's a fundamental wholeness, but even more than that, the Whole Mate locates him or herself in the larger whole. I'm located in the larger whole. I'm located in the larger evolutionary context. I'm an Evolutionary Unique Self. More than that, the Whole Mate wants to be in service to the larger whole. The Whole Mate has a sense of cosmocentric intimacy.

As Whole Mates come together, as Neo and Trinity come together, there's a first meeting scene, which is about them asking the same question. There's a beautiful scene of their making

love, but when they make love, they don't do it just to *fulfill* as it happens in *Love Story*, this ability of them to kind of move through old wounds and be vulnerable and open to each other, although that's absolutely there, there's absolutely a Soul Mate dimension but there's something larger.

When they make love it's in the context in the alcove of this huge rave that happens in the second volume of "The Matrix" Trilogy, they're making love in cadence, in rhythm with the larger community. They're making love as part of the larger pulse of cosmos, part of the larger ecstatic urgency. They recognize that the sexuality moving through them isn't negative, and it's not just positive and bland, that it's not just neutral. It's not just sex sacred to create babies because Neo and Trinity don't have any baby.

Their sex is what we would call Sex Erotic; it's the sense of the Evolutionary Impulse moving through them and it's in service. It's, if you will, bodhisattva sexing in service of the larger whole.

Whole Mates can transcend and include Soul Mates. Whole Mates can work together as two men or two women serving, or a man and a woman without a sexual component, but there's Eros between them because they're serving a larger vision.

It's not about sexuality, it's about Eros. It's about a shared Eros. It's about a shared vision. It's about a shared service of the whole, that's a new context for relating.

Whole Mates facilitate each other's Unique Selves and Whole Mates come together to offer and create a unique *We*, to create an evolutionary *We-space*, where *together* they serve the larger whole. Let's just finish this, this new context that we're able to live into today. We've gone from Role Mate to Soul Mate to Whole Mate. Why?

Last piece: because there's been a crisis.

Crisis always generates a new level of relationship. The 100,000-year-old bargain in which the man is the primary breadwinner. He's the hunter-gatherer and the woman is the child-bearer, the keeper of the hearth and the nurturer -- that bargain has been called off in the Western world, and no one's even noticed it.

In the last couple of decades, increasing exponentially, literally, month by month, many more women are graduating from college. Except from one narrow sector of the workforce, more women succeeding in getting more and more jobs across a broad sector of fields. Within a few years, in the majority of American households the woman is going to be the primary breadwinner.

What does that mean? It means the old relationship deal is off.

Procreation is beautiful and gorgeous, and yet in a world that's overpopulated, the necessity of procreation for surviving doesn't exist. There's many more people choosing the option of not procreating. The old Role Mate structure doesn't quite work and men and women often don't need each other in the Western world to survive.

Soul Mate is beautiful but insufficient for those people because there's no shared destiny. There's no shared creation for the sake of the whole as our consciousness evolves to cosmocentric intimacy. And of course, the feminine has emerged and feminism, as a wonderful emergent has called forth the full creativity of the feminine, which doesn't want to limit itself to the classical old roles, that's happened at the same time.

All of this has come together. Obviously, the pill, birth control has split; disambiguated between reproduction and sexuality. Potentiating huge new possibilities for the feminine in that dimension. All of these dimensions come together, all forms of radical change and crisis, which are generating this new form of relationship; *Whole Mate* or what we might call evolutionary relationship, Whole Mate relationship.

Now, Barbara, you and I came to this new notion of relationship from very different places, but we came to the same conclusion, and you have a gorgeous way of talking about it from *joining genes* to *joining genius*. Let me pass with delight, my evolutionary partner, Barbara, I'm going to pass the word to you as we articulate this new structure of relationship that we desperately need in the 11th Hour to take us to the next stage, this new context for intimacy, this new structure of intimacy, this new configuration of intimacy, Barbara.

Barbara:

Thank you, Marc.

That is exactly right in terms of "I must have been born for Whole Mating," because, from my earliest days, I can remember: "I am inspired by the inner impulse of creativity or evolution." Once I learned that there was evolution, and once "I realized *I am evolution evolving*," I started to look for mates that wanted to co-evolve with me. I made a lot of efforts and I had quite a few relationships, all of them had a flavor of Whole Mating and I won't go into all of them.

Until I met you: so I'm going to make this personal.

I was about 84 or 85, I had done quite a few things with others, with men as well, to discuss the evolutionary potential. But when I met you, and this is why I think Whole mating is so profound, in terms of Love, in terms of Purpose; your particular impulse of evolution, the inspiration that's guiding your entire being toward the Unique Self, the Evolutionary Unique Self, the Comsocentric, the whole thing.

When I heard you ... Somebody said, "Would you interview Marc Gafni?" I said, "Sure." I didn't know who you were.

As we started to talk, What happened? Now, this is Whole Mating: You were telling me your impulse of evolution. You were speaking about it and I began to feel the Evolutionary Impulse inside me which had sort of gotten, "Well, maybe I've done everything I could possibly do. I'm 84 or 85."

What happened? Now, this is on the inner plane about Whole Mating. The Evolutionary Impulse, which was the purpose of my deepest life, got turned on. It more or less, became really interested in what you were directing your life toward.

The thing about Whole Mating that we discovered very personally, and then we're seeing it exists for so many others, we discovered that Whole Mating is joining genius rather than joining genes to have the baby, which was the Role Mate, basically -- creating the families, and the Soul Mate which is your soul and your deep emotional realities wanting to join and sexually as well. Whole Mating is *you're passionately excited about purpose, about possibility.*

Particularly, at The 11th Hour when we can see that the crisis could lead to the devolution of our whole species, rather than the deep desire for reproducing more of us the desire is to evolve us.

I'd like to say that in real, deep Whole Mate relationship the passion for joining genius is not just a response to the crisis, even consciously. It's a solution to the crisis because when people join genius, whether it's partners like you and me or many different kinds of groups, when you join genius, what happens is that the unique purpose of each of the partners evolves.

You're not joining a static genius code, and that you get two genius codes, and you learn something from each other. It's deeper than that. When you join genius with another's genius, it turns your genius on and in a Whole Mate relationship both are more than they were when they met.

Then as the evolution of Whole Mating continues, you begin to actually create things together. What I would like to say about joining genius is that nature has created a new capacity here. People had genius all throughout history, but the idea of Whole Mating; to literally join them, it's like joining genes to have a baby, the baby is new. The baby is more than just the two parents' genes, that genetic code is new. Joining genius is more than the additive joining of two Whole Mates' uniqueness. It's evolutionary if we may say so, and it puts you at a threshold of more of your genius and more of this other person's genius until those two geniuses start to become something new for humanity.

Just like having babies was something new for humanity, Whole Mating, joining genius is something new for humanity. In the 11th Hour when there is such a crisis of relationship

everywhere, those of us who move into Whole Mates and describe it and share it and actually replicate with others that *joining genius*, will be responding in a new way to The 11th Hour.

I'm inviting anybody who is hearing this to try it out and see where your genius is stimulated by somebody else's. Then it's deep conversations. It's deep exploring. It's deep respect. It's not trying to be better than. It's not trying to get even with or show off with. It's actually mutuality at a very profound level of social and personal response to love. It's the evolution of love actually.

I say that we'll complete Chapter 10 of The 11th Hour on the theme of the evolution of love to becoming Whole Mates, and thank you, Marc.

Marc:

Thank you so much, Barbara. Thank you so much.

We want to complete, as Barbara says, this final piece of Chapter 10. Let's just notice, as we close, two things; one, this is a new emergence of intimacy -- crisis of relationship has caused evolution to generate a new form of relationship, a new configuration of intimacy. Evolution desires more intimacy, desires higher and deeper configurations of intimacy, that moves all the way through cosmological evolution, biological evolution, all the way through cultural human evolution.

And Evolution has now, in The 11th Hour, in response to the crisis, generated a new emergence of intimacy, a new configuration, a new form of relationship: Evolutionary Relationships, in which the shared vision of reality, the shared vision of the whole, the shared desire to serve the whole is the context for relating. We've actually generated a new context for relating. Now, let's just finish with our definition of intimacy because it now changes. It now evolves the next and final step for now.

We've talked about intimacy as *shared identity in the context of otherness, plus mutuality of pathos*, meaning I feel you, you feel me, feel me feeling you, feel you feeling me. Where we now add one more piece to the equation: *Intimacy is shared identity in the context of otherness, plus mutuality of pathos and mutuality of purpose*. That's the new emergent of Whole Mate intimacy, evolutionary intimacy, evolutionary relationship which will take us across The 11th Hour.

Barbara, do you want to give us our last word to close us?

Barbara:

Well, I just want to say It is luscious. [Marc: Amen.]

It is attractive. It is alluring, and it actually accentuates the purpose of both of them, so that from the point of view of society, rather than reproducing the species, you're evolving the species through becoming a Whole Mate.

Marc:

It's important to say ... Now, that's absolutely true, and we get so many questions on this, Barbara, we should share with people.

Can you have more than one Whole Mate? You could. Could you have one person as a Role Mate, another is a Whole Mate? Yes. There's many ways to do *Whole Mate*. Whole Mate can transcend and include Soul Mate, and there will be other people who will be Whole Mates without the Soul Mate dimension.

Whole Mate can be in many different configurations, so as we're looking for this explosion of new possibilities in relationship, a Whole Mate has certain parameters, but there's many different ways to create this notion of evolutionary partnership that's grounded in Evolutionary Love.

Let's go do it together, all of us.

Chapter 11: High Technology: Innovation Meets the “Intimate Universe” and “Evolutionary Love”

Barbara:

Welcome everybody to Chapter 11 of this incredible precipice of the 11th Hour that we're on.

I believe that Chapter 11 could be seen as the shift point in the downfall of humanity or the rising of humanity, it is of tremendous importance. Our theme is high-technology, innovation, and evolutionary love. Marc, I don't think these three have ever been put together this way before, and I turn my word to you.

Marc:

Delighted, delighted Beloved Barbara. Thank you for that resonant framing and I will, with your permission, speak into it.

I think you're absolutely right, love. In other words, those three, high-tech, innovation, and evolutionary love. What do they have to do with each other? Of course, what Barbara and I are going to suggest is that the relationship between them is exactly the Archimedean lever which will determine whether we're actually headed towards utopia or dystopia, whether we're headed towards a literal heaven on Earth of unimaginable depth and quality and joy, or to Dante's Inferno in a form that Dante couldn't even begin to imagine with a level of suffering that defies imagination.

This notion that we've been talking about of this pivoting point between dystopia and utopia, of course reflects itself in the two views of technology that are out there. Before I enter those two views, let's first frame this or point to the framing that we're going to be looking for; we want to frame this discussion and understand it in terms of the New Universe Story. Reality is a love story, it's headed towards evolution as a trajectory, it's headed towards more and more intimacy, more and more depth. Intimacy means new wholes greater than the sum of the parts.

Evolution is the story of the evolution of love. Love is not Pollyannaish, love is not a harlequin romance. Love involves attraction and repulsion, love involves these two forces joined at the hip out of which emerges the arc of emergence. This conversation we're about to have about technology -- we're going to have it within the context of the intimate universe and the intimate universe that lives in us and the tenants of intimacy that we've unfolded thus far.

Let's begin with what we might call the techno optimists. The techno optimists basically argue with great persuasion and an enormous amount of ostensible data to support their position and

their position is true, absolutely true, but partial. The techno optimists, and the name itself suggests that 'technology's going to take us home,' it's going to make us *fulfilled*. It's going to be the panacea to our ills and in many ways that's of course absolutely true.

The lifespan: in the last couple hundred years has moved from 30 to 70, that's one. Health: small pox, polio, the Guinea worm, malaria, measles, rubella, yaws. I mean the list of diseases that decimated, that caused abject suffering and pain beyond imagination have all been, most of them, wiped out, that's shocking. Just as recently as 100 years ago you have literally millions of people dying of disease. Between a quarter, a third, some say closer to half of Europe is wiped out during the Black Death. France, in the 17th century, 15% of the population just disappears. The notion that we actually are able to triumph over disease is enormous, this is all technology: that's two.

Three, prosperity, obviously: 200 years ago there's some 85% of people living in extreme poverty. Now, there may be some say 10% others say 20%. Peace: obviously, there's less war than there ever was, I shouldn't say obviously, we missed that fact. A developed nation hasn't attacked another developed nation in the last 70 years, that's four. Safety, violent crime is going way down in our technologies of investigation, and our technologies of apprehension have made an enormous impact.

Clearly, freedom: the innovation and technologies of (these are not physical technologies) but technologies of democracy that's also a form of innovation, a form of progress, have had enormous impact. Knowledge: 200 years ago, 1820, 17% of the world is literate, today it's 85% and rising higher. You begin to get a sense of this.

Human rights: obviously in many ways; we're not burning widows, we're not cutting people's hands off, as Steven Pinker's famously remarks, for stealing cabbage. The level of human rights, the recourse to law for at least a major preponderance of the world, is beyond imagination. The very notion of human rights that's been introduced is wildly important. Intelligence: IQ tests are on the upswing across the world.

This would all seem to indicate this enormous sense of progress which is in many ways ushered in by technology. However -- here's a big however, and I want to go through this in a number of ways -- However, the statistics themselves, that Steven Pinker, Matt Ridley, Peter Diamantes, sometimes John Mackey cites them, my colleague, are actually very misleading on multiple levels. I'll just give you one example.

Let's say 200 years ago you have, let's say 80%, 85% of the world is in extreme poverty and today let's say 20%, there's a number of statistics, let's say 20%. But 200 years ago there were half a billion people in the world, now there are 7 billion people. If you just simply do the math, what that means is, there's perhaps, got to work it out exactly, but perhaps three times as many people. Ten percent of 7 billion = 700 million, 20% = 1.4 billion. There are at least three or more [3500] times the amount of people suffering in abject poverty today than there were 200 years

ago, and Pinker completely glosses that over with this statistic. You can run through all these statistics and realize they're actually very deceptive.

Knowledge is on the increase (IQ), which is fantastic, but is wisdom on the increase? Knowledge means literacy, that's the standard of evaluation. Is that enormously important? Does literacy open up worlds to people? Of course it does. Is that facilitated in a large part by technologies? In much part by technologies, both exterior and interior technologies, but does that translate into more wisdom in the world? In certain ways yes and certain ways, absolutely not.

After the postmodern deconstruction of all wisdoms there's a level of confusion in the world today. There's a level of amoral anarchy in the interior heart of the world today, with the dissolution of narrative, with the failure to articulate a narrative identity, a narrative of *we-space*, a sexual narrative, a universe story, all of those are absent. While the old universe stories and old narratives of identity and old narratives of sexuality and old narratives of community were in many ways deficient, they also had enormous beauty to them that we've lost. We need to be careful in the way we articulate these ideas because it's actually a far more complex issue than would seem.

In the one hand, we need to grant the enormous progress made by technology and the enormous possibilities and clearly, the eradication of hunger which we haven't gotten to yet; we've halved the amount in the last 20 years. Twenty years ago there were about 40,000 to 42,000 children dying everyday of hunger or hunger-related diseases. Today there's about 21,000 but that's not good. It's fantastic, but when there's enough food in the world to feed the world four times over and we still have 21,000 children dying everyday of hunger and hunger-related diseases there's a problem in the story. We need to look at this more subtly and in a more complex way, and begin to kind of understand the complexity of technology.

Let's perhaps introduce another idea. Star Wars, a narrative that we looked at a little bit earlier in one of our earlier images. Virtually all of the Star Wars, the great epic, the attempt at articulating a story start with a picture of some empire-galactic battleship in the very first opening scene. Why? The point's very clear. Technology is neutral and all of the new technologies that are now being developed, nanotech and biotech and infotech have all been harnessed by the Empire, which is the dark side of the Force in that mythology and they've been harnessed for abject suffering and evil.

In fact, Darth Vader who in the first trilogy of Star Wars is the incarnation of the evil Sith Lord serving the Emperor. Darth Vader is the ultimate triumph of infotech and biotech. He's half -- his essential human spark is there but actually he is the ultimate cyborg, he's the ultimate augmented person. He has access to information that's being channeled in infotech all the time. He can scan everything; he has the power of ancient Gods. He's the classical expression of all of the new technologies, and so of course, the message is very clear.

When in a key scene in the third of the Star Wars movies which was called 'Return of the Jedi,' when Luke Skywalker, this newly emergent Jedi knight, is going to explode what's called the 'Death Star,' which is the expression of technology incorporated by culture, by the "Empire," which is an expression of suffering. He hears the voice of Obi-Wan Kenobi. He needs a direct hit which is very precise to blow up the Death Star. (That direct hit by the way, today in culture - to blow culture up: it's the new narrative, is what we're talking about in the 11th Hour). Back to our movie, he hears Obi-Wan Kenobi, his master who has passed, he hears his voice. Obi-Wan Kenobi says, "Turn off the computer tracking system," meaning turn off the technology, follow your heart, open up to the Force, feel the larger field and get out of the matrix of technology.

Clearly, the Matrix series itself was about a deep critique of technological tyranny in all of its forms. I think we need to be very, very careful here with technology. Let's keep going.

Although all of the statistics articulated by Pinker are correct, they ignore the larger context, and the larger context we talked about earlier, which is exponential technology creates exponential pain, creates exponential risk, and exponential risk becomes existential risk. That is to say we've never had the ability to destroy ourselves.

We've never had the ability to have our entire infrastructure taken down by cyber terrorism, rouge drones, rouge nuclear weapons that are controlled by non-state actors, have the ability to inflict damage of untold proportions, even if the better angels of our nature, people are getting, in a general sense, less violent. The exponential tech explosion creates exponential risk which then translates and becomes not just exponential; existential risk, risk to our very existence.

We need to get a sense of this, and a sense of what this means and how we respond to it. This is where Barbara and I want to try and begin to say something that's important and we think, in some sense, new, but it needs to be said.

Technology is wonderfully important. Technology is actually an expression of the intimate universe. We generally understand technology as an alienation from intimacy but it's not, technology is an expression of intimacy. When we talk about machines, machines are not non-intimate. Machines in their depth, in their very depth are about the allurements that lives in the machine between atoms, between molecules and between complex molecules. A machine itself is a structure of allurements.

I'm just going to go about five more minutes, and I'm going to start with a kind of Utopian view. What would happen if the machines woke up? Woke up not in a Sci-Fi way, not in a science fiction way, but if we actually began to realize that a machine itself is an expression of the very allurements of cosmos.

I spent a wonderful evening about 12 years ago with Lana Wachowski, who together with her brother, Larry created the Matrix series. We were talking about the last scene in the Matrix and in the last scene in the Matrix, it's Matrix 3, if you remember what happened, you have this huge

realization. You realize that actually the machines themselves, and the human beings; there's no split. They're not machines and human beings. That split's essentially a false split and the entire point, Lana said, of the entire movie, as we were talking at maybe 4:00 AM, was actually the realization that the machines themselves are alive. The hills are alive. The way I would express that idea is through this notion of allurement. From an ultimate mystical perspective, we need to begin to realize that the machines, themselves, there is no such thing as inanimate.

The self-organizing universe, even at the level of the cosmos, what we normally understand as insentient is actually in a very profound level, alive. I want to bracket that, I want to put that aside, because that is, I realize a mystical future vision that we can't readily access and operationalize now but I want to hold that as this larger, important vision.

Let's now make it much more specific and much more direct. You see, we talked about a set of existential threats in our first set of conversations. One of the existential threats was this win-lose metrics that Barbara's talked about for so many years, and the need to move beyond, have a new vision, a narrative of identity beyond the win-lose metrics. The second, that Snowden talks about and our colleague Daniel Schmachtenberger talks about, emergent from Snowden is this distinction between complicated and complex systems.

Complicated systems are the infrastructure and it's the vulnerability created by all the progress, which is real that Pinker points out. We've now created a very complicated system of infrastructure that can break down, upon which we're utterly dependent. The breakdown of that system can cause exponentially more suffering than the suffering that existed before the complicated system came into being. That's shocking.

Now, Snowden in this 2011 article that I pointed out earlier, distinguishes between a complicated system and a complex system. A complicated system is a Ferrari, where the whole is not greater than the sum of the parts. That's one form of technology. A complex system says Snowden is a Brazilian rainforest; where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

What's the difference between the two? And what we need to do is we need to invite a technology and a technological world, which actually begins to take on the qualities of a Brazilian rainforest. What does that mean? What's the difference between the two? Snowden doesn't quite get there, but we want to posit on an essential difference. A complicated system breaks down, it doesn't self-repair, it doesn't regenerate, it doesn't clean up its waste, it doesn't handle its accumulation, it doesn't handle its toxicity, it externalizes damage.

A complex system corrects all of those. It does handle its accumulation, the forest floor is not naturally filled with garbage. It does create a recycling and a regeneration, it does handle its toxicity, it does create a natural balance in the larger ecosystem of life. It does create new wholes and generate new possibility that's greater than the sum of the parts. Why? Because a complex system is based on allurement. It's a beautiful idea. It's based on allurement and intimacy between the parts. When you have intimacy and allurement between the parts, then

something larger than the parts, a synergy emerges, and new synergies are generated, emerge, and new synergies mean new intimacies.

We need to actually invest technology, invest our intention in technology and invest technology in every way we can, whether that means investing the algorithms with a sense of Evolutionary Love, with a sense of allurement, with a sense of intimacy. Factoring in those qualities, how do you factor in a quality in technology? There's actually multiple ways to do that in an algorithm but we need to actually factor in intimacy, allurement, evolutionary love both into the programmers, the people who are creating the algorithms, the people who are creating the new technologies and into the algorithms through the people into the algorithms themselves.

We need to actually download this notion of a complex system and transform complicated systems into complex systems. Now, that's shocking, that changes the entire conversation.

Look at AI, artificial intelligence. What's the danger? That artificial intelligence doesn't have consciousness, it has intelligence. Intelligence means it has huge computational power, but it doesn't have a consciousness, but by consciousness we mean something very specific. It bypasses all the levels of allurement that live in Barbara and Marc. What's Barbara? Barbara is an expression of quarks and subatomic particles and atomic particles and molecules and complex molecules and cells and complex cells all the way up into the fullness of this hominid, awakened as a human being, and evolving as a human being, called Barbara Marx Hubbard.

All those levels of allurement live in Barbara, which means Barbara's not computational power, she has a dimension, she has an enormous quality of computational power, but she has an enormous sense that's built on that intelligence. It's built on this enormous structure, all the way up and all the way down of allurement and intimacy.

We need to do two things. We need to first-off reclaim intimacy as our core value, intimacy means a generative creativity that desires and seeks deeper contact and creates and manifests greater wholes that yield in their wake ever greater depth, creativity and transformation. *That* needs to be invested, downloaded into the very algorithmic structure and the heart structure, the identity structure, the universe story, the community story, the narrative of *We* of the programmers.

Now we begin to have an emergent which is wildly exciting. We get to get nanotech and biotech merged with, it comes together with, Evolutionary Love.

Barbara, thank you for allowing the space for that introduction and you've talked for years about Homo Universalis. We've, you and I have articulated a new vision: my Homo Amor, your Homo Universalis; we've merged those qualities into *Homo Amor*. In the years that we were talking about Homo Universalis, and that's now merged into Homo Amor, you've talked for many years you were involved in the space program about the importance of relating to, as part of this new evolutionary vision, nanotech and high-tech.

With so much delight, you've been such a pioneer in this area. I'm so delighted to turn the word to you.

Barbara:

Thank you so much, Marc.

Very, very inspiring and challenging to me. In some deep sense, way before I knew you, I was inspired by the evolutionary story. I remember exactly when it happened to me. I was trying to get along with my brother, he was criticizing me and I won't go into the details, but I decided that I have to find a way to find more meaning in my life. I had actually a very good life.

I had five children, I had a husband that I loved, I had a garden and I had everything that was supposed to be good, and I was actually miserable. So, misery was a signal, like just you were saying, it's really a signal you're bringing out, you can't just *go ahead*. I just couldn't go ahead with more comfort. I couldn't just go ahead with more babies and I faced this depression and I asked around this community I lived in, "Is anybody happy?" The answer was "No," they're comfortable.

This is what I want to say in here that I discovered, which I think relates very deeply to what you're saying. I discovered through Abraham Maslow mainly, that we are only truly happy with vocation or purpose or meaning or sense of service. Once I discovered that at least that was what was missing, I discovered through Teilhard de Chardin *the story*. It wasn't just my story, but literally for 13.7 billion years, Marc, some impulse handled what you're talking about, that it should have ended up with you and me talking about it.

Some amazing core of the evolutionary spiral that you call 'allurement,' it could be called 'Divine Evolution,' it could be called 'Impulse of Creation,' whatever that is that got us from quirks, electrons, protons, and neutrons, to single cells to you and me having this conversation, I want to bring up that. What I discovered through Teilhard de Chardin, Sri Aurobindo, Buckminster Fuller and you, I put you in that lineage, that there is a divine impulse. There is no other way to explain the awesome creativity of evolution and when you look at the billions of years of it you do find, as we well know, five mass extinctions before us. What you're pointing out is the sixth possible mass extinction due to misuse of power, due to not being able to express evolutionary love.

Let's look at the reality of that, we could misuse power and destroy ourselves, but let's say we're going to go the other way at the 11th Hour. That's why we're doing this program. What would it take for the human species facing the powers of Gods, that can lead to the devolution of the species or to the evolution of the next stage of our potential? I will say a couple of things that I think help.

One is a vision of our potential if it works. One of the good things about a newborn baby is, it's a mess but, you have an image of what the baby might be like if it grows up. You're able to deal with a mess almost all the time but you love it because you have caught hold of its potentiality. Otherwise, I don't think it would be very easy to love it. Okay, so now, we're a mess in the sense of: although we have all these great possibilities, the dangers increase with the power, there's no doubt about it.

We are at an evolutionary threshold where our entire species might self-extinguish and you and I in the 11th Hour are saying "there's a way through." Once I read Teilhard de Chardin and saw that it's not just *me* who would like more love, more creativity and more power, it's evolution. Then I got to identify with the impulse and I saw the five mass extinctions and I saw our potential mass extinction but I also saw the awesome genius of the impulse.

When I incarnated that impulse, one reason I'm with you is I don't know many people who've incarnated the impulse of evolution like you have and I was pretty much lonely with incarnating this what I thought might be the impulse of evolution. Here's where the sense of optimism, I wouldn't want to even call it optimism: it's creative intention, it's more than optimism - I'm not optimistic, I'm intentional, that's really different. I have incarnated the intention of evolution, through its efforts with all its mass extinctions; it's got to you and me having this conversation on the internet, globally.

In the 11th Hour, knowing the story of creation leading to possible extinction or possible massive transformation to greater love, through greater love, through greater innovation and creativity. Let's intend *that* in The 11th Hour: intention creates reality. We are activators of this evolutionary story, every single one of us, in the 11th Hour.

The more of us who could intend to bring the innate love, sensitivity, yearning in our hearts together with the high technology. If we can do that, Marc, to bring love and hitech together, then what do we have? We have the new species, we have Homo Amor. We have Homo Amor with the powers of ancient Gods, and I really believe evolution has given us a choice, I don't believe it's inevitable that we will make it through, but I believe it's inevitable that we can.

I'd like to end this by saying let's mobilize all our high-tech, including the Peter Diamandis' of the world who basically would want this to be so. Those of us who have this evolutionary intention are the ones who have to start leading the way. We have to take our power. We have to take our impulse. We have to say this is the direction of creation. We have to say men and women joined, can join together to bring innovation and love into high technology and to be a species with the powers we used to call Gods, but now what would we call ourselves? Homo Amor.

Marc:

Absolutely, love. That's beautiful. That's beautiful, and I mean, so gorgeous. This emergence of Homo Amor. Homo Amor has to access the full range of technology. The notion that we're going

to go backwards and turn technology off isn't actually a possibility and we want to actually harness technology with its full potential for intimacy. [Barbara: Yes.] To finish let's list three ways.

One is the very notion of bringing evolutionary love, or the story of evolution which is evolution seeking more intimacy, bringing that innovation, because that's an innovation in the interior sciences. When I bring that innovation in the interior sciences together with the innovations in the exterior sciences, when I bring those two together, that's a new form of intimacy. I'm taking interior innovations bringing them together with exterior innovations, those are two parts, and then you get a whole that's greater than the sum of the parts. That begins to be very, very exciting, that's what we mean by a new whole. When we say, "Let's bring evolutionary love together with high-tech," we're talking about two innovations, the very idea of evolutionary love. The new story we're telling today, is actually an innovation.

For example Steven Pinker, when he talks about 'let's embrace the structures of the Western enlightenment,' which is the old form of democracy, which is the first baselines of human rights, which are obviously very important, which is one person, one vote, which is 'the consumer knows best.' He's actually making a regressive move because the entire nature of the market is changing and the consumer knows best no longer quite works and as you've pointed out Barbara, so many times, a win-lose democracy in the old form is actually not quite working, either.

What Pinker paradoxically is saying is, 'let's actually stop innovating in the interior sciences and rely on the innovation of the exterior sciences to take us home,' and what we're saying is, we of course, desperately need innovation in exterior sciences. Barbara, do you remember when we read 30 years ago, we were at different parts of our life, I remember reading when I was even eight or nine, seeing titles like 'The Population Bomb,' and the 'World Famine' that was going to basically decimate half of the globe. None of that happened. Well, why did none of that happen? It didn't happen because we need 68 percent less land today to make the same amount of food that we could have made 50 years ago. In other words, we need 68 percent less land, that's shocking, but those are all innovations.

Innovations are critical and with a billion people linking up to the Internet, and then they're able to combine their ideas, 'cause these are new, unique selves, with unique qualities of intimacy, that can then combine their ideas - separate parts forming new wholes. Innovation's incredibly important and innovation means how do we combine ideas and new configurations of intimacy. But, we have to actually frame it that way, and the frame is not technical, it's not semantic. We live in inescapable frameworks, Charles Taylor reminded us. If we actually experience what you called, Barbara, *intention*, not optimism, we intend our technological innovation to be an expression of the evolution of intimacy. Then, we change the whole story. Then something begins to shift in the very fabric of things and then we're ready to make the next leap, which is to actually begin to understand that inherent in technology itself, the self-organizing universe itself. What did Ilya Prigogine, that you talk about so often, Barbara, what did he win the Nobel Prize

for? He won it for this notion of a self-organizing structure in matter itself. Matter itself is driven by allurements.

The ultimate vision: we've got to wake up that allurements. The notion that technology is a materialist reductionist expression of machines that are separate parts that are just linked, is not true. The entire point of systems theory is that it's actually -- complexity theory particularly -- it's a nonlinear expression. It's a mathematics of intimacy. We need to invest high-tech with complexity theory, with the mathematics of intimacy, with the notion that subatomic particles are probability patterns of what, not of things, but of interconnectivity and interconnectivity's just the exterior, the interior of interconnectivity is intimacy.

Barbara, take us home. Give us our conclusion. Give us our blessing. Give us our vision.

Barbara:

Well, I know you'll think it sounds a little naïve. I feel God is on our side. [Marc: Amen. I don't think that's naïve at all. I'm with you all the way.]

I believe that there is no way that we could have gotten from subatomic particles to this conversation with all the massive extinctions and all the problems, if there were not an impulse greater than all the failures. What I would like to end this session of the 11th Hour with is activating in every one of us that intention, that impulse, and I would say that love, that when it turns on, if I could just be naively optimistic, nothing could stop it.

Marc:

And I think, love, it's not even naïve. I think it's a deep wisdom. It's the inner wisdom of the system itself. [Barbara: Right] Amen.

Barbara:

Thank you, thank you, Marc, very much. [Marc: What a delight.] Good night, everybody.

Chapter 12: Towards a Planetary Awakening in Love Through Unique Self Symphonies

Barbara:

Good evening everybody. This is Chapter 12 of the 11th Hour.

What does it mean that we're in Chapter 12 of The 11th Hour? It really means we're in Chapter One of the New, and we're ending the 11th Hour with something more, something new. Marc is going to lead the way with our theme; A Planetary Awakening in Love Through a Unique Self Symphony.

It's all yours, Marc.

Marc:

Thank you so much, Barbara. A Planetary awakening in love through unique self symphonies, through unique self synergies and symphonies. What do we mean?

What we're describing, this unique self symphony, is actually a new emergent of intimacy. Remember one of our principles in the tenets of intimacy is that intimacy drives emergence, and what emerges is new structures of intimacy. The plot line of the evolutionary story with which we began, reality is evolution and reality is relationships. Relationships are structures of intimacy. Which means that reality's not just a fact, it's a story, that's what evolution means. It's going somewhere, the story has a plot line: the evolution of relationships which is the evolution of intimacy.

As we come full circle, we're here to now talk about what is the emergent of intimacy that is now appearing, it's nascent in the world, which is precisely because that's the nature of an intelligent cosmos -- what is needed to cross the precipice at this 11th hour. The answer is Unique Self symphony, Unique Self symphonies. A unique self symphony is literally an evolutionary emergent, it's an emergent of intimacy and most particularly it's an emergent of Evolutionary Intimacy. That's a frame. We together?

Again, the frame matters. Inspiration, excitement, charism, delight, ecstasy, poignancy, none of that, that's all gorgeous, places we love to live, places I love to live. We actually need more than that. We need a dharma, we need a new set of ontologies, a new set of distinctions that reflect the deepest nature of reality that can express a shared story where we begin to understand that that which unites us is so much greater than that which divides us.

There's a new narrative, a new shared story, and a story means again? We take disparate parts, we weave them together in a larger whole, that's a story, that's a narrative. So this new narrative is itself a new emergent of intimacy.

The new narrative together with Unique Self symphony, those are the two pieces that take us across the precipice in the 11th Hour. Let's talk about it. I'm going to go a few steps then I'll pass the word to you, beloved Barbara, as we do, and you'll take us home.

I want to begin with a sentence and the sentence is a sentence that emerged for me a number of years ago when I got up to give a talk and it was a very painful moment. I couldn't quite find the words. So I was silent for two or three minutes and people thought I was being silent because I was in some profound meditation. I wasn't. I was being silent because I had nothing to say. Then these words emerged, and I was really privileged to talk about these words for a couple hours. I didn't remember anything that I had said, and my dear friend Sally Kempton who was there actually wrote down a lot of what was said and gave it to me as a gift. So here are the words.

We live in a world of outrageous pain. The only response to outrageous pain is outrageous love. We live in a world of outrageous beauty. The only response to outrageous beauty is outrageous love. What do we mean by outrageous love? We could talk, we could do a full set of 12, ten hour conversations reading every word in those two sentences that are enormously important. For now I want to focus on this world of outrageous pain and outrageous beauty, our response is outrageous love.

What does that mean? It means we need to be outrageous lovers. Evolutionary lovers, outrageous lovers.

What does an outrageous lover do? Well, obviously an outrageous lover keeps every boundary that should be kept. Outrageous love is not a license for inappropriate boundary breaking, so an outrageous lover keeps every boundary that should be kept but also breaks every boundary that should be broken. We break the boundary of contraction, of smallness, of pettiness, of the imposterships in which we live and we begin to awaken as Unique Self, we break through, to our essential Unique Self and Evolutionary Unique Self.

Okay, tell me more, what does an outrageous lover do? An outrageous lover commits outrageous acts of love. When we invited you to the 11th Hour, the email blast that went out said, "Let's talk about what it means to commit outrageous acts of love together." This is where we get there, this is where we fulfill that promise because it's the promise that we need to walk across the precipice in The 11th Hour.

An outrageous lover commits outrageous acts of love. 'One second, Marc and Barbara, which outrageous acts of love does an outrageous lover commit?' There's so much that needs to be

done and it's overwhelming, in that experience of overwhelm we experience this global action paralysis with which we began 12 chapters ago.

Let's find it.

We commit the outrageous acts of love that are a function of our Unique Self. You commit the outrageous acts of love that are a function of your unique self, your evolutionary unique self, that is to say, you commit the outrageous acts of love that cannot be done by anyone that ever was, is, or will be, other than you. The outrageous acts of love that cannot be done by anyone that ever was, is, or will be, other than you. That becomes the joy, the delight, the honor, the duty, in the best sense, the nobility of your life. "But one second," you ask. "If that's clear, why isn't everybody out there committing outrageous acts of love? What's wrong? What went wrong?" And so often, teachers of enlightenment will say, "Well, people are contracted, they're selfish. We lament human nature, in all of the great traditions in all sorts of ways, but we're not here to lament human nature because we actually don't think it's about human nature.

See, what we really think is that if a human being felt that my outrageous acts of love would genuinely make a difference, that's what every human being would do. And the reason people often don't commit their outrageous acts of love that are a function of their unique self, Barbara and I believe, is not because of a lamentable fallen human nature. There's actually a mistake in the dharma. People think, "Oh my god, I've got to do everything. It's too much, I've got to fix the world," and we get so overwhelmed by it because, how can we really impact? The reason we stop acting, the reason we fall into a paralysis which becomes a global action paralysis and we shut down our intimacy which becomes a global intimacy disorder because there's too much.

We feel the pain so intently but we don't know how to heal it. In the gap between the ability to feel and heal, we shut our hearts. Clearly today, we feel the pain perhaps in some sense more than any other generation, only God 100 years ago saw the amount of images of abject suffering and knew as much detail as we know today from CNN and from multiple sources on the internet and in the media structure. We've never seen in any generation in history, direct access to this much pain. So we shut down, of course we do.

How do we respond? How do we actually close the gap between our ability to feel and our ability to heal? The answer is we realize that it's not our job to heal the whole thing. Not our job. We're not just Unique Selves.

We're participating in a new structure of consciousness. We're participating in Unique Self Symphony. A Unique Self Symphony is not a top down structure, imposed, command-control, top-down by a government or a corporation. A Unique Self Symphony is a new emergent of intimacy which is a bottom up structure.

Turing, the code cracker in World War II wrote an important essay afterwards at Bell Laboratory in the late '40s called Morphogenesis. Morphogenesis was the basis for our understanding of

what we now call the self-organizing universe. The universe self organizes to higher and higher levels; of what?

People are used to saying I had a dialogue with Ervin Laszlo, a wonderful man, about five years ago and he said 'to complexity,' but remember what we've said. The interior of complexity and interconnectivity is intimacy. So the universe self-organizes to higher and higher levels of intimacy. That's what the universe does.

Now in this process of self organization, it's the same thing that happens with slime molds, it's the same thing that happens with the cells in the body that self organize to create different organs. It's what runs an anthill. It's what runs a beehive, it's not the queen bee. Every ant knows what to do, how does every ant know what to do? An anthill is organized with gorgeous symmetry and perfection. But we're more than ants, we self organize differently. Ants organize, at least in part, based on pheromone secretions. How do human beings self organize into Unique Self Symphonies, which are bottom up expressions, explosions of creativity? How does that happen?

Human beings, and this is so gorgeous, self organize based on the allurements, the desire, the allured desire towards ever deeper contribution and intimacy. Towards ever deeper structures of intimacy, which is called Unique Self. It's my Unique Self which calls me to connect, to become intimate, to give my gift in the particular places that are mine to give. I commit the outrageous acts of love that are a function of my Unique Self, I'm not responsible for the whole thing.

I am responsible to address the unique need in my unique circle of intimacy and influence. When human beings come together and begin to, out of a sense of allurements, of joined genius, wholeness, to give their unique gifts, in their unique circles of intimacy and influence, then Unique Self Symphonies begin to be formed across the planet. There's actually a Planetary Awakening in Evolutionary Love, there's actually a Planetary Awakening in outrageous love of Unique Self Symphony Synergies happening literally all over the world.

Small surface example: National Endowment of the Arts, couple years ago, gave away \$157 million. But for the first time on Kickstarter, in internet campaigns, \$200 million was raised for the arts. It's not yet a Unique Self Symphony, but it's the beginning of seeing what happens when I actually access, the organized or self-organized collective wisdom of the planet that finds a way to attract, to allure, to interact, to generate a new emergent. We've begun working on genome projects through collective intelligence.

In New York, instead of the city deciding what needs fixing in the city, there's a number, 311, that people call. All of a sudden the city is beginning to be governed, in part, by a kind of collective intelligence, these are surface structures, these are still separate self, competitive, ego driven. We first have to realize our identity, we go the next step, we realize who we are, we realize we're unique selves, we're unique configurations of intimacy. We experience our allurements as the intelligent cosmos calling us towards each other. We reach out to join genius

with those who are in our unique circles of intimacy and influence, and oh my god, oh my god, and with this Barbara I'm going to turn the word to you with such delight. Oh my god. Right?

The world becomes this explosion of evolutionary creativity, an explosion of evolutionary love. Self organizing, intelligently self organizing. It's not a group-consensus process where everyone's the same. There's natural appropriate hierarchies of gifts, everyone has a particular place, everyone can give a particular gift. No one's without a unique gift to give and we begin to self organize into these unique self synergies and symphonies to give gifts. It's only that level of creativity and that level of evolutionary love and that level of planetary awakening, all of which can happen. And the noosphere, the internet can help self organize it. It's that level, it's that next level of intimacy which addresses the global intimacy disorder. Which takes us across the 11th Hour. Which actually opens up the possibility for a genuine utopia. For a genuine alleviation of suffering and transformation of what it means to be a human being, what it means to be part of humanity. That's Homo Amor, Homo amor is defined by Unique Self Symphonies, Unique Self synergies awakened in love.

And I turn with delight, the word to you, Barbara.

Barbara:

Thank you, Marc. Thank you for the inspiration. I want to add to it an additional experience.

There is the Unique Self Symphony and the challenge for many of us is not that we don't want to give and we're willing to give. The challenge is unique purpose, because every one of us is unique and as we're saying here in Chapter 12, we're at a new threshold in evolution. It used to be pretty obvious what your purpose was, particularly if you were a woman. When I graduated from Bryn Mawr College the purpose was, get married, have as many babies as possible, 1951, and take care of your husband.

Now that was at least pretty obvious to many women, no matter whether we were highly educated or not, so I tried it. I loved my husband, I loved my children, I did absolutely everything to care for them, the house, the garden, the dog, the cats, and I got depressed. I want to bring up the importance of depression if you really want to express your Unique Self in a Unique Self Symphony. Depression is a signal, instead of saying, "what's wrong with me?" What you say is, "what more wants to be expressed? What is it in me that I would yearn to express that I don't know?" I bet many people at this threshold of a new civilization, don't know exactly what their purpose is.

The key person who identified what that is, I would say in general, is the way you find that Unique Self is by what he says every self actualizing person, that is someone with Unique Self purpose. Every self actualizing person has one thing in common: a unique vocation that is of service to at least one other.

Marc:
Abraham Maslow.

Barbara:
Yes. Abraham Maslow.

A unique vocation, who ever heard of that? I was the housewife in Lakeville with the five children and I adored my husband, the cats, the dogs, and the garden. I didn't know anything about Unique Self vocation. If we want a Unique Self Symphony, it means that every listener here in Chapter One maybe already has it and maybe is right on the threshold of it. Is what is it that when you do, is your full self actualizing gift of service that only you can do? That you, when you do it, feel self-rewarded? This is a very important understanding of the need to find that Unique Self in the symphony that, when you express it, not only are you joining the symphony towards a Planetary Awakening but you're self rewarded in the process.

That means you're paid up, that's a huge thing. Most people are constantly trying to get paid up by affirmations, by resource generation, by earning more money, all kinds of things. The real reward is you are affirmed in your own vocation, that was Maslow.

Then of course if you want to really go the whole way, you look at Teilhard de Chardin. Which we've talked about so many times here. What did he notice? He noticed that evolution itself has a direction for higher purpose. It's not just you and me. What is that higher purpose? It's greater consciousness, single cell to multi cell to animal to human, it's greater freedom, that's how you know that you're realizing your purpose. That's how you know you're giving your gift, when you do it, you feel free.

And the third one is more complexity or love. As you pointed out, Marc, it's not about we're all aiming at complexity, the importance of complexity is increased intimacy. Of separate parts creating a whole greater than the sum of the parts. In order for us to be able to enter this Unique Self Symphony we have to find our purpose, and it, probably for every single person increases your consciousness, increases your life purpose, and increases your ability to connect, your ability to love, your ability to feel part of.

Not only are you personally self rewarded, but you're now rewarding society by being self rewarded. Now this is a really great plan. It's not how to get better than or how to win over or how to make more money then. It's how to be self rewarded through greater consciousness, freedom, and love by giving your gift to others, that's actually the way it works. Then of course as you get to Buckminster Fuller, another great teacher; there's enough resources, technology, and know how to make it work for everybody without taking it away from anybody if you synergize.

Now that's a very big concept for the Day One of the new Planetary Awakening through a Unique Self Symphony. That means that I am a unique expression of the entire process of creation, as I express that uniqueness, I am fulfilling my purpose in serving others, and as I do that I am rewarded in the act, there's the plan of Day One. God has put a fantastic plan in the system and the result of it in the Unique Self Symphony is joy.

Let's just, I'll turn my word back to you. It becomes a new culture, we're at the threshold of something from the devolutionary tendency where we could really lose our life support system, to an evolutionary tendency that none of us have been in before. That's why we have to say Chapter One of the new story of evolution is ending, the 11th Hour. And I turn my word back to you, Marc, just to give us a marvelous farewell.

Marc:

Beautiful. That's gorgeous, gorgeous, gorgeous. Amen. I mean just completely stunning, and what an image, what an invitation. Let's just perhaps finish with three short things.

One, why symphony? Why do we like the word symphony? Because in a symphony, you have to master your own instrument. You can't just declare. You have to actually master an instrument, you have to train, that instrument is your instrument and you can play that instrument in a way that no one else ever has. It's not that no one else will play that instrument, it's that you're gonna play that instrument uniquely. The unique way that you play violin, the unique way that your violin does a Beethoven sonata.

At the same time, when you're in a symphony, you've got to be deeply resonant and listening to all the other instruments, and that's the capacity of intimacy. The symphony is an image of intimacy, and when you're missing one note in the symphony, if you really know classical music well, I love classical music, when an instrument's missing you literally feel that the intimacy of the symphony is off. It actually jangles you, you're missing something. Wow.

Now let's add something. We call it actually a Unique Self Jazz Symphony. We've added a dimension to it. How does jazz work? In jazz, what often happens, let's say you have a jazz quartet. The trumpet player kind of comes forth and he starts to play the trumpet and everyone kind of steps back and delights in the trumpet, that trumpet player is both practiced, has practiced enormously, and at the same time is creating something new. It's not just we're playing a new unique version of Beethoven, or the Sorcerer's Apprentice, we're actually creating music that's new. It gets newer every day, as you love to say, Barbara, 'I'm not getting older, I'm getting newer.' There's a genuine emergent, it's a Unique Self *Jazz* Symphony.

Now the jazz symphony is actually what begins to address our crisis of imagination with which we began. Perhaps, the image that we can end with, it's an image that Elizabeth Satoris has

talked about, Barbara, you talk about it beautifully in your book *Conscious Evolution*, and it's been used appropriately to try and capture something that we're trying to feel here. See, imagination's everything, people say God's a figment of our imagination, but they forget that our imagination is a figment of God.

The capacity to imagine is actually the capacity, Al-Farabi says in Sufism, of the Prophet. We need to be prophets here, all of us though, not one prophet, we're all. We need to see the future the prophet has a memory of the future -- what the 11th Hour is about, articulating that memory of the future. Let's just feel into it in the image, the image of course is of a caterpillar, and I'm going to turn off my video for a second so you can just hear the voice and just let the words find their way.

It's about a caterpillar and the caterpillar is nearing its time to transform. The caterpillar begins to consume, consumption, consumption, ravenous consumption, everything in sight. Of course we know about ravenous consumption today, and what that does and how it works. We know about that machinery company that builds heavy construction called Caterpillar, Inc. the images are clear to us.

The caterpillar body becomes very heavy and bloated and it outgrows its own skin many times until it's literally too bloated to move. Which is exactly where we're heading in this exponential growth curve that's about to fall off a cliff. Where we've used an extraction model that's actually destroying and we failed to deal with accumulation in a win-lose metrics within a complicated system that's breaking down and showing symptoms of potential disastrous breakdown on every level.

So what does the caterpillar do?

The caterpillar attaches to a branch, upside down. Everything's turned on its head, that's the world we're in. The caterpillar, as we all know, if we know our basic biology, forms a chrysalis, an enclosing shell. That chrysalis limits the caterpillar's freedom for the entire duration of the transformation.

What happens within the chrysalis? Cells begin to appear, and you wouldn't believe us if it wasn't true, the biologists actually call these cells 'imaginal' cells. They begin to appear, but the cells aren't yet intimate with each other. They're not yet communicating with each other and they're wholly different than the caterpillar's original cells, they carry different information. They actually resonate to a different frequency and it's the frequency of emergence. Of the new structure of beauty and the new structure of intimacy. At first, the immune system of the caterpillar participates in what Wilhelm Reich calls the murder of Christ or the murder of Eros. When we try and kill that which is new, that which is an evolutionary throw forward, that which is a mutant.

The caterpillar's immune system perceives these new cells as enemies and attacks them, just like new ideas in science and medicine and politics and in sexuality and in Eros and in entrepreneurship and in education, are attacked and denounced, by the powers that be. But the imaginal cells begin to find each other. They continue to appear and they reach for each other. They're allured to each other. They begin to bond to create new configurations of intimacy until the new cells are numerous enough that they can literally create new structures of intimacy. They organize into clumps, and when enough cells have formed to create new configurations of intimacy, the caterpillar's old immune system is overwhelmed. The caterpillar body becomes a kind of nourishing soup for the growth of the butterfly. When the butterfly is ready to emerge, the chrysalis becomes transparent, the need for the limiting of freedom has been outgrown, and the butterfly emerges.

Alright, what an image. And I turn the word to conclude to you, beloved Barbara.

Barbara:

Thank you, Marc.

We are in that chrysalis together. Each one of us is a unique part of the social butterfly that has never been seen before on this Earth. We've seen the caterpillar turn into a butterfly but we've never seen planet Earth turn into a Co-creative Humanity.

I'd like to end on Chapter One of the 12th session of the Evolutionary 11th Hour. We're in the 12th hour of birth. I will end with my favorite phrase: "Our crisis is a birth of the new human and the new humanity".

With that I say goodnight to you, Marc, and to all of us, as we will meet again soon, I know.

Good bye.

Marc:

Thank you. Oh my God.