

Apology Is Golden

David: Today it's about apology.

The bane of human existence is guilt, guilt and shame. It separates people, because of the egoic assumptions *about* wrongdoing that give rise to a certain egoic iteration or version of guilt and shame. It is very specific to the ego, its own particular take on guilt and shame. Very characteristic and inimitable by God. Inimitable because Heaven does not, will not, cannot make the assumptions of self and other that are implicit in the ego's thought system or way of thinking about things.

So what happens is, in an ego-mind world, when a person makes a mistake or does something wrong, the person then feels guilty and ashamed and goes to the step of hiding, withdrawal. So you see that the person who has done something wrong, feeling shame and guilt, also goes to the extent of collapsing within oneself and hiding or withdrawing from relationship.

Now this withdrawal is itself consequential. It eliminates the on-the-same-page-ness that a person might have moments before enjoyed, and employed for its power, the we-ness power. But when shame or guilt arises on the heels of the awareness of wrongdoing, that one has committed an error or a mistake or a moral deviance or transgression, the person will, as I say, collapse and then separate from others.

Now this is where apology comes in. Apology is a way of returning to the same page with others, when the person got *off* the page because of guilt and shame, and went into hiding/withdrawal, as their adaptation to the feeling of guilt and shame. An adaptation. This is built on certain assumptions that oneself is bad and wrong.

We went through the whole thing of childrearing and saying, "Bad girl, bad boy," to a young child, communicating the idea that because they did a wrong thing, they themselves are in fact bad. "Bad boy. Bad girl." This inculcation of an association between personal value, worth, and dignity, and actions. If you crayoned on the wall then you are by definition a bad boy, bad girl, we've been through this many many times.

But the message is ill-conceived and problematical in its inference, and it sticks with egoic culture. In other words, egoic culture is all about rejecting others, and

therefore the expedient is call them bad, and then on the basis of having called them or considered them bad, to then withdraw from them or to disassociate. It justifies the dissociation to think of *them* as bad. But when it comes around to oneself, when I think of *myself* as bad, then I myself dissociate, or separate with the idea that I'm a bad person. And *as such*—within this logic, this is not a true statement but within this logic—I am a bad person, I then have fear of others, which is fear of retribution and punishment, and low self-esteem, which is the idea of being a bad person. A person who is so shameful in their essence or being or reality that they should *not* show up. It would be ill-advised, it would create rejection, it would create retribution, punishment, it would create disgust, and it would terminate whatever remnants of relationship are left after I've already withdrawn from it essentially in guilt and shame *myself*. You see how this works.

Okay now, now let's take a true idea about wrongdoing, apology, confession, acknowledgement: Getting on the same page with the true mind that thinks alike is the matter of saying, "Wrong is wrong." This is what we called "golden."

So now I surprised you, didn't I?

Group: (laugh)

David: You didn't think of that, did you?

It's golden that great minds think alike. It's golden that someone who wronged you is telling you that they *know* it. And it's golden that somebody who did something that they believed to be wrong, ill-advised or otherwise problematic, *knows it*.

And so what apology, confession, and acknowledgement are in the *true* sense of the word, is very, very different in its inference, implications, and effects than what ego brings to that particular process or party. Ego wants to come and to confess, and then it wants to be beaten to complete the cycle of action of retribution and penance to round out the picture and get off the hook from the vengeful God who is now *satisfied* that it's taken a pound of flesh retributively.

So people will honestly say, "Okay, I did this wrong, now go ahead and beat me up and then we'll be done with this affair." Right? They may feel incomplete in just giving an apology. If the blows don't come on schedule, then the cycle is not complete of apology and penance or retribution. So the person feels incomplete.

In that psychology that's the best people can get out of apology. Which is generally a sense of incompleteness, because the person isn't going to oblige with a beating *usually*, unless they're particularly sympathetic to your mindset and

realize that you badly need to be beaten and so forth or else you can't feel good about anything. But apart from that rare brilliance, what you end up with is an incompleteness. It doesn't do any good to come there in a mood of shame and groveling and say, "I was bad, I'm bad, I'm sure you're going to hate me, but this is what I did and I hope someday you'll be able to forgive this, it might take a while, I understand."

Okay, the psychology of being a bad person and offending and getting out of the good graces of someone and everything else because of the wrongdoing is—the whole apology system, confession or acknowledgement is—*steeped* in that psychology to the point where it *reeks* to high heaven of bad idea. And therefore, sometimes an apology does more harm than good in a relationship, because it actually sets a pattern in which the person is actually groveling and feeling terrible. And now what you've got is a relationship with a person who, having confessed their sin, actually feels even more ashamed somehow that the word is out and that they obviously have a *bad* reputation with you now that the word is out.

So on the one hand they got it off their chest but at the same time they made a public mockery of themselves or a scapegoat or an obvious confessed sinner with a red letter. You see, the complexity of that machination is endlessly stupid and problematical.

Now, same-page-ness is the human spirit recognizes that its action and itself are not identical, and that in fact we have all done a billion actions and we are still who we really are. Once we accept our true self-nature we can peer at these things from a different vantage point. We can understand that that child psychology lesson about bad boy, bad girl is very, very primitive, and in fact wrong, inappropriate and *immensely* troublesome to the soul. What you have to say is, you shouldn't crayon on the wall. There are troubles involved in repainting the wall, and therefore this is not advisable. Just like shitting on the floor is not advisable. You're trying to inculcate a person into a reasonable way of living with other people. But you are not evaluating who they are. They stand free of their actions always, as do you.

So therefore, when you do right in the area of apology or confession or acknowledgement, all you are doing is getting back on the same page by admitting to a person that a great mind thinks alike. And that great heart feels alike. What is wrong or offensive to the spirit is problematical to the heart. And that when a person says, "I stepped on your foot in this dance, I'm sorry about that," that's golden because it is an acknowledgement that a person *knows* what a person knows. A person *sees* what a person sees, a person *feels* what there is to

feel about something, anything. You see what I mean? That restores the same-page-ness. When the person steps on your foot, you're wondering, are they going to acknowledge that this happened? Do they realize that it's a problem to step on my foot, it breaks my metatarsals? Do they... Or are we that different that we don't see these things as one?

Well, we *must* be on the same page, we *must* restore same-page-ness in the case of a person who stepped on their foot while dancing, and then in shame hid the fact and would not confess the fact, and therefore could not return to the bosom of relationship. And therefore was self-ostracized, self-separated, self-alienated by virtue of their whole conception of life. The true confession/apology/acknowledgement is literally a statement that you see things as your beloved sees things. That you understand the truth. You come to your beloved, you come to heaven, you come to the tribunals of the universe, and you state what you know is true. And they will say, "Of course!" There's not much to say. It's just that one carries on one's life as a true penitent or apology, with a fresh adaptation. In other words, "I stepped on your foot in that dance, I'm going to really try not to step on your foot in the *next* dance. I made this mistake, I acknowledge it as a mistake, and I'm willing to not do that mistake again," or all the time or whatever it is. And the person says, "Great, we understand this. This *was* a problem for me as it *was* for you, exactly the same. Great mind thinks alike, we'd *both* be glad to get rid of this mistake because this mistake is a mistake, it's problematical as such. It's deleterious in some way. All mistakes are.

That we understand this in common is golden. That we have returned to the bosom of relationship in our mutual acknowledgment of what is true about something is huge in relationship. Relationships never get back together until a person is willing to disburden themselves of their withdrawal policy and their shame and their guilt by virtue of simply acknowledging the fact that something that was wrong was wrong or is wrong, and then that's it, okay? Then the relationship is *restored* by the very virtue of the fact that they came into the light, they gave their acknowledgment, and now they are back on the same page and they're not pretending that the other person is an ogre. They are not pretending that they themselves deserve to be killed or punished. Right?

All of this is also part of the great knowing of what is true, that the person is *not* equivalent to their actions. And no, being beaten up or beating oneself up is itself inappropriate. And that therefore, the entire fear-cycle, which is actually a vicious accusation about the terrible nature of other, needs to be released. In other words, how long do you continue to blame the world for the supposition that it is sufficiently evil to want or have to beat you up if it discovers that you did

something wrong. What is that holdingness of that world? What does that amount to in consciousness?

It's a make-wrong. It's a make-bad of equal and essentially identical nature to the make-bad and make-wrong that you have in your own shame about yourself, right? You're projecting an egoic way of construing bad, all around and within. When you get on the spirit page, you realize that *all* of that is a terrible mistake and that that's not the way to live or think. It's not the way you would like yourself to presume of others who have done wrong—that they are evil, that they are bad, that you should kill them or whatever—and it's not the way you would like to be construed. In a generous and realistic heart-view of wrong, you would revise and walk away from all the egoic stuff, and you would find the true value of apology. You would find the true value of confession. You would find the true value of acknowledgment of what's true about something, which is the restorative element of a true self relating to true selves about what is so, and that's *it*.

Then the bond is restored by virtue of having moved to a place where one *can* bond. Right? Which is in a generous-hearted and intelligent place. One cannot bond as a fearful ego-dog running around hiding everywhere behind trees in terror of others and in terrible beating-oneself-up shame about oneself. One cannot bond from that place *ever*, in a billion years. You see? We need to move up and out and get back on the same page of the only where there is any there. Which is in the heart of understanding about wrong. Right? And the heart of understanding about the mercy and grace of others, their true understandingness, which we then are presuming. You see, we throw ourselves at the mercy of the court, knowing, presuming that it *is* merciful. We hide presuming it is *not*. Right?

When will we revise our opinion of others from foul to good, so that we have a chance to relate to others harmoniously? When? Because we will *not* come out of hiding a moment before that. And even if we try to confess, acknowledge, or apologize before that, it will be a miserable shameful event in itself, and it will create separation by the very fact that, "I confessed my sin, now they will all hate me. Now the cat's out of the bag, I am known to be a shit, and so it's all over." Right? See? You can see that goes nowhere good at all. It actually goes worse, if anything, or at least it continues on the same miserable level. It doesn't get anywhere.

There is no value in it. There is no value in that confession. There is no value in that apology. There is no value in that acknowledgement. Because it is all being done in such a way as to reinforce the essential seeds or tenets or precepts upon which it is being built. You can't build anything good on a bad foundation. You

can't build anything true on a falsehood. You can't get there from there. You have to go to the other place, then make your apologies, confessions, acknowledgments, so that you can get back on the same page, on the only place where there *is* a same page. And that is a place in the heart.

Group: Yes. Beautiful.