

UPDATE (5/26/2016): It has been brought to my attention that some folks believe that this report summary is a forgery. That is not the case.

Also, this summary has been critiqued as having been doctored or edited (maliciously, I assume). In the opening of the report summary, I mentioned “edits” but I did not provide sufficient detail.

As repeatedly stated, this document contains a summary of the conclusion drawn in a larger, internal report. This document is **not** the complete report. The summary was edited prior to public release in three ways. First, certain names were removed. Second, brief excerpts from evidence that has not been publicly released were removed. And third, some of the syntax, along with grammatical errors and unclear language were adjusted. The report conclusions were not altered, as I have stated.

Next, I also explained in an unclear manner how this summary (not the full report) was updated over time. As you will see, the summary contains sections written in 2008, 2011, and 2014. Each of these sections also has an addendum. Over the last eight years, this summary (not the larger report) has been shared with I-I stakeholders, as required. As such, these additional sections were added, over time, so that this document mirrored our conclusions about each event, as it emerged and was investigated. Earlier conclusions were not altered when additional information was added.

Initial Review (2008)

We have spent the last several months researching this issue with care and precision. Extensive documentary and interview evidence was reviewed. I consulted extensively with Ken Wilber, who spent over one hundred hours in conversation with key complainants. And, I have also spent dozens of hours in 1:1 interviews with Marc Gafni.

A notable amount of direct and inferential evidence has been considered in formulating the following conclusions, which were prepared in 2008, updated in 2011, and updated again in 2014 in light of new developments. In effect, this has been a living internal document which has been used to summarize key aspects of this situation as it has unfolded over the last 8 years. The initial section of this document is distilled from a 80+ page document that contains excerpts from the documents reviewed.

This document was originally written for a small audience of just a handful of people internal to Integral Institute. In light of the public release of this document, I have edited it again to be more suitable for a public audience. Key details and conclusions have not been changed.

- 1) The original 2006 complaints, as reported in the press and as stated by the persons in question, were false. They contained numerous false assertions, which, in my estimation, cannot be reasonably attributed to simple misunderstandings. The gap between the extensive email record and the claims of each party is vast and cannot be credibly bridged. This indicates malice, intentional falsification, and/or coordination between the parties.

- 2) The email record was made available to me in its entirety. It was also reviewed by four different evaluators and many other readers. Each review led to similar conclusions—at least as judged by my conversations with these other people and/or my review of their conclusions.
- 3) The phenomenon of false complaints has been extensively documented in the literature. Key works by Alan Dershowitz, Charles Sykes, Christina Hoff Sommers, Laura Kipnis, Bell Hooks and dozens of other feminist thinkers document this dimension of shadow, which has been largely overlooked by mainstream feminism. From an integral perspective, this literature is important to consider directly and seriously.
- 4) The women in question, along with their supporters, spoke extensively and directly and via internet chatrooms, blogs, and email to dozens of people. They were highly active and quite aggressive.
- 5) Despite such engagement, they refused and continue to refuse to meet with Marc. They refused any forum or dialogue that would have subjected evidence to validation and reasoned debate. They and their supporters, including key behind-the-scenes figures, took actions counter to the reasonable principles of fairness and integrity. They appear to have done everything in their power to block any contact with Marc.
- 6) They engaged in a process of demonization, coupled with repeated false assertions--deliberately falsifying or distorting the nature of their relationships with Marc at the times in question. It appears that the intensity of the demonization, the denial of Marc's involvement in a fairly-facilitated process, and the continued obsession with this for many years after the originating events, were and are part of an attempt to hide the fact that the original complaints were false and to obfuscate the complex motives behind them.
- 7) Marc was quiet throughout this process on account of believing the police complaints were real. Once Marc's voice was removed from the story, the basic narrative put in play roughly runs as follows.
 - "You thought Marc was a good guy. That was all a mask. In fact, he is a sociopath, etc. The claims made were in regard to behavior of the most nefarious kind. Marc mocked people who came to him for counseling. Marc abused his kids. Marc slept with hundreds of women. Marc was always manipulating everyone for ego maniacal ends, and he truly cared about no one."
 - The venom permeating these reports was stark and unreserved. There were of course many people who understood—even without a review of the evidence—that the complaints as presented could not be true. But even they could not imagine the degree of falsification present in the dominant public narrative.
 - Both Marc and his team were lead to believe that police complaints were indeed filed. The evidence needed to refute them was partially erased from his computer. Marc was strongly advised by his attorneys to maintain silence in order not to reveal to the complainants that he was engaging in processes necessary to recover the deleted material from his computer.

- The demonization of Marc was the only available narrative until he put up his website in 2008. At that point, however, the initial story was solidified for many people.
- 8) It appears that the parties in question did not anticipate that this situation would blow-up to the degree or scale that it did. However, once everything was set in motion, they appeared to not be able to find a way to retreat, back down, heal or otherwise temper their positions. Instead, they appeared to feel the need to justify their position through the ever intensifying demonization, refusal to dialogue, additional attacks, etc.
 - 9) In cases where a psychologist is accused of sexual misconduct there is always a forum to check evidence. Even if he or she is found guilty, a process of rehabilitation is set up, along with a process for ongoing review. Marc, as the evidence indicates, was innocent of these claims. However, it is striking that in this case, despite the fact that the relationships were fully mutual, all fact checking processes were blocked. In addition, there was a concerted attempt to pathologize Marc by these people. Though none of them have any credentials or schooling in psychology, they cited DSM categories to suggest that Marc's friendliness and charm are evidence of sociopathy, and they warned people not to talk to him lest they be deceived by his talent, charm, and ability to empathize with others. In other words, they do their best to pathologize even his gifts, and use these 'diagnosis' as a reason for banning Marc from teaching and as justifications for seeking to get his teaching banned. I have heard people in the community call him a "magician," implying that his natural charisma is evidence of deceptive and even supernatural skills. All of this suggests motives of malice and again stands against principles of integrity, due process, fact checking, and fairness.
 - 10) This kind of group dynamic is not uncommon. It is extensively documented in the literature mentioned earlier in #2.
 - 11) From the email evidence, it seems apparent to me that the emotional hurt that some of these women suffered, while sad, was within the normal spectrum of pain suffered when a relationship ends, or when one person is more 'in love' than the other.
 - 12) Marc and the women involved in these early complaints had established between them that Marc was not acting as their spiritual teacher with any formal authority. The women were in Marc's circle of friendship. This was made quite clear in the email record.
 - 13) The tone and texture of the relationships, as evidenced in the detailed documentary record was one of equals. These relationships were characterized by mutuality and peer-to-peer communication. Again, this conclusion was drawn from the nature of the email communications directly.
 - 14) The dynamic described in Karpov's triangle, in which a person claiming to be a victim then becomes a perpetrator appears to have played a central role in the dynamics of this situation.

- 15) The hurt suffered by Marc through these false complaints is extensive. He lost his community, his income, his key teaching opportunities, his home, and many friends. Forced to go silent in order to recover the emails that proved the real nature of the relationships, he spent his savings to prepare a defense against these complaints. He has suffered repeated public humiliations, and years of personal and professional damage through internet attacks which remain on the web. He has been unable to spend regular time with his Israeli children, including being able to attend his son's wedding. He lost his positive relationship to the public culture of Israeli and Judaism in general. To me, this is an example of the "dehumanization of the subject" that often accompanies false complaints.
- 16) Despite all of this, Marc issued an in-depth, sincere, and detailed apology for what he calls his "part in creating the conditions that allowed the dynamic of false complaints to take place". He placed this into public record via his website in 2008. His statement demonstrates regret and authenticity.
- 17) In all of my talks with Marc, he has consistently refused to attack these parties. Even though he was deeply pained by these events, he maintained right speech and right action, which is inspiring and in many ways unusual, given the circumstances.
- 18) Marc has sent messages to key figures in the community asking them to review the same documentation I have reviewed. There is extensive email record of Marc reaching out to Jewish leaders. Sally Kempton also wrote to many of these leaders asking them to review the evidence contained in this record. All entreaties in this regard have been ignored. Others, including Sally Kempton, reached out to one of the main complainants, and to several Jewish leaders, asking to meet and discuss the nuances of the situation. In all cases, her letters were either ignored or met with mocking attacks on her reputation. All of this is documented. All overtures from Ken, Sally, Marc and others through the years were rejected out of hand.
- 19) Marc engaged in extensive evaluative processes across different quadrants (polygraph, psych. evaluation, legal evaluation, etc.) all of which has largely confirmed or were consistent with the conclusions represented here. These processes have also confirmed his psychological fitness to the extent that such tests are capable of doing so.
- 20) Marc has sent multiple communications to key parties inviting them to meet, evaluate/discuss evidence, and to move toward forgiveness and resolution on all sides. All such communications have been ignored or mocked.
- 21) As in other cases of false complaints and demonization of public figures, Marc has been subject to a trial by internet, in which principles of justice are violated or outright neglected. The people involved avoid fact checking and any possibility of having their assertions challenged. All of this allows for a continuation of the character assassination that is going on. As is so often the case in contemporary internet smear campaigns, there is on-going resort to false pattern recognition, and imputations of pathology and pathological motivations.

- 22) One indication of this has been the claim that “Gafni keeps reinventing himself.” The fact that his gifts and hard work allow him to keep making contributions in the public sphere are caricatured by these people, and asserted as evidence that he is some sort of charlatan. In fact, to investigate Marc’s work is to see evidence that any success he has had at any time is the result of, significant gifts, hard work, and intelligence.
- 23) Marc moved to rebuild his life by putting up a website in 2008 and engaging in creative thinking, writing, and teaching activities. Marc has refrained from aggressive engagement of any kind towards the parties; he has refused to share the recovered emails in public, despite significant pressure to do so. He has taken what might be fairly characterized as the “high road” in real and material ways throughout this process.
- 24) Marc has written for example, a point-by-point refutation of the “chaya letter” which he has refused to publicly share despite Chaya’s repeated attacks on him.
- 25) The intention of the complaining parties demonstrated a notable degree of cruelty. This was described in an unpublished autobiographical essay by Marc. He touched down in Israel on May 11 2006, only to be confronted upon landing with frenzied, hysterical accusations about which the complainants refused to hear defense. This kind of “sexual hysteria” around false complaints is extensively documented in Daphne Pattai’s book, *Heterophobia*.

Addendum:

- A statement written by Erica Fox in Marc’s name was issued in 2006, five days after the initial complaints were made.
- During those five days Marc was in shock. He flew from Israel to Boston to Erica Fox's home and then to Ken Wilber's loft in Denver. Marc realized that his computer had been erased during his return trip to the US. He and Erica understood the need to stop the frenzy and give Marc time both to recover balance and to recover his computer files.
- Erica drafted the letter, which she strongly advised creating. Her advice was to make the letter public, leading Marc to effectively fall on his sword in order to be able to prove his innocence at a later point. Marc, in a state shock, unfortunately followed that advice.
- In 2008, after recovering the emails from his computer and putting up his website, Marc published a document called "Why I Signed the Letter," which explained his motivation at the time.

Update (2011)

- 1) From 2008 onwards, key parties involved in the original complaints sent defamatory letters about Marc to every place he taught. These letters are eight pages long and filled with the same kind of falsehood and distortion that characterized the original complaints. Readers have described reading these

letters as being like "dipping your toes into a lake of poison." The intensity of the demonization contained in these letters is shocking—at least as viewed by anyone who works with Marc presently. However, to those who do not know Marc, which is the majority of the letters recipients, they appear to have a deleterious effect.

- 2) The same group has posted extensively on the Internet, contacted bloggers, and engaged in an ongoing, behind-the-scenes campaign of defamation and character assassination. One of the main architects of this campaign told a male friend of Marc's (who tried to facilitate a meeting between Marc and the women) that she would not rest until Marc was barred from any public work.
- 3) In a June 2011 book published by Sounds True, Mariana Caplan published an essay on false complaints, which used Marc's story as its focal point and which exonerated Marc in a careful and nuanced fashion. The publisher of Sounds True was contacted by the same parties mentioned above. Some of these parties live in Boulder and have relationships with the publisher and other Sounds True staff. The publisher was apparently overwhelmed by the intensity of the onslaught, which she noted in private communication with a staffer. In her one subsequent, 20-min. interaction with Marc she repeated almost verbatim the classic canards perpetuated for years by these parties. It was made clear from her near verbatim language (and through verification at a later date using alternate channels) that she was inundated by Donna, who continued to perpetrate the earlier demonization. The meeting was not characterized by dialogue and there was no subsequent contact between the publisher and Marc. The meeting was best characterized as hysterical. (Update: Kate Maloney, board chair of Center for Integral Wisdom met with the publisher some years later to discuss this falling out. At this time there seemed to be reason to hope for an eventual reconciliation between Marc and the publisher. Marc has consistently held the publisher in high regard in all of our conversations with him. Blogger, Joe Perez, has written extensively about the Sounds True story in his blogs on the topic. They are linked to on Marc's website. Ken Wilber's comments on the internet controversy which was evoked by these dynamics was "so much flame and so little fact")
- 4) In 2011, Marc had two relationships with two adult women, both of whom were aware of one another. There was an understanding between all parties that the sexual relationships were an expression of mutual affection, taking place in peer relationships. These topics were discussed at length with each woman before the sexual relationships began. Decisions were made to hold the relationships privately.
 - The first person participated in a few study sessions prior to becoming Marc's editor at Sounds True. At no time did Marc take up the role of her therapist as has been reported online.
 - It could be argued that, as Marc's editor, she also held a degree of power in the relationship.
 - Her and Marc mutually agreed to hold the relationship privately for a time. Had the relationship not been interrupted it probably would have been shared with the publisher at the end of the summer, and Marc and the editor may well have established a long-term relationship.

- On August 2, 2011, the editor shared with the publisher that she was in a relationship with Marc and that Marc had a relationship with the second person.
 - Unbeknownst to the editor or Marc, the publisher was at the same time beset by Donna and other parties who were pressuring her into pulling Mariana's book from the shelves because it contained the essay referenced above.
 - These were ordinary relationships which should not have engendered any public drama. The publisher, however, urged on by a number of different people behind the scenes, reacted vociferously, apparently out of fear for Sounds True.
 - The second relationship was with a woman who was hired to play music at a few of Marc's events. She explicitly requested that the relationship be held privately, which was resonant with Marc and which he honored. So when the publisher asked Marc if he was in a relationship with this person, Marc said he was not, in order to honor his agreement for privacy with the woman in question.
 - This woman studied texts with Marc for a period of time. Prior to engaging in any intimate relations, they engaged in discussion about the feasibility of studying with someone and having a sexual relationship. This woman had read Marc's 2007 article many times and was in agreement with its conclusions. This article, along with writings of leading feminist writers such as Bell Hooks, Laura Kipnis, and Christina Hoff-Sommers, and a recorded interview given by Ken Wilber's in 2011 to the Integrales Forum, all affirm that this kind of relationship can be engaged with full integrity.
 - Together, they explicitly discussed and agreed to engage in such a relationship. This is evident in the email record I reviewed.
 - It is important to note that such relationships are different than obedience relationship (e.g. many traditional teacher-student relationships in the Zen Tradition). Marc has consistently pointed out that he will only study with people who have full autonomy and independence, that he wants nor claims any spiritual authority. All of these relationships are based on an explicit mutuality and autonomy. There is no evidence that any party was coerced into entering or staying in these relationship. In fact, there is an extensive email record that indicates the opposite.
- 5) The board of directors of the Center for Integral Wisdom looked at these issues carefully and crafted a clear statement in support of Marc after talking to all parties extensively. Key board members, including Sally Kempton, Mariana Caplan, Sam Alexander, Barbara Alexander, and therapist Peter Dunlap, had extensive contact with the key parties. It was clear to them that Marc had acted in integrity with the two women; as Ken wrote, there was "so much flame and so little fact." It was concluded by the board that these had been personal relationships which did not belong in the public eye.
- 6) Once again Marc made himself available to meet and resolve the issues in direct conversation and facilitation. Since the parties involved in 2006 so heavily influenced the dynamics in 2011, it was unsurprising that the refusal to meet,

check facts, or create closure was also the dynamic in 2011. What initially appeared like a separate incident turned out to be directly catalyzed by the same parties.

- 7) It appears clear that this situation would have been very unlikely to have erupted without the contextual background of 2006 and the active encouragement of parties from 2006.
- 8) The triggering event was the article by Mariana Caplan, which exposed the falsehoods of the 2006 situation. This article purposefully omitted personally identifiable details regarding the 2006 situation (e.g. the involvement of David Ingber, etc.) This was done so as not to further exacerbate the issues and humiliate anyone in the public realm. This sensitivity was an expression of Marc's desire to create closure, forgive, and resolve these issues constructively.
- 9) In 2006, Marc's colleague, Abraham Leader, was the person cited as affirming the veracity of the complaints. In a highly-circulated document, Abraham stated that he had read the depositions and stood by them unequivocally. This was taken as confirmation by all concerned that Marc was guilty of sexual harassment. However, in email communications with Marc in 2009 and 2010, Abraham contradicted his public statement. He said he had never read the depositions and that when he supported the women he only meant that he knew the relationships had taken place, but that he was neither referring to or supporting any claim regarding their nature. Without Abraham's public statement in support of the complaints it is highly unlikely that they would have been seen as legitimate. Had Abraham convened a committee to validate evidence, or had he spoken to all parties before acting, the entire chain of events might have been dealt with fairly and equitably.
- 10) My final sense of this is that Marc's core mistake here was believing that all parties involved in these relationships were able to maintain such relationships in any and all contexts. His mis-estimation in this regard, opened the doors for these acts.

Addendum:

- Over the time span covered here, Ken has issued a number of statements supporting the exoneration of Marc Gafni. The statements are posted in the Facts section of the Marc Gafni website. ([Statement 1](#) | [Statement 2](#))
- An earlier statement (2006) was made by Ken before the emails were recovered from Marc's computer—that is, prior to when we were able to review evidence indicating the the complaints were false.
- The parties in question routinely refer people to this earlier statement as if it adequately captured Ken's present position. In our estimation, this is a move to obfuscate the fact that this earlier statement was made prior to a review of the recovered emails. These parties ignore the subsequent statements linked to above.
- Ken is a partner in the founding of the Center for Integral Wisdom, and he is an ongoing and active collaborator in intellectual and activist projects. Marc and

Ken have meet weekly for over five years to discuss Integral thought and the direction of the think tank.

- In regard to the 2011 situation, Ken again issued two additional statements. The first said that he would be reviewing additional information before coming to a conclusion, and the second was a definitive statement concerning the situation.

Update (2014)

- 1) Eight-days after the initial incident exploded in Israel on May 11, 2006, Marc retained a high-level Israeli attorney to check on the status of the complaints. Israel is the only country where a complaint of sexual harassment under statutes 345:1 and 346:1 is a criminal offense. The threat to Marc was both reputationally and materially significant.
- 2) The women stated unequivocally that they had made formal complaints which had been legally registered by the police. (No one claimed that any charges were filed. Complaints simply means that they claimed the police had registered their statements). This was stated in emails to Marc. It was also stated in the public meeting on the evening of May 10th as reported in the affidavit provided by a meeting participant. It was also stated in the subsequent article published in a leading spirituality magazine in Israel (which has since closed). This article was reproduced in the file I reviewed. The affidavit was taken by Marc's attorney who was retained in Salt Lake City in July 2006. Dozens of internet blogs and comments by these women and by third hand reports on internet sites said that complaints had filed with the police.
- 3) Because of the supposedly legal nature of the issue it became imperative for Marc to recover emails that had been deleted from his computer, apparently by one of the parties to the complaints. The missing emails covered a pivotal period of Marc's relationship with one of the complainants.
- 4) The need to recover this material, and the advice of Marc's legal counsel, prompted Mark to go silent. His silence largely determined the course of these events and magnified the impact on Marc, his work, children and associates.
- 5) In 2014, another attorney retained by Marc investigated the police files and reported that no complaints had EVER been registered and that no files had ever been closed by the Israeli police in 2006. The attorney in question wrote a formal statement to this effect. Marc retains that statement. The name of the lawyer is Nitza Cohen (כהן ניצה משרד [REDACTED]). She worked for many years as a senior police investigator. She has issued a written statement saying that there were no complaints. She is also familiar with the victim feminist lawyer that was retained by the women. Nitza was contacted and retained through Dr. Ruth Engel Eldar ([REDACTED]), a prominent Israeli educator, who Marc did not know but who contacted him to encourage him to return to Israel and teach. Dr. Eldar is also familiar with the victim feminist lawyer who encouraged the women at the time. Ruth also had an extensive conversation at Chaya's home to investigate the nature of the claims after validating that there were no police complaints.

- 6) It would appear from the Dalit Arnon affidavit, cited in the file, taken by Rick Thaler at Rae Quinney and Nebeker law firm, that the police rejected the complaints when they were first made because the parties indicated the mutual and consensual nature of the relationships. The complainants then apparently hired a “victim feminist” lawyer who encouraged a reframing of the complaints. It would appear however, based on the 2014 finding that the complaints were not accepted. Whatever happened, the parties let Marc believe that real complaints were filed and indeed existed. Apparently, this was done to frighten Marc, to silence him, to prevent him from returning to Israel, and to force him into engaging a costly defense.
- 7) As of 2014, Marc has shifted his primary focus from formal spiritual teaching to running a think tank, and serving as a public intellectual and thought leader. Attempts by the same group of people to professionally undermine Marc and his work are still ongoing. One can only wonder at the source of this relentless pursuit some ten years later. Perhaps it stems from the fact that each of these people is someone that Marc had left behind or in some way “rejected.” But, it seems more reasonable to suggest that the continued demonization and attack intends to cover up the fact that the original complaints were false.

Addendum:

- In approximately 2013, Marc and Dafna has a five-hour phone conversation. Sally and Lori were both there for the conversation. The conversation took place in two parts: For the first two and half hours Sally was present and for the second two and half hours Lori was present.
- Marc challenged Dafna very directly on the false complaints. Dafna repeated the standard lines, while constantly saying that she was afraid that Marc was recording the conversation, which was not the case.
- After the conversation concluded, Dafna sent Marc a lengthy, ranting, and quite frightening email. In it she said that she heard Marc panting on the phone during the conversation. She said that she remembered that he "got off on the pain of others" and essentially suggested that he was masturbating on the phone while they talked.
- Even to Marc, Lori, and Sally—who were used to the pathological characterizations—this was shocking, particularly since it was so far from the truth. In short, these assertions were entirely the product of Dafna’s imagination.
- Marc had been with Sally or Lori during the entire conversation. According to both of them, Marc was engrossed in trying to have an authentic conversation with Dafna; to listen to her and to speak his own truth in the hope that there could be positive movement towards resolution.