

# "TEACHINGS FROM THE HIERARCHY"

## **Monthly Teaching Letter for the dedicated student/seeker**

**Channeled through  
Ralph Jordan**

**No. 02/XVI**

**February 2008**

### **COMMUNICATION – PARTNERSHIPS - RELATIONSHIPS**

(Channeled in Villmar)

continuation from No. 01/XVI

Seeker: What do you mean when you say “comfort zone”?

Jordan: Can you comfortably, lovingly and willingly polish your companion's shoes every morning? Can you iron his underwear? Can you dutifully clean his house, his barn, his car and say: “Yes, darling, whatever you say?” – Comfort zones! Recognize your comfort zones. We all have them, and we should recognize them. It's Jung, Freud and a few other of the geniuses in psychology who say that all of us need to discover our bottom lines, our comfort zones so that we don't go over them. Because going over them begins the destruction of the self and the destruction of the union that we've formulated. Comfort zones! You should know them in the beginning so that you don't promise what you are not willing to give. You see, by our attachment to society's dictates, to religious dictates we make promises - whether vocal, projected or inferred - that we are not willing to live up to after we've caught our fish. It's called the dating game, the investigation game. So many of the people playing that game are only putting forth their most calculated determined best foot so that the person that they are out to hook never sees the other side of them. This other side could be manipulative, controlling, possessive, determined to have it all done their way, but in the dating game it's role-playing.

So many of the ladies are soft marshmallows who just look up adoringly, worshipfully at this knight and never show their manipulative, controlling, demanding side. As a result the knight looks at this damsel in distress and he says: “Oh how perfect. I could love her forever. She is such a little sparrow. She needs my protection. She needs my guidance. She needs me to tell her which restaurant we are going to eat at, what she looks good in,” and so forth. That's not presenting a clear picture. Then the knight stands there in all of his masculine glory with superior intelligence with the answer to everything and the ability to hold the world on his shoulders. He certainly can take care of this little sparrow without any problems. He has patience, tolerance and he certainly wants her to know that she is the cutest, the sweetest and the most charming thing that he's ever seen and he'll be faithful forever. And she blinds herself to when a pair of boobs and an ass walks by that give off a chemical scent and his head turns...

She thinks she's found her knight. They've both been lying to each other, each for their own purposes and not necessarily being honest in their communications. If they'd been honest in their communications, it would've given them a better, a more stable foundation for the relationship to develop in harmony. I believe that we need to know what signals we are sending and what roles we are promising to play, and we may not be willing to play them 24 hours a day. We may want to assert this other portion of ourselves which takes control, which is exceedingly capable and wants to be recognized as an equal. But we do have to be aware of what signals we are sending out and what illusions we are projecting to that potential candidate.

I know lots of men that would just as soon sit home and play Mister Mom and let their wives go out and make the money. They'd be contented to clean the house and prepare the meals and to take care of the children if there are any. But they send out this signal about their capabilities of handling everything. They hide their sensitivities. They mask their insecurities. They deny their self-doubts. For their little lady they have to be perfect. These are false lying signals that set us up for destruction because our partner believes us and wants what we are sending out as those signals. The first few months in the relationship our partner has to deal with their delusions, with awakening to the realities of what they've got instead of what they thought they'd got by the signals that we sent.

That's why it's so important for us to know us, to have our list of what we expect, to have our comfort zones clearly defined so that we can be able to enter into trade-off and that's a big word here – trade-off. It's what every relationship requires and we should be able to trade off comfortably, willingly, supportingly rather than forcibly, regretfully and miserly. Trade-off is the most important part in relationships. You can't do trade-off until you know your comfort zones because you have to know when you are trading off your comfort zone and for what purpose, and it should be done willingly, not expectantly, not demandingly, but willingly.

Seeker: Would you give a practical example for trade-off?

Jordan: Sure. "You are going to go out to work. You are going to spend eight hours confronting all manners of vibrations. I am going to spend five hours at work. I may not be encountering as many vibrations as you will be. So you'll trade off the responsibility of cooking and cleaning and caring for the children. I'll trade off my masculinity and I'll come home and prepare the dinner, take care of the children, set the table romantically. Then when you walk through the door, I'll have a Martini ready for you and I'll sit you in your chair, take your shoes off, give you your Martini and tell you that dinner will be ready in an hour." That's trade-off. And it has to be done willingly. It's that realization that you are in a partnership and that you are not role-playing. You can easily trade off your role identifier and become that other portion of yourself if it suits and fits the harmony of the concept. So I don't have to be sitting there smoking my pipe or my cigar with my dirty boots on your clean couch saying: "Oh, I've had a bad day – when will supper be ready?"

Seeker: Does that mean that in a good partnership, there are no conflicts any more?

Jordan: That's correct. There are discussions, which can take on the appearance of conflict, depending on how intensely the discussion manifests. But it's the statement of two individual view points. Neither one of the view points are wrong. But which view point brings about the desired goal? Then if the individuals are prepared to enter into trade-off, they can expand on their view point and adopt the view point of their partner to support it to bring about the goal. There are no wrong view points. Each individual is entitled to enjoy how they see things and to grow at their own pace. But there should be an agreed upon concept that two individuals are coming together lending their energies in order to

manifest. One doesn't have to play the superior masculine role where one's view point is always greater, more in depth than the weak feminine view point. And that requires trade-off.

Seeker: When we talk about an agreed upon trade-off in a partnership such as who uses the car at what time of the day...

Jordan: Okay, who uses the car? You got one car for two people and two life styles.

Seeker: Yes, and the original agreement was that my partner can have the car in the morning and I can have it in the evening. So what happens when this agreement is not adhered to by my partner?

Jordan: Is it most essential to you that you hold your partner to the agreement, that if you are going out to the park, to a foot ball game, or to the local pub the car is yours regardless? Or can you be flexible and trade off and take the car in the morning and give the car to your partner in the afternoon because they have to go visit their sick mother in the hospital, do the weekly shopping, bring the kids to the aerobic class, or whatever the case may be? Logical reasoning says that simply because a prospective agreement is reached that there won't be those occasions when that prospective agreement needs to be altered and trade-off needs to be entered into without insulting the dignity of the individual who is trading off their aspect of that agreement. There must also be flexibility in trade-off.

I would also look at the concept of family and ask myself: "Okay, what's more important? That these family responsibilities are attended to or that I have the leisure of the car? For me the harmony of the family would be more important than having the leisure of the car. So I would say: "Sure, I can trade that off," and have no problem in doing so because I am trading it off for the goal that was established by both parties without the role-playing.

Seeker: I want to come back to what I think I've heard you say about the females marrying their fathers and the males marrying their mothers. How can we find out which parent we identified with and how can we bring that influence into balance?

Jordan: You can do some self-scanning and ask yourself how you feel about your mother, how you feel about her communication points and whether she was the aggressor or the victim. We can start to do our own research by coming to terms with how we feel about those people who were closest to us in the family we were exposed to. Usually we find ourselves adopting many of the traits of the parent we dislike the most. As a result we find ourselves marrying or creating a partnership with individuals who possess much of the traits of the one we disliked the most.

Seeker: It is difficult for me to remember which parent I disliked most because my parents passed to the other world many years ago. How can I get back into that time?

Jordan: Look at what you are most commonly using at this time. Are you most commonly promoting an aggressive, logical masculine trait in your environments? Do you shy away from some of the sensitive-intuitive-submissive expectations that society may have of you?

Seeker: Let's say the parents in their performance show the opposite roles of what's traditionally expected. Such as, the father is not the strong and aggressive one, he is the weak one and the mother is the strong one. What does the child then want to be like, and does it matter what gender the child is?

Jordan: It doesn't matter what gender the child is – not at all. If the mother is aggressive, promotive and wears the pants in the family and the father is submissive, sensitive, less aggressive, it doesn't matter what gender the child is, the child is still going to identify with and absorb the traits of the parental influence, which it says it doesn't want to be like because it will continue to project and work with fears and anxieties about being like that parent. It will be governing its actions and attitudes in most of the controlled situations to be the opposite of the parent it disliked the most. But under stress circumstances it will be the parent that it dislike the most.

Just think of how many mature individuals find a companion that is far stronger than themselves so that this companion would force them, encourage them, inspire them to be the dominated sensitive feminine role. But then they discover that they've married a rather insecure, oftentimes unclassified individual who easily lets him/herself be dominated and they slide right into the same domination that they said they didn't like.

Think about how many people say that they don't want to be like their mother. Then when they find themselves in stress situations they are exactly like the mother, only worse, because they are fighting it every step of the way.

But that doesn't alter our ability to be able to come to a clear, precise understanding of what it is we want to create and manifest within a relationship. Regardless of what our predominant traits may be, once we have done this evaluation, this recognition of what it is we expect to have active in a companion and what we are prepared to give in order to sustain a relationship, we have already given ourselves a clear picture of what our most prevalent dominant characteristics, tendencies and attitudes are. Then we can begin our redirection through our self-talk and through our positive self-reinforcements. It's when we overshadow, don't recognize or deny - on the surface or in degrees - that characteristic, that trait being prevalent in our lives and we unconsciously or even consciously are looking for a partner to overshadow that trait so that we can then release it, that we find ourselves oftentimes choosing companions which bring that trait into the foreground where we have to look at it and eventually deal with it. So we have to make an evaluation of what's important to us in a relationship.

Seeker: So if I find out that sometimes I want to be dominating and demanding, that is okay, too, even though I am in a female body?

Jordan: Sure. Why not? I am not saying any of it is bad. I am saying you need to know it. You need to stop sending out false signals as you are promoting your gender. You need to accept the fact that from time to time you really want to promote your manhood, which for you being in a female body would not be the obvious choice, and that you want to take control of situations and you want your partner to be willing to be submissive.

Seeker: From time to time.

Jordan: Who cares how often you want it? Only you care. But you are sending out crosscurrent signals which are illusions that we bombard our chosen, our desired, our hoped for companion with. Then he's got to deal with the disillusionment of recognizing that you lied to him. You really don't want to be the subservient dominated female gender who sits in the back seat and lets him perpetuate the automobile of your life down the highway. You want to throw him into the back seat and drive the car because he didn't drive it to your liking.

That's part of the destruction that takes place in relationships because we start activating those parts of ourselves accusatorily. We usually have to find a justifiable reason to bring those characteristics into the forefront of our expression, which then causes us to be demeaning to our partner. We say: "...because you didn't, but I am going to..." That brings about a negative and a defensive reaction. It would have been far better had our partner known that we from time to time like to be the aggressive, dominant, controlling figure in the relationship and had they agreed to do trade-off, to recognize their sensitivity and to let go of their indoctrinated illusionary masculine image role and lovingly and willfully become their feminine self. Because they can't deny they've got it in them no matter how much they say that they are all man.

Seeker: Here is another scenario: I was married, the children were very small. My husband wanted to continue his education. I felt I should stay home for a while and take care for the children. So how do I find a balanced solution in that scenario because I'd asked my husband to postpone his education until the children were older.

Jordan: What I am hearing and what I have to feed back to you is the adherence to traditional role concepts. "I am wife. I bore the children. You are a man. You should be out there providing a living. I should be tending to the needs of the children." So I see a lot of adherence to traditional role playing.

In this particular situation I wouldn't have necessarily denied the ability of my husband to tend to the needs of the children. I would have taken this a bit further and said: "Do you think you can do some time management and take care for these children while you are studying and while I am working to bring in the money to give you the option to do the studying?" That would have been my point of confrontation, not the fact that I as mother was the only one capable of giving these children nurturing. I would have recognized the capabilities existing in my partner to do the nurturing job while he'd actively pursue his education.

Seeker: I tried to suggest that, but he had a problem with that idea.

Jordan: His problem was that he was insecure in his masculinity and that he refused to entertain his duality. His problem was that he was determined to continue to function under his denial of his feminine self and to only activate his masculine authoritarian self. And that comes from his buying into his cultural, educational and religious exposure, which prohibited him to recognize his other self and to let that be an influence in his ability to not only educate himself but to also play mother to his children. But it was his insecurities and your role playing, your education, your indoctrination into what you should be as the female and this rather odd condition that you found yourself in because your education finished sooner than his and you were able to go out and to go to work.

Seeker: I saw this idea as a practical solution.

Jordan: I am not denying that. But what you didn't see was your attachment to your womanhood.

Seeker: That's where I have difficulties. Why was I attached to my womanhood?

Jordan: Because you've accepted his resistance to entertaining his womanhood and you've let it become a major pitfall in the communications in the relationship.

We are talking about a very essential factor that happens in everybody's relationship. And that's the indoctrinated role playing and the unwillingness to recognize the flexibility and the duality within the

confines of the physical shell. We are in a situation where two people in education come together. They decide that they are going to build together, that they are going to grow together. The female finishes her education first. Then they bring children into the world and they are playing roles. "You are the dominant and I am the subservient. You go out and make the money and I take care of the house." But you've got a problem here. Those roles can not be instituted because he needs to go to school. He needs you to take on the dominant role, which you are totally capable of taking on as he is totally capable of taking on the nurturing role, the sensitive role while he is actively pursuing his education. But his indoctrination says that he loses his face if he takes on the nurturing role. It makes him less of a man if he has to say to his schoolmates: "I can't chat with you. I've got to go home and change the children's diapers. I've got to go home and prepare supper for my old lady because she is getting home at 7 o'clock and she'll be tired and the food has to be prepared. The house has to be cleaned. The children have to be bathed. I don't have time to chat with you." That would be diminishing to his insecure masculinity.

Seeker: He evaluated it as diminishing.

Jordan: Of course, but that's his indoctrination. That's his education. That's the projection from Hollywood. That's the projection from literature that men can't be anything but macho strong. We don't let little boys play with dolls. We make them play with footballs. We don't let little boys cook. We send them out to saw wood. We don't let little boys wear pink. We keep them in blue. That's our problem.

We deal with that indoctrination and that denial and that whole submission of a whole aspect of ourselves. Then you get the other side: "You can't play football. You are supposed to play with dolls. You can't saw wood. You are supposed to cook. You can't go out and play baseball, you are supposed to clean the house. But your brothers can." That's total nonsense.

Om Shanti.

This teaching letter will be continued in No. 03/XVI.