

# The Practical Enneagram

Volume 1, Issue 6

November / December 2025

## Contents

Editor's Comment 2

*The Enneagram of Narcissism: an Introduction to Narcissistic Expression through the lens of the 27 Instinctual Subtypes* 3

*Powerlust: Reconsidering the Passion of Enneagram Type Eight* 6

*The Eclectic Enneagram Library: A Review of 13 Books* 8

*A Guide to Developing the Instincts* 11

News & Views 17

## Seasons, Theatre, and the Self: Inside Asaf Braverman's Path of Development

For those of us that are sincerely committed to developing, finding authentic teachers can be surprisingly difficult.

In the spiritual world, many teachers are themselves realized, yet for reasons often unclear, they lack the ability to effectively guide their students to awaken. Within psychological and therapeutic contexts, guidance is often excellent, but it focuses solely on the development of the ego or personality self, which feels limited and unsatisfying to the student yearning to know a more fundamental truth.

Asaf Braverman, founder of the [Old New Method](#) and leader of a global community of students, stands out as a rare, authentic teacher of self-development. Asaf describes his path as being indebted to mystic and spiritual teacher, George Gurdjieff, and his principle student, P.D. Ouspensky, but having its own focus on going back to the sources: in particular, agriculture, nature and the archetypal cycles that inspired early rituals and theater.

The view of the Old New Method is that teaching should be experienced,

not just studied. With its focus on community, inclusion of theatre and honouring of natural cycles, the Old New Method has a distinct aesthetic. It is, as Asaf acknowledges, not for everyone. But the students are devoted. Indeed, as Asaf shares, it has to be that way for any school and its students to reach their potential.

Rezzan Huseyin ('RH'): Perhaps we can start with my curiosity about how faithful the Old New Method is to Gurdjieff's Fourth Way? How does it diverge?

Asaf Braverman ('AB'): That's a bit of a trick question, Rez. Gurdjieff was not particularly faithful to himself. Let me explain. Any teacher lives, teaches for a period, and then dies. If the teaching is impactful, students are left with whatever the teacher left — books, transcripts, knowledge of movements.

But the author is dead. You can't add to it, you shouldn't remove from it. In that sense, later people might ask, "How faithful are you to the canon?" But Gurdjieff himself was extremely resistant to that sort of formulaic canonization. He would have been the first to pull the rug from beneath his own teaching if it helped his students see more clearly, and not get caught up in form at the expense of life.

So, the Old New Method may not be faithful to the literal form of his teaching, but I believe it is faithful to its spirit. That is, the spirit of seeking truth, being true to oneself, and learning across many traditions. He gathered knowledge from many places, never claiming it as solely his own. He presented a unique body of knowledge, yes, but always as a collection, not a dogma.

Gurdjieff knew that every age must rediscover truth for itself. You can inherit truth, but you rarely value what you inherit. You haven't paid for it. He intentionally made it difficult, for example in *Beelzebub* [*Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson: An Objectively Impartial Criticism of the Life of Man*], sending students down blind alleys. The challenge is necessary; rediscovery is part of becoming worthy of the knowledge. He understood that very deeply.

RH: That makes sense. If we don't struggle to understand something, we don't truly value it.

AB: Exactly. And that struggle is not just intellectual, it is lived. It is embodied.

RH: As I understand things, central to his approach was

[\(Continued on page 20\)](#)