

CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
January 19, 1983
PB PARAS; EMOTIONS & ETHICS

TOPIC: PB Paras

SUBJECT: Emotions & Ethics

SUBSUBJECTS: Five Ethical Stages of Quest, Philosophy, "Who am I?" and "What am I?"

CONTENTS:

PB PARAS ON DEVELOPING CHARACTER; FIVE ETHICAL STAGES OF THE QUEST

**# YOUR PATH IS DETERMINED BY PAST CHOICES; THE SENSE OF ISOLATION IN
RECOGNIZING YOURSELF AS A UNIQUE VARIATION OF ONE MIND**

THE CORPOREALIZATION OF PHILOSOPHY

THE MYTH OF LINEAGE SUCCESSION FROM MASTER TO DISCIPLE

MORE ON THE CORPOREALIZATION OF PHILOSOPHY

PB PARAS ON THE QUEST, EMOTIONS AND ETHICS

**# TRANSCENDING THE WORLD-THOUGHT; THE NEED FOR "WHAT AM I" IN ADDITION TO
"WHO AM I"**

MORE PB PARAS ON EMOTIONS AND ETHICS

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives* [*Persp.*], published 1984-1988. Some Paul Brunton Notebook paras are, as of 2018, unpublished, and are noted as such.
- Paul Brunton, *A Hermit in the Himalayas*
- Vyasa, *Bhagavad Gita*
- Bible, Luke (17:21)

NOTES:

- Anecdotes about PB 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 *Living Wisdom*. 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, alters Subject, alters and expands

Subsubjects, alters and adds some Subheads to make more accurate, completes Book List, fixes errors/typos, adds new notes within transcript, reformats to accord with new conventions.

Readable edited transcript – V14.1r.

AUDIO FILES: 1983 0119a, 1983 0119b. [Note: “Tape” and “Side” refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

1983 01/19 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Emotions & Ethics
Readable Edited Transcript

PB PARAS ON DEVELOPING CHARACTER; FIVE ETHICAL STAGES OF THE QUEST

[Audio File 1983 0119a Begins]

PB: "He who is jealous . . . sense." (Persp. p. 73 only)

PB: "No one has the right . . . selfishness." (6.2.90)

PB: "Jesus' preachment . . . wisdom." (6.2.129 & Persp. p. 76)

DB: (question = 1 min.)

PB: "'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' . . . game of life." (6.2.103)

(Student discussion on the actions of the sage and love = a few minutes.)

PB: "The act of renunciation . . . perception." (6.2.154)

PB: "How can we renounce . . . one." (6.2.155)

PC: . . . one we read last week?

(Student discussion = a few minutes)

PB: "'Hatred ceaseth not by hatred,' declared the Buddha . . ." (6.2.136, para not finished, read up to ". . . their actions.")

HE: . . . One of the first ones you read.

RC: One of the first ones? (He starts looking.)

AD: Randy, did you ever hear of infinite regress? (laughter) You'll be going backward all (the time).

RC: What would you like to do?

AD: Keep going ahead.

RC: Ok.

AD: Keep reading.

PB: "The fundamental test and final measure . . . actions." (Persp. p. 72 only)

PB: "All those points of . . . second." (6.1.10)

PB: "The pursuit of moral excellence . . . valuable." (6.1.52 & Persp. p. 67)

DB: Could you please repeat that?

AD: Don't worry--you're going to read all these things over and over again, many and many a time.

PB: "The pursuit of moral excellence . . ." (reread)

PB: "There are five ways in which the human being progressively views his own self and consequently five graduated ethical stages on his quest. First, as an ignorant materialist he lives entirely within his personality and hence for personal benefit regardless of much hurt caused to others in order to secure this benefit. Second, as an enlightened materialist he is wrapped in his own fortunes but does not seek them at the expense of others. Third, as a religionist he perceives the impermanence of the ego and, with a sense of sacrifice, he denies his self-will. Fourth, as a mystic he acknowledges the existence of a higher power, God, but finds it only within himself. Fifth, as a philosopher he recognizes the universality and oneness of being in others and practises altruism with joy." (6.1.53 & Persp. p. 67)

AH: What's the difference between the materialist and the enlightened materialist?

DB: One's rich. (laughter)

(Several minutes student discussion on above quote and about the will.)

SD: In recognizing the impermanence of the ego, in a more common usage, that's just being aware of death, and a lot of the ascetics, a lot of the monks were constantly reminding themselves of that.

AH: Wouldn't that refer to the third one, the religious stage?

AD: They (couldn't) be simultaneously in one and the same person.

NH: What do these stages refer to again?

PB: "There are five ways in which the human being progressively views his own self and consequently five graduated ethical stages on his quest. . . ." (reread)

NH: So really to put ethics over any other form of inquiry, say philosophy or whatever, is really irrelevant because in each stage you have to go through an ethical development, so you can't really place a hierarchy.

DB: The point in the previous quote was that ethical development was in some sense immeasurably more valuable than any one of the mystical states. It was longer lasting, more efficacious, more indispensable. It seems you could get familiar philosophically with a lot of ideas and even have some sort of mystical experiences, and still have the character of a snake. In terms of what he's defining spiritual unfoldment to be, the ethical part is primary.

AD: Do you think a person will undertake that ethical development unless he's been given some guidance from within? And if that's so, then which would you give priority to?

JB: You mean it's prior, that the guidance from within came first?

AD: If you don't get a glimpse, let's say, or some kind of intuitive guidance from within, that this is the right thing to do, you won't do it. So now which would you give priority to--to the stage of ethical development and the character unfoldment, or to the glimpse, which is almost a necessary prerequisite to

bring that about? Or do you have instances that that you can show me where a person undertook an ethical development without a glimpse, or without some inner enlightenment?

StDm: How would you get that glimpse if you didn't work for it? Don't you meditate and work towards getting a glimpse?

AD: Yes.

StDm: And you have to live a certain way in order to be able to receive that glimpse?

AD: If you take someone like Brother Lawrence, for instance, who was a soldier of fortune, or Ignatius-- and they didn't exactly live an exemplary life--and a glimpse came to them and they change their way about(s).

StDm: Well, they had to live a certain kind of life--I mean they weren't criminals--

AD: Soldier of fortune? They were mercenaries! I was just asking a question. I'm not proposing to answer it.

StDm: Well, what you're saying there is that you can do anything.

AD: Well, we do, don't we? (laughter)

StDm: Well, pretty much, and we don't get very far, either.

AD: The reason is because we don't have an intuitive guidance precisely--

StDm: Maybe if we follow some of the doctrines that are laid down--

AD: But then that already presupposes some kind of grace has been shed--or, you're not going to follow a doctrine.

NH: It seems from that description that the glimpse has to come first, but there are people like Eleanor Roosevelt who led an exemplary life but didn't appear outwardly to have had a glimpse, but something did drive her on to live that kind of life, but it seemed to be unconscious, an unconscious glimpse?

(inaudible student remark and laughter)

AD: Let's go on. (more laughter)

PB: "The aspirant must begin by examining himself . . ." (2.4.1.)

YOUR PATH IS DETERMINED BY PAST CHOICES; THE SENSE OF ISOLATION IN RECOGNIZING YOURSELF AS A UNIQUE VARIATION OF ONE MIND

PB: "Some have the illusion that the Path is heavily trodden. It is not. "Many are called but few are chosen." The traveller must learn to walk resignedly in partial loneliness. The struggle for certain truth and the quest of the divine soul are carried on by every man and must be carried on in an austere isolation when he reaches the philosophic level. No crowd progress and no mass salvation are possible here.

"There is and could be no such thing as a sect in philosophy. Each of its disciples has to learn that there is only one unique path for him, dependent on his past history and present characteristics which

constitute his own individuality. To attempt to forego that unique individuality, to impose the spiritual duty of other persons upon himself is, as the *Gita* points out, a dangerous error. Philosophy tries to bring a man to realize his own divinity for himself. Hence it tries to bring him to independent thinking, personal effort, and intuitive development. This is not the popular way nor the easy one; it offers no gregarious comfort or herd support. But it is the only way for the seeker after absolute truth. Though the solitary student may suffer from certain disadvantages, he also enjoys certain definite advantages.

“In any case, man never really escapes from his essential loneliness. He may push his social efforts at avoidance to extremes and indulge his personal ones to the point of creating illusions, but life comes down on him in some way or other and one day forces him back on himself. Even where he fancies himself to have achieved happiness with or through others, even in the regions of love and friendship, some physical disharmony, some mental change, some emotional vacillation may eventually arise and break the spell, driving him back into isolation once more.” (Persp. p. 10 only)

JohnL: Randy, do you think that is an inner movement or a question of decision?

LR: Is what an innermost?

JnL: Choice of your own path, what is appropriate for yourself.

LR: Isn't it the result of karma and those other factors? . . .

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1983 0119a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

RC/AH/

RC: There's a lot of quotes in different sections--the very first thing in the notes--in the first section is called an "Overview of the Quest," and the very first subhead is "Its Choosing," and there's a lot of material in the fourth book in the library now, where most of those quotes are coming from. He seems to talk about it in terms of the choice that one does make. Once it's made, then it can't be escaped, that you could decide to do differently for awhile, or try to differently for awhile, but eventually, the choice that you made that got you started, imposes on you through outer circumstance or an inner reawakening to get back to doing what you started.

(JG/RC/JL/JB/= less than 1 min.)

JnL: My question was more directed towards the determinability of one's individual way.

RC: The determinability?

JnL: Yes.

SDx: It seems he's asking will you know what is right for you, as opposed to is it something deep within that you might make the wrong choice about? Is that what you said? (hard to hear)

JnL: No. What is right for you--

AD: John, it's not a determinable, it's not determinable, it's already determined.

JnL: I thought that.

AD: You already made your choices.

JnL: Then there's a question of choices.

AD: No question of what?

JnL: Choices.

AD: No, you already made them.

JnL: What does that do with effort on one's own part?

AD: I don't understand.

LR: I don't see how that contradicts--the fact that your path has already been determined doesn't preclude, doesn't contradict the fact that certain efforts are made. In other words, once the direction is determined, the effort still has to be made. You know PB has a quote: "You may not have any idea of what you're doing or how to do it, but you may know that you're headed in the right direction." (Q: paraphrase, see 2.3.10-17) It seems to say that the effort part is not contradicted by the fact that a certain direction is determined.

JeffL: What do you mean by path--direction or a particular approach? I think that's a question. Is the path being on the quest or a particular path on the quest that's predetermined?

RC: If you think of the quest as directed towards anything but your own true being--you have to think of it as you are what you're looking for, and it's a matter of--how to get back to that will vary for each individual because of the karma that's been made by that individual that's steering it right now.

St: . . .

RC: I think what's predetermined is the fact that that has to be done. What you have to do is different from what someone else has to do.

(AH/BS/JnL/RC/LR/RC/HE/RC/= 2 min.)

AH: What I remember from the quote, is that the absolute prerequisite for the highest philosophic truth is the acceptance of this isolation, and if one isn't able to accept that on one's own, then the world presents you with it. I really would like to hear that quote again, unless you'd rather not read it--

PB: "Some have the illusion . . ." (reread)

JB: Every man has this--it's a priori about man, whether he's on the path or not.

AH: He does quite clearly say at the beginning of the quote that this applies to that one who's attained to (the) philosophic level.

JB: But here (later in the quote), he says man, in any case, will return to loneliness.

RC: I think that's valid in the sense that loneliness is what you're trying to escape. . . .

LR: This is a very interesting idea to juxtapose with the earlier idea, of the highest stage of love, where you realize all Overselves to be the same as yours. . . .

JB: It shows how mean the trick is. It's a mean trick to motivate us principally by the fear of our isolation, in order to hide the fact that we're all one.

LR: Somehow I don't think that's a trick. The question is, when you realize that the essential nature of every other being is one with your own Overself, are you then less lonely? Or less alone?

JB: (inaudible)

AD: Jonathan, why not look at it this way--if each person, per-so-na, each person is a unique variation of the one mind, then you have both: you have the isolated individual, insofar that he is that special version, and you have the one mind, which includes all of them at the same time.

JB: So isolation might persist even in oneness? I wouldn't feel that uniqueness as an experience of isolation--just to imagine what it would be like, that's why I asked Linda . . .

AD: Then why call it uniqueness?

LR: (inaudible)

RC: I think on a personal level that type of insight does bring in a certain sense of isolation, because your common ground with other personalities has been largely sublated. And many people who you might have felt a common ground with on the level of the personality, is taken away--that they can't understand why you've changed, and they're not interested in opening up any kind of change in themselves. There's one quote (paraphrase): "In the realm of feeling, the perception of the highest truth comes in terms of the conjunction of the opposites." Insofar as you continue to persist with the simultaneous awareness of both levels--he talks about the sage having much more sympathy for the universal rather with some particular individual.

AH: . . . If there is this one truth, this one mind, and unique individuals who approach it in varying degrees, it's translated in accordance with that uniqueness and therein lies the isolation and loneliness. The fact that that one mind must be interpreted via A unique individual--I'm trying to see those two things juxtaposed--

AD: You can see them juxtaposed and also see them simultaneously, Andrew. If you see them juxtaposed, you'll get one feeling; if you see them simultaneously, you get another--and you merge the two.

AH: . . . Each sage expresses uniquely the truth that he has experienced.

AD: I'll go further, I'll say each person, and the meaning etymologically of 'persona'--is "that which makes an individual to be one through himself"--per-so-na. And each and every person is a variation of Mind. Now you don't experience that until you reach a certain philosophical level, and you recognize that this is what constitutes you as an individual--this special variation. Then on the other hand, since you experience yourself as this unique individual, or just ONE MIND, you have to, by definition, include all the others, too.

So you have both of these aspects simultaneously--they're both present. On the one hand, the diversity that you find in looking at all other persons, and on the other hand, the unique solidarity of being just ONE, when you turn inward.

DB: Could it be said that the essential loneliness that he speaks of, it doesn't start out as the feeling of isolation from the rest of humanity, but--

AD: I think the loneliness that he's speaking about you'd better keep distinct from the loneliness that you're acquainted with.

DB: . . . I was trying to ask about the distinction between a loneliness which each individual feels which he attempts to solve in one of a variety of forms, but is basically a sense of separation from the higher self. And that the sense of isolation that takes place once that has been made a reality--

AD: No, no, the sense of isolation in recognizing yourself as a unique variation of that one mind has to be separated and distinguished from the loneliness that you're speaking about down here.

DB: Yes, right. But what I'm asking about (is): is this sense of loneliness that we have at this level an unconscious awareness of our separation from that higher self, here?

AD: You could put it that way for now. (pause)

Those are extraordinary metaphysical statements he's making.

RG: He says in the quote that it's the loneliness of the seeker IN the quest and not necessarily the loneliness of what he experiences in the attainment.

AD: Well, if you start the reading from where he speaks of the philosophic student, the philosophic level:

PB: “. . . The struggle for certain truth . . . constitute his own individuality.” (Persp. p. 10, repeat)

JB: That refers to the higher sense of isolation.

RC: Yes. There's a change that took place in the Christian Bible not too long ago, at that point that Christ says to the disciples that the “kingdom of heaven is within you” has been changed to “the kingdom of heaven is AMONG you.” [Note: Bible, Luke, 17:21.] And something is different. (laughter) (Q: Refers to various modern Bible translations--International Standard Version, New American Bible, etc.)

AD: (inaudible)

THE CORPOREALIZATION OF PHILOSOPHY

PB: “The initiation into wisdom--if it is to be lasting--is not suddenly given by any master; it is slowly grown by the experiences and reflection of life. Thought is gradually converted into habit, and habit is gradually merged into high character. The philosophic attitude, if it is to be genuine, will pass into the student's nerves and move his muscles.” (20.3.193)

EC: . . . In the *Hermit in the Himalayas*, PB talks about being ALONE but not being lonely, a lot.

RC: Yes.

AmyC: Do you think that's a spiritual evolutionary evolution? Do you think that's like a process of evolution of the quester?

RC: Yes, I think “Thought is gradually converted into habit” means that you consciously develop good vasanas and then those good vasanas make it possible for you to have a more transparent receptivity to the guidance of the higher Soul, and consequently through that--

AC: To the extent that all of your actions are led by the higher.

RC: Exactly.

AC: Literally, all your actions are dictated by the higher.

AD: Philosophy becomes corporealized, (in) the body. (Q: not clear if ‘in’ is on the tape.)

LR: You say that it moves into the nerves, and then moves the muscles?

AD: It becomes corporealized, LITERALLY. You become that, your body becomes that attitude.

(Less than 1 min. student comments)

THE MYTH OF LINEAGE SUCCESSION FROM MASTER TO DISCIPLE

RC: We (Q: RC & PB) talked at one point about the myth of succession--the lineages that you hear so much about, the master passing on to his successor who his successor is going to be. PB just said that that’s not possible. It can’t be done. If the individual disciple is able to recapitulate within his own being the attainment of the master, then he can be said to be his successor. But the master couldn’t possibly give it to him.

(Less than 1 min. student remarks)

LR: So it’s mythological when a sage speaks about giving up his powers to some other being?

LG: There must be something that’s passed on. (inaudible)

RC: (inaudible)

LR: (inaudible) To what extent-- I’m thinking specifically of the story of Ramakrishna and Vivekananda.

AD: Well, you have to understand what that means, Linda, the (transference(?)) of the master’s power, you have to understand. Don’t take for granted that the words delivered any meaning.

LR: I’m trying to understand specifically what that means. Can you help?

AD: No. (laughter from class)

AC: . . . Zen monk . . .

AD: What is that, a bird speaking up there? (laughter)

AC: . . . The master gives him the answer. You just told it the other day. The story about--

RC: Oh, yeah.

AC: Isn’t that a good example?

RC: There was an old monk who'd been with a master in a Zen monastery for a very long time. They were very close--at least it appeared that they were very close to all the other people in the monastery. And then the master died, and it was just assumed that this fellow was his successor. And then one day another master came, and said he had been sent to take over where the other master left off. And the old monk said that he was welcome to come, and they started to talk in terms of what the different people there would need, and things along those lines, and the new master said, "Well what about you?" And he said, "Well, the old master gave me the essence of Buddhism and you should be more concerned with the others." The master that had just come said, "Well, please tell me, what is the essence of Buddhism?"

And the old monk smiled and said, "The Lord of Fire never burns himself." And the new guy just rolled on the ground laughing, rolled around. This was in front of all the other disciples, he was just calling this guy such a jerk. The guy was so embarrassed anyway that he left. Anyway, several years had passed, and he went through a lot of suffering and came back.

HS: Randy, which guy left?

RC: The old guy.

VM: They all left! (laughter)

RC: And he came back, and after going through a lot of difficulty, he came back several years later and finally decided that he in fact was not enlightened, and he hadn't received the essence of Buddhism, despite his former master's ability to transmit it, and he humbly returned to the monastery, and asked the new master to please carry on with his instruction. And the new fellow said, "Let me give you the essence of Buddhism"--he repeated exactly the same thing, but that time it worked, the fellow had to go through the whole purging.

JB: So in this quote PB says "to be permanent it can't be given by a master" which means you have to make it your own, and then it's ok to get a gift. It's ok to receive help from a master, but to make it permanent you have to OWN it.

(LR/PB (one sentence)/JB/RC/JB/RC/= 2 min.)

MORE ON THE CORPOREALIZATION OF PHILOSOPHY

HS: What does it mean that philosophy is in the nerves? Is that in the quote?

PB: "The philosophic attitude . . . muscles."

HS: Yes, what does that mean? Could you do a gloss on that?

(AH/LR/HS/RG/JB/= 2 min.)

AD: You're getting a gloss, Herbie. (laughter)

RC: PB talks in terms of the necessity of taking a proper attitude in order to be open to certain types of inspiration.

HS: Ok, you want to be open to inspiration--let's say you got an emotional understanding--

AD: PB's saying there that the philosophic ideal that you're reading and studying has to be actualized in your character, in your very being, that's all he's saying. Don't worry about the nerve pushing the arms.

RC: . . . There's already an attitude that's in your nerves and moving your body.

HS: Well, for instance--

RC: And he's saying I want to make that attitude the philosophic attitude.

HS: But if the images, say, arise in the blood, you've got to, so to say, get into the blood, to get the incorrect images out.

SDx: Isn't there an understanding at this point that the body you have, the actual body, is a concretion of your past activity?

HS: What does that mean?

(SDx/MB/JG/= less than 1 min.)

AD: Let's go on.

(More student's discussion on body, mind, behavior = 2 min.)

RC: PB was so--in terms of his body--he would know, a few minutes after he put something in his mouth, if he wanted to take in any more of it or not--because it either disturbed the equilibrium of his body or it didn't. It enhanced his ability to do something he wanted to do or it interfered with it.

And he's actually aware of whether or not this particular thing at this particular time was going to help or hinder his ability to do what he wanted to do.

(Student discussion = 2 min.)

RC: He told me about a--that story (inaudible) of a Japanese Zen teacher who had a disciple. He told this guy that he had an opportunity for sanctification, that this student was going to have the opportunity of sanctification in a year, and that during that year he should be EXTREMELY careful about what he ate, what he drank, how many liquids, what kind of solids he took into his body.

(Student discussion = 4 min.)

[Audio File 1983 0119a Ends]

[Audio File 1983 0119b Begins]

PB PARAS ON THE QUEST, EMOTIONS AND ETHICS

PB: "At the beginning of each temptation . . . of it." (Persp. p. 72 only)

AD: Alright, everybody could write a gloss on that. (laughter)

PB: "To the degree you keep ego . . . more." (6.5.315 & Persp. p. 78)

PB: "We may first take to this quest . . . existence." (Persp. p. 5 only)

PB: "This is the power . . . wisdom." (22.2.102)

PB: "We can depend on making a correct ethical choice *always* . . . mercy." (6.1.347)

AH: Feelings are not a suitable vehicle for ethics, because they're at the mercy of something other than a philosophical basis.

RG: The same claim could be made about the will and thought as not on a philosophical basis.

AH: What's left?

RG: Only the philosophical basis; none of the functions.

PB: "Ethical practice . . . precept." (6.1.132)

(Student discussion = 10 min.)

TRANSCENDING THE WORLD-THOUGHT; THE NEED FOR "WHAT AM I" IN ADDITION TO "WHO AM I"

PB: "To the degree that we are able to transcend the world-thought within our consciousness, to that degree we are able to transcend the gravitational force of worldly desire itself. But this presupposes a knowledge of the mentalistic doctrine. Therefore, even in the sphere of ethics can be seen the usefulness of such knowledge." (21.5.32)

PB: "Perceive these two things now: the dreamlike character of life in the world, and the illusory character of the personal ego. Hence the need of the "What am I?" enquiry, that the illusion of the ego may be dispelled. When you can see these things clearly, then you may be still and undisturbed, unentangled, and unillusioned amid the struggle of life. You will be wise, free, impervious to the petty persecution of men--their lies, malice, and injuries--for being no longer identified with the personality, you are no longer their target." (21.5.4)

AD: Let's have the glosses now.

(Student discussion = 8 min.)

AD: Tim, would you reread the first one?

PB: "To the degree that we are able to transcend . . . desire itself." (repeat)

AD: Alright, why don't we stop there, see what he's saying. What does he mean by "transcend the World-Idea"?

AH: What happens in our consciousness--insofar as it happens THERE is like making some distinction between the world-thought--to be in--as presentation.

AD: What does he mean by "transcending the world-thought"?

BS: Seeing it as a projection from the mind.

AD: Yes. In other words, to understand it. To understand it means that you recognize that it's an incessant repetition of an idea. And if it's an incessant repetition, like a cinematographic film, then you will not believe that it has reality. As long as your I-thought, or the ego, covers that interval that exists between

two of these thoughts, then the world will appear as a solid real thing to you. In other words, it will appear as reality to you, and if it appears as reality to you, it's going to have a lot of glamour. You're going to want it. Now in mentalism you understand that that's not the case. You understand that the world-thought is a projection instant-by-instant, of a thought. And in that sense, if you can understand it, you transcend it. You don't rise above it, you don't go up to the Amida spheres, you understand thoroughly, then you transcend it. Let's read the next one.

LR: Anthony, you interpret that to be world-image, the image that the ego takes to be other than itself.

AD: Yes.

PB: "Perceive these two things . . . ego." (repeat)

AD: Stop, stop. "Perceive these two"--the dreamlike thought and the illusory character of the ego. (pause) Well, if you understood the premise before, that the world is an incessant duplication, then naturally the ego would have to be of that illusory nature as well as the world-thought, wouldn't it? (pause) Well, come on, I like to hear your "gloss".

LDm: Isn't that saying the same thing as the first part of the other? In transcending the World-Idea it seems to be saying the same thing by seeing the world as a dream, and the ego as illusory is to see the World-Idea, which includes the ego, as mental.

AD: So now you're transcending both of them.

LDm: Transcending of the--?

AD: The way I just explained transcendence: When you understand something, for instance you see a mirage, you no longer go over there expecting to get a drink of water. You've transcended that. It doesn't mean you've taken a balloon and gone up high.

LDm: It more or less means transcending your conception of it.

AD: Transcending your conception of your ignorance. Finish it, Tim.

PB: "Hence the need of the "What am I?" enquiry . . ." (repeat)

AD: There's an interesting letter. Tim, I don't know if you remember. He wrote a letter to Alice Osborne, PB, which he never sent, and you know they had for a long time been penalizing PB about this here, when PB makes a remark, that Ramana's doctrine was incomplete. And he points out that in the East they've been constantly preoccupied with trying to understand the "Who am I", and that's legitimate, and that's part of philosophy. But it seemed that in the case of PB, being a Westerner, that he always found that that was only half, half the answer, because the other half of the answer was "What am I" and the "What" necessarily is included, as part of the World-Idea. And so the part, the Westerners were preoccupied with, an inquiry into what is the nature of the world-- Not only what is the nature of the "I" but what is the nature of the world. So he came in with the "WHAT am I" to complement the "WHO am I," and these two together would give us a complete picture of philosophy. But these people were so riled up that PB had made the remarks he did, that they never forgave him for that. And he didn't send the letter. How could you send a letter to people that are not philosophically-oriented, and don't want to know the

complete truth--they only want to know part of the truth--“Who am I”--they don’t want to know “What is the World.”

AH: Anthony, there’s these two things--the dreamlike quality of the life of the world and there’s the illusory quality of the ego. Now if you make the exercise--“WHAT am I” that’s referring specifically to the World-Mind’s thoughts. To say “WHO am I” is referring specifically to the individual mind’s thoughts--what’s being suggested? Because in another place PB describes the first task is to stop the thought of individual mind--and once that’s been accomplished, it’s necessary to stop the World-Mind’s thought, in terms of this training. In that distinction he’s coming out with here. But then we also speak about that presented World-Idea as INCLUDING the ego.

AD: Yes, but the World-Idea including the ego is something that is projected by the individual. It is HIS experience.

AH: My question is to see the illusory nature of the ego, is not necessarily to see the dreamlike quality of life in the world?

AD: Then you haven’t seen the illusory nature of the ego.

VM: To see one is to see the other. Is that so?

PB: “Hence the need . . . undisturbed . . .” (repeat)

TS: I think he’s speaking directly to your question. The “What am I” exercise shows the illusory nature of the ego, and the dreamlike quality of life in the world, these two are seen together, and as one of the results of the “What am I” exercise.

AH: In the “Who am I” exercise, what do you see?

TS: Well, I don’t know.

AD: The “Who am I” exercise leads you to the subjective Logos that’s operative within you, and will not give you an explanation of what the world is.

AH: Will it show you the illusory quality of the ego?

AD: No, I just said, it would lead you to the subjective Logos which is within you--so it would NOT explain what the nature of the World-Idea is.

AH: What is its efficacy if it can’t point out the illusory nature of the ego?

AD: It shows you what the real I is.

LDm: But won’t it also show you the real importance--“What am I”--it’s like showing you in a way the illusory nature of the world in a way shows you the real importance of the world in contrast--

AD: It does NOT explain the nature of the world to go into your subjectivity.

LDm: The “WHAT am I” explains-- If in contrast to the Eastern notion, many Easterners seem to be preoccupied with the “Who am I” and then tend to regard everything else as maya. Whereas the “What am I” seems to show also the importance of the world, even though in a way it’s polluted.

RC: These two things seem to correspond also to the fourth and fifth levels of the (first quote), that we conceive of ourselves progressively and they have their corresponding fourth and fifth levels of ethical development. The fourth being: He perceives the divinity but perceives it only within himself.

AD: Yes, you could make that correlation, Randy. That's why he considered Ramana and people of that nature more like mystics than philosophers.

RC: And the ethics that he has corresponding to the fifth is that "He practises altruism with joy" which is a very different ethical ideal than renunciation of the world.

AH: I would like to pursue the discussion. We hold the distinction between the individual mind-stream and the World-Mind's presentation. It's certain those two things are together, but we do make a distinction. Like the individual mind overlays this presentation--you know, that idea. But then you also said tonight "to see the nature of that individual mind's overlay or illusory quality is also to understand the nature of the World-Mind's dream-like quality." I don't really see that conclusion. I don't see why it's necessary. I can imagine that one would have the experience of the illusory quality of their own ego but that without dissolving the world into a dream . . . The distinction is a very blurred one.

TS: Doesn't it seem that the ego as a thought which is capable of being recognized as being illusory . . . is a thought which is part of the World-Idea?

AH: Yes.

(Student discussion = 5 min.)

RC: . . . Like the personality might have every reason to get angry, but if you're not identified with the personality, YOU don't have to get angry.

AD: Say that again?

RC: The personality might have every valid reason to get angry. A person might insult you, and the personality would normally take that as "I should react to this person," but if you're not identified with the personality--

BS: Then why shouldn't the personality get angry?

(student remarks through end of Tape 2, Side 1)

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1983 0119b Ends; Side 2 Begins)

MORE PB PARAS ON EMOTIONS AND ETHICS

PB: "Sufficient unto the day . . . time." (9.3.502 & Persp. p. 114)

PB: "From Lord Beaconsfield's novel: " . . . heroes."" (Persp. p. 72 only)

PB: "If a man becomes cold . . . philosopher." (6.6.10 & Persp. p. 73)

PB: "Rousseau taught . . . mixture." (6.1.360)

PB: "When this curious feeling . . . end." (13.1.228)

PB: "The philosophical discipline seeks to build . . . out." (Persp. p. 67 only)

PB: "If we lack the willpower . . . reasons." (6.4.69)

PB: "The disgruntled mind, which picks flaws in others by habit and complains about things by routing, which indulges in unrestricted fault-finding, jars on the nerves of its victims and poisons the blood of its body." (unpublished, 6v/283/62)

AD: Once more, Tim!

PB: "The disgruntled mind . . ." (reread)

St: Once more, Tim, with the feeling!

AD: Go ahead, Tim, don't pay attention to them. That's a gloss on what I just said.

JG: What's so funny?

AD: Private humor.

PB: "No decision, no action . . . same." (6.1.501)

PB: "No act is too trivial . . ." (unpublished, 6v/283/54)

AD: Thank you, Tim. Thank you, Randy. Do you want to continue next week? Let's give it another week.

RC: I think one of the things that's so overwhelming to me about this material is how much of it (there is).

AD: It's an observation on human nature.

RC: The outline that he made of the next book--that he had four chapters written for--he had one section in there, "Spike this with a lot of section 6 material."

AD: Well, the way we're doing it now, it'll be unadulterated.

[Audio File 1983 0119b Ends]