




Comments on Daniel's essay "The Enlightened Person Balances Masculinity and Femininity"

December, 2006

Author	Message
<p>manjushri</p> <p>Joined: 08 Sep 2006 Posts: 146 Location: UK</p>	<p>Posted: Sat Dec 09, 2006 5:03 am Post subject: The Enlightened Person Balances Masculinity and Femininity   </p> <p>HI Daniel and Everyone!</p> <p>I'd like to explore the ideas Daniel puts forward in one of his new essays 'The Enlightened Person Balances Masculinity and Femininity'- This essay deals with the issues raised in Kaleo's threads on gender and the eternal feminine from an 'enlightenment perspective' and proposes a truly integrated perspective on these issues. My intention here is to put some of my early responses to this essay out there and invite others to contribute theirs too!</p> <p>Quote from the essay:</p> <div data-bbox="516 831 1357 926" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"><p>We are all comprised of the masculine and the feminine. Our job on earth is to balance the two within ourselves in accordance with our soul's deepest truth.</p></div> <p>This rings very true to me,- the idea of balance seeking, of integration, of listening and tuning in to the soul, the true self this is what I attempt to practise and hold as the primary goal for myself.</p> <p>Quote from the essay:</p> <div data-bbox="516 1121 1357 1272" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"><p>The masculine is the mind, the feminine the heart. The feminine is the emotional, the masculine the rational. The masculine is form, the feminine content. The feminine is passion, the masculine perception. The masculine drives the car, but the feminine is the engine and the gasoline.</p></div> <p>These are all concepts which seem to polarise the masculine and feminine and I feel some instinctive resistance to accepting such definitions! I want a continuum not an either or! I want to ask WHY/HOW? what makes passion feminine and perception masculine? And how do such principals become gendered in the first place?! However, if balance of 'masculine' and feminine' traits at the individual, internal level is the goal of the enlightenment seeker these distinctions make sense as a way of defining what it is we might need to strive to balance. For me I hear echoes of the Indian idea (I'm interested in your thoughts on this Kaleo!) that the female is the source of energy to which the male must return in order to get the juice he needs to go out into the world, she is the stable base that he needs to return to (and that a balance of both types of energy is what the world and the relationship depends upon). Although this seems to be (one part at least) of a blueprint for male/female relations in Indian (Hindu) culture and is obviously potentially abusive and restricting to the individuals concerned but as principals rather than role definitions (which I think is the real intention with this paradigm anyway) it seems to fit. Such a model in terms of role definitions makes more sense at the level of child/parent - babies need their mothers as sources of nurture and 'juice' -as stable bases from which to explore the world -but this is the feminine as mother and the masculine as</p>

child- (not sure about that! - Is the masculine infantilised here? Who's feeding the mother?) Now if I think of this as an **internal**, intrapsychic process it makes more sense! **I** need to supply my own juice so that **I** can drive out into the world. Balance is about being both the engine, the gas AND the driver so to speak!

Quote from the essay:

The feminine is the root of the masculine.

I'd like to hear more about why you think this is the case Daniel? I'm open to agreeing but am interested in how we arrive at such notions!
Interestingly this does seem to be the case biologically- all fetuses start off essentially 'female' (hence male fetuses have nipples they'll never use to feed a baby) its only in the middle of the fourth month of the pregnancy that the genders become distinct after all. (Even though male babies are obviously different chromosomally from female babies from the beginning the development of the sexual organs is relatively late, and if I remember correctly the development of the 'template female' foetus into a male is caused by a surge of testosterone 'programmed' at the chromosomal level. There is some very interesting research about the impact of maternal testosterone (released by the mother during stressful episodes) on the developing foetus in relation to the foetal sensitivity to stress and this MAY contribute to gender dysphoria for instance!

Quote from the essay:

A person who has lost his inner balance of masculine and feminine lives forever in search of it. The balance lies within his soul's deepest template, buried underneath the distorted, trauma-laden patterns imposed on him primarily by his family, by his parents. Until he resolves his traumas he will be partially walled off and blocked from accessing the full truth within, and will forever search for his missing balance externally.

This makes sense to me- though the masculine/feminine paradigm here is one part of the picture.

Quote from the essay:

He will be drawn to others whose imbalances complement his own, and he will attempt to incorporate their imbalanced selves into himself to make himself feel whole. If blocked from his inner feminine he will be drawn toward those blocked from their masculinity – and compensating for their blockage by being over-feminine. If blocked from his inner masculine he will be drawn toward those blocked from their femininity – and compensating for their blockage by being over-masculine.

I really enjoyed this section- it makes sense within my own experience personally, it also fits with codependency based models of relationships.

Quote from the essay:

But merged relations with others will not make up for his imbalance within. He cannot make others a part of himself. Such relationships are based on mutual self-deception and are always be at risk of collapse – just as our greater world and ecosystems are at risk of collapse because of the global imbalances of our species.

Not just a risk of collapse but doomed from the start to block the development of both parties! - Impossible to get anywhere in relation to the search for enlightenment with merged relationships.
Can you elaborate more on the environmental parallel Daniel? Its really interesting but I'm not fully grasping it I don't think!

Quote from the essay:

Only the balance resulting from inner resolution brings deep stability.

Absolutely!

Quote from the essay:

Each of us was created in balance,

I'm also interested in this idea... Hmm I need to understand this more- can you define this idea a bit more Daniel?

Quote from the essay:

and if we are to live and die in peace – both as individuals and as a species as a whole – we must find our balance once again.

I do agree that we need balance to live and die in peace. but did we have it once? (you seem to imply that here) If so when and what did it look like???





Thanks for the essay! Looking forward to hearing from everyone on this and the other new essays- some great stuff there. 😊

Best wishes to all,

Rebekah

'To be disillusioned is better than being under an illusion!'

cc

Posted: Tue Dec 19, 2006 2:01 pm Post subject:  quote  edit  x  ip

Joined: 06 Oct 2006
Posts: 47
Location: Long Island, NY

Quote:

Rebekah Wrote:

Looking forward to hearing from everyone on this and the other new essays- some great stuff there.

Hi Rebekah,

Ok, here it goes. The following are my thoughts.

Quote:

Rebekah Wrote:

This essay deals with the issues raised in Kaleo's threads on gender and the eternal feminine from an 'enlightenment perspective' and proposes a truly integrated perspective on these issues. My intention here is to put some of my early responses to this essay out there and invite others to contribute theirs too!

I don't know, I see it different Rebekah. I don't believe that this essay has

something to do with the gender or eternal feminine threads but I can subscribe to the idea that the essay is coming from an "enlightenment perspective".

I also don't think that I would find an overlap of ideas between Daniel's essay and those threads, or that the essay would further clarify the subject matter of those threads but maybe it will (I won't discount it) and I will remain open.

To me, the gender and the eternal feminine threads have been examined through anthropological, biological and sociological lenses. Daniel's essay is very different in scope and purpose although he made use of similar language.

Perhaps there is some common ground between the essay and the threads but in my opinion the purport of Daniel's essay is something different than what the gender and the eternal feminine threads entailed, or at least in the directions that the threads went on. Of course, I may be way off in my interpretation of the essay but nevertheless this is my view.

I understand the "spirit" of Daniel's essay to be attempting to describe some aspects of a deep part of us, that deep part being The Soul (the self).

Trying to describe something of this nature (the self) and its qualities with exclusivity is not an easy thing to do, particularly when one is presenting something that is outside the sphere of reference of any cultural biases, poisonous pedagogy, reference groups, family of origin, academics, etc. of which the gender and the eternal feminine threads were influenced by, and with which were analyzed and explored with.

But even so, in attempting to explain such a thing (self), one would have recourse to making comparisons with things that we are acquainted with and whose qualities and characteristics we have an understanding of, by making use of metaphors, symbols and practical representations. So in trying to describe the soul (the self), I believe that Daniel selected two qualities (masculine and feminine) that we are familiar with, to serve as a basis for comparison, to better understand the concept of the self (soul).

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

We are all comprised of the masculine and the feminine. Our job on earth is to balance the two within ourselves in accordance with our soul's deepest truth.

Rebekah Wrote:

This rings very true to me,- the idea of balance seeking, of integration, of listening and tuning in to the soul, the true self this is what I attempt to practise and hold as the primary goal for myself.

This partially rings true to me. I also understand that "masculine and feminine" were labels used to help describe the concept of the self by identifying with qualities that we are familiar with but not specifically used to describe gender roles and/or differences, as we understand them from an anthropological, biological or sociological framework.

As to balancing the masculine and the feminine as a primary goal (job), for me it is not so. I think that it is necessary to regain this balance in order to know what our true job (purpose) on earth really is. But lacking this balance

myself, it is one of my primary goals among other important jobs that I would like to bring about. Also, I wonder if I could experience this balance as a result of my healing and not by specifically aiming for it.

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

The masculine is the mind, the feminine the heart. The feminine is the emotional, the masculine the rational. The masculine is form, the feminine content. The feminine is passion, the masculine perception. The masculine drives the car, but the feminine is the engine and the gasoline.

Rebekah Wrote:

These are all concepts which seem to polarise the masculine and feminine and I feel some instinctive resistance to accepting such definitions! I want a continuum

I don't think that Daniel is defining roles here, he is ascribing attributes to familiar terms (masculine and feminine) that we can identify with in order to explain distinct qualities that the soul (self) is endowed with, which seem to be in disarray in an unresolved person and lost to their consciousness, but whose qualities are naturally present in the person, whether that person is a man or a woman. I believe that as one becomes more enlightened, the gender differences would become less polarized or probably extraneous. Yet the points you have made here are relevant if they were to be considered with prejudice from a cultural, feminist, "instinctive resistance" and/or intellectual point of view, etc.

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

The feminine is the root of the masculine.

Rebekah Wrote:

I'd like to hear more about why you think this is the case Daniel? I'm open to agreeing but am interested in how we arrive at such notions! Interestingly this does seem to be the case biologically.....

I too would like to hear more about this but this is one way that I interpret his quote, "The feminine is the root of the masculine":

Feminine as the root, is our feelings. The Masculine is the intellect. Without the feelings the intellect is flawed and incomplete and the full truth is missing. But I am sure that one can have many other interpretations.

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

A person who has lost his inner balance of masculine and feminine lives forever in search of it. The balance lies within his soul's deepest template, buried underneath the distorted, trauma-laden patterns imposed on him primarily by his family, by his parents. Until he resolves his traumas he will be partially walled off and blocked from accessing the full truth within, and will forever search for his missing balance externally.

Rebekah Wrote:

This makes sense to me- though the masculine/feminine paradigm here

is one part of the picture.

This makes sense to me too. And yes, the masculine/feminine paradigm is only a part of a greater picture but I am not talking in terms of gender differences. This model is dealing with a few (though no less important) selected qualities of the self in order to explain forces at work in the self and which are only parts of the whole (self).

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

He will be drawn to others whose imbalances complement his own, and he will attempt to incorporate their imbalanced selves into himself to make himself feel whole. If blocked from his inner feminine he will be drawn toward those blocked from their masculinity – and compensating for their blockage by being over-feminine. If blocked from his inner masculine he will be drawn toward those blocked from their femininity – and compensating for their blockage by being over-masculine

Rebekah Wrote:

I really enjoyed this section- it makes sense within my own experience personally, it also fits with codependency based models of relationships.

I enjoyed this too. I have witnessed these dynamics in my life. This also hints to some degree that the masculine and feminine characteristics are not partial to biological classification (or cultural expectations) and supports my notion that this essay is not about conventional gender roles or differences and that these same characteristics are innate qualities of the human soul (male or female).

I also want to point out that in saying the above does not imply, although it will seem contradictive, that I don't believe that there are other forces at work (natural tendencies), which when observed, and drawing conclusions from same, are worth mentioning and discussing. But this would fall under the scope of a gender discussion from an academic point of view, which is not the intention of the essay in my opinion.

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

But merged relations with others will not make up for his imbalance within. He cannot make others a part of himself. Such relationships are based on mutual self-deception and are always be at risk of collapse – just as our greater world and ecosystems are at risk of collapse because of the global imbalances of our species.

Rebekah Wrote:

Not just a risk of collapse but doomed from the start to block the development of both parties! - Impossible to get anywhere in relation to the search for enlightenment with merged relationships.
Can you elaborate more on the environmental parallel Daniel? Its really interesting but I'm not fully grasping it I don't think!

Yep, Codependent relationships are doomed from the start and so is one's potential for enlightenment. In regards to the environmental parallel, I think that one global imbalance is the over population of our species and the consequential destruction of our environment (nature) in order to support this excessive (out of balance) condition.

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

Each of us was created in balance

Rebekah Wrote:

I'm also interested in this idea... Hmmm I need to understand this more- can you define this idea a bit more Daniel?

I do agree that we need balance to live and die in peace. but did we have it once? (you seem to imply that here) If so when and what did it look like???

I just had this thought Rebekah; if I am trying to bring something (back) into balance, what would follow is that this something was in balance at one time. Or if I lost something for one reason or another, what follows is that I possessed this something at one point. The same goes for recovering, regaining, recuperating, recouping, retrieving, recapturing, etc. I know this sounds facetious but I'm trying to incorporate some logic into the picture (limited cc logic that is).

Anyway, if I were to completely heal my entire trauma (this implies that I was healthy at one time), I would return to the state of perfection that I enjoyed at one time; the time before the events of trauma (caused by the unenlightened adults) led me to my inner imbalance (unconsciousness), which has plagued and dominated my existence ever since. This is the balance that we lost to poisonous pedagogy. We lost the true self to the false self (which was defined for us by damaged people), foisted on us by outside forces, whom were impaired and out of balance. I have some ideas of what this balance (pre-trauma) looks like and they are only as good as my healing will allow.

Also, I don't think that the word "balance" here is used in terms of a measure of something- as in numbers like a 50/50 notion (or half man /half woman). I think that the word "balance" here is used in terms of harmony, sustainability, viability, practicality, etc. I am not saying that you don't see this but I thought that it was worth mentioning.

To use nature as an analogy; I believe that all of nature is in harmony with itself (there is an inherent balance), and when that balance (harmony) is violated, a resultant imbalanced (disharmonious) condition is created, whereby the damage experienced is based on the gravity of the transgression. In a large-scale oversight, much havoc can be brought to the system, and until the balance (harmony) is restored, pain, suffering and destruction are endured. For example:

Deforestation is approved of when the land is to be used for farming but deforestation not only creates an open space for farming but also takes away important nutrients, which the land needs for anything to grow. Trees have a wide-ranging affect on our environment. So when the trees are cut down recklessly, barren land is the resulting condition. In parts of china and Africa, farmland has turned into desert. And now their windstorms have become sandstorms, which have caused great damage to their surroundings. Deforestation is out of balance and the imbalance produces disharmony and unpleasant effects. I don't know how good of an example this was Rebekah, but I hope that you got the gist of it.

In becoming enlightened and healing ourselves, we recover our inherent soul (self) balance- the harmony (both masculine and feminine qualities and

many others) and potential that evaded us at one time (and still does to a degree) - by ridding ourselves of the disharmony (false belief of self) that is still unconscious to us.

manjushri




Posted: Fri Dec 22, 2006 4:43 am Post subject:  quote  edit  IP

Joined: 08 Sep 2006
Posts: 146
Location: UK

HI cc!
Great to hear from you again and thanks for your thorough and very interesting reply- I can't reply properly for a few days (I'll be away from the computer world!) but am looking forward to the debate!
Best wishes and happy festivities,
Rebekah

'To be disillusioned is better than being under an illusion!'

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Fri Dec 22, 2006 5:09 pm Post subject: Re:  quote  edit  IP
The Enlightened Person Balances Masculinity and Femininity

Joined: 03 Aug 2006
Posts: 523
Location: New York City

Daniel Mackler wrote:

The masculine is the mind, the feminine the heart. The feminine is the emotional, the masculine the rational. The masculine is form, the feminine content. The feminine is passion, the masculine perception. The masculine drives the car, but the feminine is the engine and the gasoline.

manjushri wrote:

These are all concepts which seem to polarise the masculine and feminine and I feel some instinctive resistance to accepting such definitions! I want a continuum not an either or! I want to ask WHY/HOW? what makes passion feminine and perception masculine? And how do such principals become gendered in the first place?!

All fair questions. I actually wrote this essay in a different way than the others. There is nothing objectively masculine or feminine in terms of gender - men versus woman, MALE qualities versus FEMALE qualities, per se - in any of those qualities I mentioned in the essay. I just arbitrarily chose to call them masculine and feminine. I might as well as labeled them black versus what or "zeroes" and "ones" - but masculine and feminine just has a nice ring to it.

In fact, I could write the essay in the complete mirror image way, labeling all the "masculine" qualities as "feminine" and all the "feminine" ones as "masculine" - and I don't think it would change my basic points one bit! The whole essay is just based on an artificial construct. It's very different from my other essays in that way.

Daniel Mackler wrote:

The feminine is the root of the masculine.

manjushri wrote:

I'd like to hear more about why you think this is the case Daniel? I'm open to agreeing but am interested in how we arrive at such notions!

Part of it, honestly, was that I was being "cool" and making a reference to a very similar line that I always liked in the Tao Te Ching. But in terms of the

"feminine" versus "masculine" qualities, I think the ones I arbitrary label as "feminine" go deeper and are at the "heart" of the matter.

Daniel Mackler wrote:

But merged relations with others will not make up for his imbalance within. He cannot make others a part of himself. Such relationships are based on mutual self-deception and are always be at risk of collapse – just as our greater world and ecosystems are at risk of collapse because of the global imbalances of our species.

manjushri wrote:

Not just a risk of collapse but doomed from the start to block the development of both parties! - Impossible to get anywhere in relation to the search for enlightenment with merged relationships.

I meant risk of collapse in more surface terms – that the veneer of the relationship, or at least the things that are working within it, could collapse because of its imbalances.

manjushri wrote:

Can you elaborate more on the environmental parallel Daniel? Its really interesting but I'm not fully grasping it I don't think!

I'll try. What I meant is that our individual imbalances play out in our individual lives and intimate relationships, but this also plays out on a more global level, that our whole cultures and species play out our individual trends on huge scale. For instance, very rational cultures that nevertheless have radical emotional disconnection (like the United States) are very rational in our behavior, and yet we're radically polluting the world, killing the ozone layer, causing global destruction (and wars) and yet are able to rationalize our behavior every step of the way.

Daniel Mackler wrote:

Each of us was created in balance,

manjushri wrote:

I'm also interested in this idea... Hmmm I need to understand this more- can you define this idea a bit more Daniel?

We were all created perfect – and if raised by parents who really nurtured our development appropriately we would naturally and spontaneously develop in synch with our inner template for perfection. It's trauma that throws us out of whack.

Daniel Mackler wrote:

and if we are to live and die in peace – both as individuals and as a species as a whole – we must find our balance once again.

manjushri wrote:

I do agree that we need balance to live and die in peace. but did we have it once? (you seem to imply that here) If so when and what did it look like???

We were not born enlightened (because enlightenment is truth connected with CONSCIOUSNESS) but we were born with a full template for truth. Babies and fetuses are purely honest (and purely emotional, NOT rational), and to gain enlightenment they need to keep their connection with truth and then gain consciousness about it. Most people sacrifice much or most or all of their truth before they gain much consciousness.

manjushri wrote:

Thanks for the essay! Looking forward to hearing from everyone on this and the other new essays- some great stuff there. 😊

I'm glad for your questions. Hopefully I answered them.




Best,
Daniel

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Joined: 03 Aug 2006
Posts: 523
Location: New York
City

Posted: Fri Dec 22, 2006 5:28 pm Post subject:  quote  edit  ip

cc wrote:

So in trying to describe the soul (the self), I believe that Daniel selected two qualities (masculine and feminine) that we are familiar with, to serve as a basis for comparison, to better understand the concept of the self (soul).

Yes, that's pretty much it! I wasn't wedded to the words masculine or feminine as related to gender or male or female.

cc wrote:

I also understand that "masculine and feminine" were labels used to help describe the concept of the self by identifying with qualities that we are familiar with but not specifically used to describe gender roles and/or differences, as we understand them from an anthropological, biological or sociological framework.

Yes, that is what I intended.

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

We are all comprised of the masculine and the feminine. Our job on earth is to balance the two within ourselves in accordance with our soul's deepest truth.

cc wrote:

As to balancing the masculine and the feminine as a primary goal (job), for me it is not so. I think that it is necessary to regain this balance in

order to know what our true job (purpose) on earth really is. But lacking this balance myself, it is one of my primary goals among other important jobs that I would like to bring about. Also, I wonder if I could experience this balance as a result of my healing and not by specifically aiming for it.

Sounds good. I see anyone who really healed their deepest traumas would, as a consequence, naturally end up balanced in terms of their "masculine" and "feminine" qualities.

cc wrote:

I believe that as one becomes more enlightened, the gender differences would become less polarized or probably extraneous.

Yes.

Quote:

Daniel Wrote:

The feminine is the root of the masculine.

cc wrote:

I too would like to hear more about this but this is one way that I interpret his quote, "The feminine is the root of the masculine": Feminine as the root, is our feelings. The Masculine is the intellect. Without the feelings the intellect is flawed and incomplete and the full truth is missing. But I am sure that one can have many other interpretations.

That's along the lines of what I was writing about.

cc wrote:

Also, I don't think that the word "balance" here is used in terms of a measure of something- as in numbers like a 50/50 notion (or half man /half woman). I think that the word "balance" here is used in terms of harmony, sustainability, viability, practicality, etc. I am not saying that you don't see this but I thought that it was worth mentioning.

Yes, that's what I was getting at.

cc wrote:

In becoming enlightened and healing ourselves, we recover our inherent soul (self) balance- the harmony (both masculine and feminine qualities and many others) and potential that evaded us at one time (and still does to a degree) - by ridding ourselves of the disharmony (false belief of self) that is still unconscious to us.

Sounds good to me.

I enjoyed reading all of these comments, cc and Rebekah – interesting stuff. It's funny, I put up that essay some time ago, maybe a year or so ago, and this is the first feedback I've heard about it. Thanks!!!

-Daniel

Daniel Mackler