

**CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY**  
**with Anthony Damiani (AD)**  
**October 20, 1982**  
**PB PARAS; EGO; SURRENDER**

TOPIC: PB Paras  
SUBJECT: Ego

SUBSUBJECTS: Surrender, Self-Will, Serpent's Path

CONTENTS:

- # PB PARAS ON SURRENDER, EGO, AND SERPENT'S PATH
- # EXPERIENCING THE EGO AS PART OF THE WORLD-IDEA
- # EGO CAN'T HIDE IN THE STILLNESS
- # MORE PB PARAS ON EGO; MORE DISCUSSION OF SURRENDER
- # SELF-WILL HAS TO BE BROUGHT TO SURRENDER ITSELF; THE SAGE IS IDENTIFIED WITH THE WORLD-IDEA
- # ISOLATING THE EGO FROM THE REASONING PROCESSES AND TRACING IT TO ITS LAIR

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives* [*Persp.*].
- Paul Brunton, *The Quest of the Overself*
- Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.)

NOTES:

- Anecdote about PB told by Randy highlighted in yellow.
- Earlier transcript versions exist.

TRANSCRIBED from Audio Cassette Tapes by HP, JF, et al. in 1992 as part of the set for *Standing in Your Own Way*. V11 version 2018. Reformatted from V11 version by JRM & JF 2019-2020, with Subheads and Table of Contents added by JRM. In 2024, IT updates prefatory matter and footer, replaces tape markers with audio file markers, expands Subsubjects, adds and alters Subheads to make more accurate, completes Book List, corrects typos/errors, adds new notes within transcript, reformats to accord with new conventions. **Readable edited transcript – V14.1r.**

AUDIO FILES: 1982 1020a, 1982 1020b. [Note: "Tape" and "Side" refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

**1982 10/20 at Wisdom's Goldenrod**  
**PB Paras; Ego; Surrender**  
**Readable Edited Transcript**

**# PB PARAS ON SURRENDER, EGO, AND SERPENT'S PATH**

[Audio File 1982 1020a Begins]

(paras below were read, with mostly student discussion, and AD comment below)

PB: "If he is willing to look for them . . ." (Persp. p. 96 & 8.4.167)

PB: "Everything that intrudes . . ." (Persp. p. 328 & 23.8.153, "battle para," para typed in its entirety and discussed later)

PB: "The mysterious character of the Overself . . ." (22.3.386)

(student discussion)

AD: You're getting off the point.

LR: Surrender?

AD: What are you asked to do when he speaks about surrender? What are you being asked to do? Randy got very close to it.

PB: "If he is willing . . ."

PB: "Everything that intrudes . . ." (& student discussion continues rest of side 1)

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1982 1020a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

(Q: RG reading)

PB: "When he is so fortunate as to attain this glimpse of what undifferentiated Thought means he must exert himself energetically and unwaveringly not to let it slip away. This will certainly happen if he is not vigilant enough because he has upset the whole habitual tradition of personal existence. This sudden glimpse when the mind ultimately solves its own mystery and gains in the "lightning-flash" the solution of *its own significance*, must be caught, precisely as the flash of intuition must be caught, before it fades. . . He will have to hold the citadel of consciousness strongly and steadily against the invasions which are sure to come, against the legions of memories, anticipations, reasonings, distractions and emotions which will try their utmost to enter the gates or climb the walls. If they cannot succeed straightforwardly they will try to enter in disguise. That is they will make pure Thought itself the subject of their activity and before he knows where he is he will be outside and they inside! The task demands a constant vigilance, a continual remembrance of what it is that he has set out to achieve. Eventually thought after thought--not about external objects, for he has long advanced beyond their tyranny, but this time about pure Thought itself--will insistently intrude itself in what is a masked and desperate effort to tear him away from increasing his intent concentration upon pure Thought itself, but he must vigorously thrust them aside.

"The aim is self-reflectively to isolate Mind--that which enables him to think--from the images and thoughts which stream forth continuously from it, to achieve a state of *understanding* consciousness

where there is no object of consciousness.\* . . . The higher meditation begins when thought is no longer preoccupied with its offspring thoughts and is no longer directed to alien topics but seeks to get an insight into its own nature, to succeed in recognizing itself and consequently be itself. Thought is that hidden ultimate element whose activity we know as consciousness, whose manifestation we experience as thoughts and whose existence contains the world-idea's own existence . . ." (*The Wisdom of the Overself*, Serpent's Path exercise, pp. 245-246, Rider 1943 edition)

\*AD: (comment at \* of above) The words should be changed there from 'UNDERSTANDING' consciousness to 'BEING' consciousness. (then above paragraph finished)

AD: Dickie, that's the framework in which the surrender takes place but nothing about the surrender.

PB: "Everything we do or say . . ." (Persp. p. 95 & 8.4.393)

PB: "We achieve a total surrender of the ego . . ." (18.4.117)

PB: "The average spiritual aspirant . . ." (23.4.70)

### **# EXPERIENCING THE EGO AS PART OF THE WORLD-IDEA**

AD: Dickie, can you read that quote again now? (Q: the WOTO quote above is reread)

AD: The last line, Dickie.

PB: "Thought is that hidden ultimate element whose activity we know as consciousness, whose manifestation we experience as thoughts and whose existence contains the world-idea's own existence . . ." (*The Wisdom of the Overself*)

AD: The very last phrase.

PB: ". . . whose existence contains the world-idea's own existence . . ."

AD: Which would include the ego, right?

(student discussion)

VM: I also find it interesting, the statement in there, it seems that the World-Idea is made contact with at the level of this pure Thought. It seems to go along with that more radical form of mentalism that we were working with a month ago or so. I remember this discussion of the World-Idea and where you actually make contact with it. It appears from this quote that he's suggesting that you make contact with the World-Idea, let's say, at this level of pure Thought or in other words your participation in the Nous or Cosmic Soul is at the level of the Overself and that's where...

(student discussion)

LR: That's only at the highest level of consciousness?

VM: I'm suggesting that that's an interpretation of that.

RG: He means the highest level?

VM: I think he does. That's where the world-thought is contacted, at the level of the Overself.

PB: "Each individual receives his image of the world from his own Overself." (paraphrase from *The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe," p. 35, Rider 1943 edition)

VM: Yes, same idea.

RG: I think he's saying all our experience ultimately comes from mind of Thought-in-Itself.

AD: Dickie, if you got to that level where you saw the World-Idea, what would that vision include?

VM: Sounds like the ego would be a small element.

RG: The ego, the world and its relations.

AD: That would be included as part of that World-Idea. But what would stop you from getting to that viewpoint? Would it be the ego wanting to see itself as it is?

RG: He also says the ego or the "I" is the center around which the world-thought revolves. [Note: Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe," p. 35, Rider 1943 edition.] You have to submerge the ego to get to that center.

DD: Give the ego up and you get it back.

AD: Yes, but how do you get it back?

DD: Um--

AD/PD(?): Part of the whole.

AD/DB(?): Yet it is whole. (Q: not sure of speaker for this & above comments)

AD: If you got it back as PART of the whole, that is it's a little tiny part of the World-Idea . . . you would see it as what--if you saw it as part of the World-Idea?

VM: Objectively given.

AD: Would you also see it as thought?

VM: As pure Thought.

AD: Not as pure Thought but the activity of consciousness which produces thought... would you see it then as (inaudible)

VM: As what Anthony, I couldn't hear you.

AD: Wouldn't you see it as illusory if you saw it as part of the World-Idea?

VM: I don't see why it would be any more illusory than the World-Idea itself.

RC: And you (& inaudible)

AD: Prior to that there was only the "I," you know, your identification with the "I," identification with the ego. It doesn't seem illusory, it seems very real.

VM: The realest thing I know.

AD: That's the point. From the other point of view, where you see it as part of the World-Idea, will it have the reality that it has for you now? Now if that's so then what's going to try to stop you from seeing that?

VM: Its own desire to remain preeminent.

AD: . . . If you could you put it that way--would the ego be willing to commit suicide?

DB: It seems that by its very definition it would be incapable of it.

AD: It would be incapable of it. Yes, even if people do commit suicide, they're not committing real suicide. They just don't like the conditions they're working under so they want a change.

DB: That ordinary suicide seems like an attempt by the ego to perpetuate itself even at the expense of its life.

AD: The point here would be then that the ego is really engaged in a tremendous amount of activity to prevent you being that consciousness which can see the World-Idea and the ego as part of that World-Idea, a very small part of that World-Idea.

VM: Can we say that the illusory aspect of that ego is the disproportionate interest he has in it?

AD: No. What I'm trying to say is that we're only talking about it as illusory now. It doesn't really mean, you don't see as illusory. Nobody sees his ego, there's only one chance of seeing the ego as illusory and that's when you see the World-Idea as an idea. Then you have to see that the ego is part of that idea, has the nature of thought, and that is the only nature it has. And there's also the relative factor of the reality of being the consciousness or being the mind that experiences that idea as idea.

VM: Can I pick up this a little bit more? Can we say that the illusory aspect of the ego was its taking itself to be the reality, taking itself to be the center of subjectivity and so on. The ego is still seen from the point of view of the World-Idea but now it's seen from an entirely different perspective, as part of a larger whole.

AD: Who sees it as part of a larger whole?

VM: Certainly not the ego.

AD: Ok.

(Q: student discussion & references the battle in the stillness quote below.)

RC: It's an interesting thing, that PB told me about Nirvikalpa being the ultimate of the yogic development (which is/he says) that you can have that, and that's what the yogi strives for, but they always come out, and until you've made it, so that you are permanently established on that other shore, you can fall all the way back down.

DB: Right . . .

RC: That's why I was disinclined to say it's just in meditation. That would be to confine it to Nirvikalpa . . .

DB: . . .

PB: "Everything that intrudes upon the mental stillness in this highly critical stage must be rejected, no matter how virtuous or how "spiritual" a face it puts on. Only by the lapse of all thought, by the loss of all thinking capacity can he maintain this rigid stillness as it should be maintained. It is here alone that the last great battle will be fought and that the first great fulfilment will be achieved. That battle will be the one which will give the final deathblow to the ego; that fulfilment will be the union with his Overself after the ego's death. Both the battle and the fulfilment must take place within the stillness; they must not be a merely intellectual matter of thought alone nor a merely emotional matter of feeling alone. Here in the stillness both thought and emotion must die and the ego will then lose their powerful support. Therefore here alone is it possible to tackle the ego with any possibility of victory." (Persp. p. 328 & 23.8.153) (Note: Para not read at this point on the tape, but earlier in the class.)

### **# EGO CAN'T HIDE IN THE STILLNESS**

AD: It seems that all we did has been discussing the framework and the context in which surrender takes place but we're still not into what surrender is. Let's read some, Randy.

RC: You said you didn't want to get into that tonight. I'm not really prepared.

AD: I want to hear about it, just listen to what people think surrender is.

(Q: discussion, RC et al.)

LdS: If I can interject one thing. Randy, you seemed to talk a little bit before about getting to the stillness, that effort to get to the stillness, and then to establish yourself there, seems to be in the context of the ego's work. That the stillness itself is a state still within the psyche, or still within the ego.

RC: If I said that, I didn't mean it.

LdS: Because then he says the battle, the battle there is going to be waged in that stillness, the final battle.

AD: Louis, that's too pedantic.

LdS: In other words don't take so much the phrase...

AD: The stillness isn't in the ego. You never experience your ego as stillness, never in a million years.

LdS: But aren't there degrees of stillness, the way the mystics speak.

AD: But that's not the point, we're talking about the stillness in the ego. You mentioned the stillness in the ego. There's no such thing. The ego by definition is nothing but a washing machine. (Q: laughter)

LdS: Isn't it true that you could be in a still state of mind and not really be in the presence of the Overself?

AD: You wouldn't be in the ego if you were in a still state of mind.

RG: The fact that there's a battle doesn't mean that the ego is the stillness, it means the ego still would be a content or a thought to that stillness in the battle.

AD: If you were in absolute stillness, Louis, where will your ego hide?

LdS: Ok, I think I see your point.

AD: You see the battle, too?

LdS: But isn't it true that there is some kind of effort or pressure that a person would experience in that stillness? In other words the pressure of the force of that ego habit, of that vasana of the ego. There is a struggle with that, there's a suppression of that in the stillness.

Louis Damiani: I don't understand that.

AD: Louis, where will the ego hide, if the ego is thoughts and you're in the stillness?

LdS: If the thoughts are stilled.

AD: If you're in the stillness and your ego is a thought or a bunch of thoughts, where they going to hide?

LdS: Just because there are no manifest thoughts which we're saying the ego is constituted of, that is not to say the ego root...

AD: We're speaking about Nirvikalpa, we're speaking about the stillness. And you're stationed there for a while, let's say more than a couple of minutes, where is your ego going to hide? It can't, right? (Q: alternative transcription of last sentence is: "You can't hide there.")

LdS: There's no place.

AD: Then what's inevitable?

LdS: You're saying to stay there a few minutes would mean by necessity the influx of the Overself, the Light.

AD: No . . . You're in the stillness, you're absolutely quiet. What must inevitably happen?

RG: Thought must appear.

AD: It must appear.

LdS: I see. In other words, you have to come out of the state.

RG: No, you can stay in the stillness but thoughts are still going to appear even if you are in the stillness and that's when that second battle starts, that higher meditation, when you're established in the stillness and then thoughts appear. The World-Idea thought, not a thought.

LdS: There's the stilling of the personal thought and that's the first...

AD: Why do we keep changing things around? You're meditating. You're in the stillness, you're there for a little while. Now they can't hide very long there because that's like space. If there's anything, it's going

to show, you're going to see it. If you're in the stillness, sooner or later thoughts are going to appear. What do you do?

CdA: You're still in the stillness...

AD: You're still in the stillness, yes.

LdS: You don't have to follow them up, you don't have to identify with them or anything. They can just go on.

RG: No, you have to push them out again, you have to push them out. It's a great battle, he says.

AD: What kind of thoughts do you think would be in that realm? Do you think it's going to be thoughts about paying next month's rent?

LaurieD: "I am in the stillness."

RG: He says the thought of pure Thought itself.

LrD: It's very quiet. (Q: & student discussion, hard to hear)

RG: Also, the root ego thought would appear.

AD: What do you mean?

RG: If you haven't quieted all the vasanas, if it's not a state of Nirvikalpa, then some of the very tendencies that constitute the ego also would appear to the stillness. They couldn't hide either really. We're going to be battling those too. That seems to be part of the implication what he says.

AD: So the root ego-thought appears. Could you say more?

RG: No, I thought YOU would.

AD: I'm asking you WHAT IS THAT, the root thought, the root ego.

LdS: That I-thought which is part of the World-Idea.

AD: Yes, we keep going around and around.

LrD: Anthony, wouldn't you say that I AM?

LdS?: As a separate being.

AD: Some separate being which . . .

LdS?: That object of thought that appears.

AD: Some separate being then is . . .

DD?: The ego is rooted in a thought of separateness. (Q: & hard to hear)

AD: You're in the stillness and the root ego appears and it seems like some other being, good. Fine, so far. What's it look like?

(Q: indistinguishable answer from student, laughter)

AD: Let's read some more quotes.

### **# MORE PB PARAS ON EGO; MORE DISCUSSION OF SURRENDER**

PB: "When he steps forth from the ego's timed life into the Overself's liberating timelessness, the feeling of confinement falls away like a heavy cloak. He enjoys an unimagined exhilaration." (22.6.130)

(Q: quote reread/Herbert/Randy/Laurie/Randy/Bert/Randy/Bert/Randy)

RC: I think you could apply this to any exalted idea or exalted thought that you've ever had which lifted you above your petty personal concerns, that for a moment, you're lifted outside. I don't think it has to be a meditational experience. That anytime you get lifted outside your little sphere of personal concerns, it's exhilarating.

AD: You won't feel that the sky is an inverted bowl. Let's have some more.

PB: "All methods which dissolve the I's faults and weaknesses . . ." (8.4.416, published para begins: "The frontal attack . . .")

PB: "To know what his real "I" is not . . ." (8.4.372)

[Audio File 1982 1020a Ends]

[Audio File 1982 1020b Begins]

PB: "The "I" gets angry . . ." (8.3.40)

RC: . . . if we're going to talk about surrendering, I'm not seeing it as the ego as surrendering so much as I'm giving up everything that I ever thought or felt about anything in order to be open to an influx at a deeper level. . .

HS: Could you see the ego's surrender at all? I mean, it seems to be a kind of renegade.

RC: (inaudible) to the end.

HS: So here he might even pretend to surrender.

RC: This guy's whispering in Robert E. Lee's ear all the way.

HS: Well, here's a civil war, isn't it?

LR: Isn't grace almost a prerequisite for the surrender (of the ego to the Overself)? (Q: paraphrase)

RC: From what I can tell, they're so intimately bound up, if you don't surrender, you can't accept the grace.

HS: If they're not going to give you the grace, why surrender.

AD: You already lost, Herbert. (laughter) That's like the fellow who told Ramana, "I surrendered, now what do I do?" (Q: laughter) Let's read some more.

PA: Is it possible that this surrender can take place in a kind of graded way?

AD: A what?

PA: That it's gradual.

RC: I hope so. (Q: then student discussion)

AD: It (Q: surrender) doesn't have to be when you're meditating, by the way.

RC: It might just be in class trying to listen to something...

AD: That would be one of the graded surrenders. (Q: laughter)

RC: Just to let yourself hear it.

(Q: student joking comments & discussion)

PB: "There are today very few . . ." (8.4.294)

PB: "The subjugation of his ego is a Grace to be bestowed on him, not an act which can be done by him." (8.4.413) (para reread)

RC: Subjugation as opposed to repression. (inaudible)

AD: Do you want to try once more, Randy? (Q: para reread)

AD: (Subjugation of the ego) means surrender the ego. Go on. Just in case you think YOU'RE going to surrender the ego! (Q: This was hard to hear, not sure at all about first phrase.)

PB: "As a highly personal . . ." (8.4.448)

PB: "This wrong self-identification . . ." (Persp. p. 9)

PB: "There is always a risk . . ." (7.1.192)

(Q: discussion, RC et al.)

DB: Have we determined that it's the ego that surrenders?

RC: I think that from the quotes we've done so far, we've said the ego can't. I think we've got that much.

DD: The ego's the problem here, the ego's the tyrant. It seems that it must, unless it surrenders nothing can be won.

AB: Can't you say that it's the ego that is surrendered?

RC: I wouldn't put it that way. I give up the ego.

LR: Suppose you change your source of identity from the ego to the Overself.

AD: No. You're not going to get out of it that easy.

LR: That's a big change.

RC: How about if the grace comes and you allow them to take it away from you?

LR: No, but if you're really identified with the ego you're never going to surrender it. You'd have to change the ego.

AD: But you're going to try. You have to try.

DD: This vehicle is made over gradually, graded, as we said. Herbert was talking before, he said he had this thought, he pinned it down in meditation, he noticed it and he said alright, now I know something about you. In a way it took a kind of surrender to come to that conclusion. The ego had to bow its head for a minute for you to have that realization.

LR: But who was he identified with? With what was he identified?

AD: That's the easy part, Dennis.

Lisa: Could you speak of surrendering as a form of art? as an art?

AD: She's going to try to make surrender ecstatic.

Lisa: No I was thinking of it more like as an art because like all art to be most effective the ego is not there and that is it possible that true surrender takes place without your really knowing it.

AD: Don't worry, you'll know it, honey. It will be the most agonizing thing you've ever gone through. You'll know it.

DB: It's more like an artless death. (Q: laughter)

### **# SELF-WILL HAS TO BE BROUGHT TO SURRENDER ITSELF; THE SAGE IS IDENTIFIED WITH THE WORLD-IDEA**

PB: "If he has the courage to obey the command which comes forth from the divine silence within himself and to cast out his egotistic will and egotistic seeking, then his attempt at self-immolation will be brought to an abrupt end. The ego will be restored to him but never again can it hold the same primary place in his life. . . . In short, he surrenders himself to a numinous presence which he vividly feels as active within his own heart. Surrender is therefore the chief note to be struck on the keyboard of his being during this crucial stage.

"It is said that the sage's character will always be selfless and serene, detached and disciplined, passionless and impersonal. But it will lead only to illusion if the student thinks--as so many usually do think--that he can enter such a state solely by his own striving or will. He can not. It is indeed beyond mortal strength. He can enter it fully only by the mysterious grace of his Overself. When this happens he feels some power other than his own take hold of his consciousness and lift it into this exalted state and keep it there." (*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "Some Fruits of Philosophy," p. 268, Rider 1943 edition)

(Q: student discussion)

RG: It sounds like there's a position, which seems to be the position of that mental stillness, where you're listening to the higher, but you're not really identified with the ego itself and that's the part that surrenders, neither the ego nor the Overself, but the middle person.

LR: . . . that middle realm . . . One thing that we may have been overlooking, is the fact that when the call is made, everyone is going to drop everything.

AD: Where's that from, Dickie?

RG: "Some Fruits of Philosophy".

AD: Oh, that's in the *Wisdom*. . . .

(Q: then inaudible remarks)

AD: No, the middle entity is taken away. Reason and emotion are no longer of any--if reason and emotion, if the reasoning faculty in man is what creates, perpetuates it by means of supplying the means for the manifestation of the ego, when that's no longer functioning the ego can't call on it for its support and help. Then it only has its own self-will. The problem isn't faced.

CdA: What has its own self-will, the ego or the rational soul?

AD: The rational soul is what provides it, makes it possible to be. And that possibility for it to BE is now its own self-will. You can take away reasoning, you can take away emotion and no longer does it have these as supports, but it still will have its own self-will. This is where the surrender comes. It's not going to come by the reason or (emotion.) It's the self-will inherent in the ego itself, that must bring itself to that situation where something is forced. But I think if you'll read that again, I think you'll see that that's not facing the problem of what the surrender is.

BS: I'm sorry. I didn't understand . . . the self-will is left with, the only remaining item of the ego, is that the will that will surrender? Or just the opposite?

AD: It's what's in the ego. What distinguishes the ego is its self-will. If you introspect into yourself moment by moment you are actualizing yourself through that self-will, and that's what will have to surrender itself. Now, how could the self-will surrender itself? It has to be brought to do so. It can't do it on its own.

RG: Who brings it to surrender?

AD: It's usually part of the situation, the World-Idea or the particular circumstances. His own higher self forces him into it. No one would go out willingly and seek that.

RC: Did you want stuff on surrender?

AD: Yes. A few people told me that these were very discouraging sessions and I thought that they should go on, looking at this for what it is.

PB: "His own self-centeredness keeps out the light. If he cannot himself open up a free way to let it in, then grace alone can crush his ego and thus reveal his sin and bring about surrender." (8.4.429)

AD: Now, of course, anyone who gets crushed is not going to consider it as grace.

RC: Maybe if you don't get angry.

AD: After. After. Read it again.

(Q: quote reread & inaudible from student)

AD: I remember an interesting story of a man who was a student of Krishnamurti for many, many years. He had to go in for an operation and just before he went in for an operation, the very last minute, he gave up his ego. He came out, he had the liberating experience. It was brought on. He didn't bring it on. It was brought on. He wasn't meditating in a nice quiet corner. He was on an operating table. He had a few minutes of quiet, waiting and the struggle took place. Let's have a few more, Randy.

PB: "How true is the Bible's metaphorical statement that man shall not look upon the face of God and live. Yes, he, the ego, must die if God is to be present." (8.4.52)

AD: Was that a question?

RC: No, that's an assertion. "Yes, he, the ego, must die if God is to be present."

PB: "The ego in him which thinks the "I" must be rooted out. It will be followed by the Overself, which neither thinks discursively nor identifies itself with the outer person whom the world considers him to be." (8.4.451)

AD: What would be the consequences of that?

PB: "The way forward from here is travelled by cultivating the quality of being impersonal in his reactions to outer experiences, contacts, and surroundings. He must recognize and accept the truth that the Spirit is utterly impersonal and unegoistic." (24.3.195)

AD: Read it again. (Q: quotes reread)

AD: But if we went back to the first quote, then if the Overself wasn't identified with the ego then what would it be identified with, if anything. It's capable of absolute impersonality.

RC: You mean what content would it have?

AD: Yes. I don't know if the word 'identified' but what would it be associated with?

RC: That would be the metaphysical wanderer, wouldn't it?

AD: Read it again, the first one.

(Q: Quote reread. "The ego in him . . .")

AD: It doesn't identify itself with the outer person then what would its point of view be?

VM: It would be universal.

AD: It would be the World-Idea. Sure, that's why it's capable of absolute impersonality. Your Overself is not identified with your ego because that would be discursiveness, so what is its functioning? That's why the sage is absolutely impersonal. He's not identified except with the World-Idea.

RC: Which would include the ego?

AD: Yes--it's not--Don't go to the other extreme and make the ego a non-entity.

DB: How does the way the first part of that sentence is constructed differ from the I-thought? He says, "The ego which thinks the "I" must be rooted out."

AD: The I-thought is that light which is present in the structure of the ego. The ego thinking itself to be the "I" is an entirely different set-up. They're two different things. (& inaudible)

DB: Ok. So the surrender, then, would have to do with the relationship, not between the ego and its thoughts of "I" but the relationship between this light and the ego itself. Is that so?

AD: No, it's not so.

DB: Is it then prior to that?

AD: We said that the ego is self-will, some kind of self-will.

DB: This is the part that I don't understand because on the one hand the ego has this self-will to perpetuate itself in the limited form that it does, but it seems to require the presence of that light in order to do so. Is that ok?

AD: Yes.

DB: It seems like the surrender of that, the grace which makes possible the surrender of that ego's self-will is that which going to permit that light to no longer be entangled within it. If it could be spoken of in that way.

AD: But the emphasis has to be put on the self-will canceling itself out, not on the light which illuminates its activity.

DB: Can it be said that the emphasis there on the fact that the ego is going to try to eliminate itself or try to eliminate that self-will is due to the presence of that light in the final analysis?

AD: I don't buy final analysis. We're talking about you bringing up the notion of the surrender of the ego and I'm putting it in the context where it belongs, that is, in the activity of the ego itself. Its own self-will is what has to be surrendered or canceled out. The light that happens to permeate it is not involved in the surrender. It's got nothing to do with the surrender although the surrender will take place within that light.

DB: It is to that light that the surrender is taking place?

AD: No, over here it becomes meaningless.

### **# ISOLATING THE EGO FROM THE REASONING PROCESSES AND TRACING IT TO ITS LAIR**

HS: We spoke before, you said thought and emotion are taken, seem to be other than the ego, the I-thought itself.

AD: I pointed out that the reasoning soul is what fabricates the ego and ultimately invests the ego with its capacity to think. . . . And if you enter or you are on the verge of Nirvikalpa or on the threshold of stillness, you've gone beyond the reasoning phase of the soul. And that means that the reasoning phase of the soul is looked upon for what it is. You see it (as/has) that phase, the soul which reasons. This is no

longer going to be capable of offering support to the ego's self perpetuation because you have made the distinction between what the ego is and that which brings it into being as a sensible thing. So the ego won't be able to call on support from the reason or feeling.

HS: Then the reasoning phase of the soul is prior actually to the ego-thought in some way.

AD: That goes without saying, doesn't it, for ten years.

HS: I don't have any ability to hear.

PC: . . .

HS: Excuse me. It's been ten years. The reasoning phase of the soul supplies the life and thought to a thought within.

AD: What you call your empirical ego.

HS: Supplies it life and thought--

AD: Brings it about. You think yourself into actuality, into sensible corporeality. You think yourself into that.

HS: To differentiate the "me" from that which is thinking me into corporeality. How does the ego thought get differentiated from the reasoning phase of the soul which is thinking it into corporeality? Are you saying that there's a retraction of the subjectivity?

AD: No, there's no retraction. There's a clear distinction between the ego and the impersonal reasoning processes, or if you want to use another term, transcendental or a priori synthetic reasoning that brings that ego about. You have to think hardness into existence in order to have the experience of hardness. You have to think the ego into existence in order to have the experience of ego.

HS: Ok, then it's possible to have its supplies, its source, cut off from it or differentiated from it.

AD: No, they're distinguished, one distinguishes them.

HS: And when it gets distinguished?

AD: Then you have isolated the ego from the reasoning processes and now you've traced it back to its lair.

HS: You traced it back to its lair but it still has its innate capacity to perpetuate itself.

AD: Yes.

HS: That's what it operates on. When it's traced back that way and isolated, is that like where you get introduced to terms of surrender.

AD: No, that introduces you to what it really is.

HS: You're still not in...

AD: You're still not in the battle. You're still not in conflict with it. Still not a conflict going on.

HS: Would you say that there's like a relaxing of the position and then its source is given back to it?

AD: I don't know what you mean.

HS: To stand that way, you're differentiating the ego from the reasoning phase of the soul, and you're saying that that's still prior to the battle. It seems that the battle would be...

AD: Yes, this can go on without you surrendering anything. It's part of the mystical understanding.

HS: Now, if you want to take up the battle, you give back to the ego...

AD: You don't take it up. It happens.

HS: If the battle is given to you?

AD: If it happens.

HS: If it happens, is what has happened now the ego has re-appropriated or been given back its source?

AD: No. Now, it stands alone and isolated. Separated off from everything else.

HS: Any yet it still keeps going on and on.

AD: Keeps going on?

HS: Keeps going on.

AD: I don't know. I don't know what you're doing. The point I'm making here is now that you're encapsulated within that--what do you do? Are you willing to give it up? No. Of course not because the only thing that surrounds you is nothingness and an abyss. You're encapsulated now, in this ego structure which we distinguished and separated off from the reasoning phase of the soul and the higher phase of the soul and you're going to surrender?! You won't do it. You might be forced into doing it and then the prior discipline and training might come to your aid but you're not going to do it willingly. But the important thing is to see that you stand alone in that isolated capsule and that within there is where the self-will is going to try to surrender to itself. But what will it surrender to? How will it cancel itself out? To whom? PB says to the Higher Self. Right but when you're in there you don't know that there's a Higher Self. You're going on, you know, like blind flying. Instrument flying. Think about it, Herbert. Let's read some more quotes. As long as they're hanging around give me some more.

JohannaG: May I ask a question about what you said? Does the I-thought have that light inherent in it?

AD: It's always like in the context that a thing is said. More often than not when he speaks about the I-thought, that's the light that's shining in the ego which make the ego think that it is this I, appropriates that light and now conceives of itself as itself. But that I-thought is not the same, that light is not the same as the ability of the ego to perpetuate itself by discursively thinking itself into being. They're two different things.

JG: So when PB in the very first quote speaks about that final confrontation with (the root?)?

AD: Well, because you're speaking about, this ability on the part of the ego...

JG: ...that's not necessarily the I-thought that he mentions in other...

AD: It is not the I-thought that--(lets?) this light which is coming in but this ability of the ego to perpetuate itself by discursively thinking itself into being, constantly. Now, we're only abstractly separating the light from that. You can't do it in actuality because there wouldn't be no consciousness in the ego that will make it aware of its own activities. It's a very messy affair.

Anna: Could you explain more what you mean by reason? . . .

AD: We went through that so many times. That's the different phases of the soul that they speak about in the Plotinus class and maybe they think that Plotinus was just punching bubbles or something, but it should be obvious that Plotinus was speaking about different phases of the soul that a person who is a proficient becomes aware of. That there is a phase of the soul that is a reasoning phase of the soul and which we can call the sort of permanent witness; and then there's the supreme subject, the Overself; and then there's an empirical ego. He speaks about these in various ways. Now the fact that he made these distinctions shows that he's speaking about very distinct aspects of one and the same entity. Which means that he was able to stand apart and see them as different from one another.

Anna: Does that phase backup the ego, so to speak?

AD: That's always backing you up, always backing you up. You're always calling on it to make sure that you have your way. I think it was Freud who claimed that reasoning is nothing but self-rationalization. He was part right.

SD: Anthony, you're saying that it appropriates that reason in the same way that it appropriates the light.

AD: Exactly, the way it appropriates the light. Did you notice the first thing a child says is "mine" or the second thing, "no" and then "mine." (Q: laughter and inaudible) A couple more, Randy.

PB: "By thought, the ego was made; by thought, the ego's power can be unmade. But the thought must be directed toward a higher entity, for the ego's willingness to attack itself is only a pretense. Direct it constantly to the Overself, be mentally devoted to the Overself, and emotionally love the Overself. Can it then refuse to help you?" (18.1.77)

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1982 1020b Ends; Side 2 Begins)

(Q: Herbert/Randy discussion)

RC: . . . There are some really discouraging quotes we could read.

AD: Let's hear 'em!

RC: I don't have them with me today. But it was interesting that one of the things he told me, I think I mentioned it before, about one of the things that we would have to do is point out that what he published so far in the books made it seem much too easy and that it is a very long-range project. And that for many people who are enthusiastic about getting started now, the culmination of this life's effort might be a realization that it will take them several lives to get what they've glimpsed.

AD: Permanent employment. (Q: laughter) I know because I told you the story about one of the fellows I knew when we first went to see PB. He was reading PB's *The Quest*. He told me let's take the summer off and get this quest over with. (Q: laughter)

RC: Was he a ripe soul?

AD: He was very RIPE. (Q: laughter)

HS: In one context, it's kind of like grace itself that you even hear of enlightenment, that you even hear of grace. That itself is a kind of grace. It's like a wondrous thing that you have a place to study, you get born in a physical, human being. The doctrine is around. All those things are fine and you can say actually it might not even be grace, it might just be karma. You were a social worker in a past life. But when you talking now, I don't really see any necessity, this is extreme, grace you say is all round, and grace will come, and you speak of one step toward, ten steps toward you will come.

AD: Yes, but you have to take that one step.

RC: The most realistic quote I have got on it speaks much more in terms of the ego's being able to receive as being the problem. And there's that one specific one that I read before where he talks about how . . . when the desire for the extinction of the ego is as sustained and continuous as its self-preservation formerly was. (Q: 8.4.358)

RC: The karma side is there always. What was the one you said about some king that spoke with the Buddha?

AD: The one I like best: "The ego worships itself." (Q: see Persp. p. 106, second to last para, & 8.3.133.)

[RC: Yeah.] I like that the best. Alright, we've got to call it quits. Pleasant nightmares.

[Audio File 1982 1020b Ends]