

CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
March 25, 1983
PLOTINUS; ONE

TOPIC: Plotinus

SUBJECT: One

SUBSUBJECTS: Astronoesis Working Draft (One: Dyad, Illusory Modification, Emanation),
Vivarta, Duality and Non-duality

CONTENTS:

**Reading of Astronoesis draft on One: Dyad, Illusory Modification, Emanation
throughout class (see Astronoesis pp. 30-37)**

Meaning of the One's 'actuality'

***Truth* of Intellectual-Principle and Soul are in One**

Manifestation and One

Self-sufficient and illusory

Ways of viewing One and its aspects

Gold and trinkets analogy (vivarta)

Gold-trinkets and star-emanating-light examples contrasted

Glowing-body-emanating-light example

Two views contrasted

Criticism of Vedantic view

Trinkets and gold as One's act & repose

Vivarta consequences and the ego

Humorous discussion: Does Brahman pay the rent?

Proper level of application of gold-and-ring analogy

One and universal relativity: philosopher-sage has both viewpoints simultaneously

Mind always expresses itself as universal manifestation

Both views needed, non-duality

**Consequences of dual standpoint to soul, i.e., soul always has an evolving principle
of manifestness, etc.**

**Don't deny the Intelligence within you, by which we can speak of these things; its
source is in the Absolute**

Source of principle distinguishing One from Many

Dual and non-dual

Vivarta and transformation emphasize passive and active perfection, respectively

BOOKS / MAGAZINES READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Anthony Damiani, *Astronoesis: Philosophy's Empirical Context; Astrology's Transcendental Ground* (published 2000)
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)
- Aristotle, *Metaphysics*
- *Shrine of Wisdom*, "The Simple Way of Lao Tzse," v, no. 18
- Fung Yu-Lan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, Volume 2, "Fa-tsang's *Essay on the Gold Lion*"

PLOTINUS QUOTES READ OR REFERENCED: V.4.1, V.5.11, VI.7.40, VI.8.16, VI.9.1, VI.9.5

ASTRONOESIS WORKING DRAFT, section on the One, read in this class. See *Astronoesis*, chapter on the One, p. 19 ff.

NOTES:

- 1983 03/25 = the Correct Year and Day. Verified 2018. A Friday. Class begins with discussion about the "simplicity of the One" which is the end theme of the previous Friday (1983 03/18) Plotinus class.
- Previously printed, distributed 2003 as part of a set.
- This class series on the One was held on Fridays.

TRANSCRIBED by jf 2002 from audio cassette tapes; reformatted by jf 2018. In 2024, IT updates prefatory matter and footer, replaces tape markers with audio file markers, expands Subsubjects, completes Book List, adds Plotinus quotes section, corrects typos and some listening errors, adds new notes within transcript, reformats to accord with new conventions.

Readable edited transcript with AD Paper – V11rp.

AUDIO FILES: 1983 0325a, 1983 0325b (formerly labeled 1983 0326a, 1983 0326b). [Note: "Tape" and "Side" refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

NEW FILE NAME

1983 0325a, b

OLD FILE NAME

1983 0326a, b

1983 03/25 at Wisdom's Goldenrod Plotinus; One

[Audio File 1983 0325a (formerly 1983 0326a) Begins]

AS: We left off, we're in the middle of this discussion on the simplicity of the One. We're still on that first point I believe, okay, and on the fact that it is in fact not just the simplicity of a point but infinite. And we had just read this passage on the fact that "no symbol can be really adequate to this Absolute but that 'there is some rough fitness in designating it as unity.'" [Note: See Plotinus, VI.9.5, third para from end.] Where we left off.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "In fact we cannot approach analytically the perfection, the self-sufficing completion of the One: the nature of Unity precludes any such possibility. In the strict sense, then, our approach is incorrect, but, based on Plotinus' reasoned revelations, we will conceive of the One as having indivisible aspects that we can examine one at a time in an effort to make them at least vaguely accessible to our understanding. We must learn to accommodate our mental processes to this expanding vision. So we will proceed in the unorthodox fashion of subjecting each of these indivisible "aspects" to itemization and description and will try to understand each and every one of them in a certain relative manner. Then, we may take either of two approaches to begin adjusting for our initial error. We may, on the one hand, speak of how these various aspects of reality fuse and interpenetrate one another. Or, through a second approach, we may try to think of each mode or aspect of the Unity as the entirety itself and then see how they *must* necessarily merge as undifferented Unity. Once we have done all this, and *only* after we have done all this, we cancel out the whole process of reasoning that has brought us this far and seek to plunge beyond our own rationality: that is, by a leap of the creative imagination, through inspiration from the life of the knowing principle, we are then to immerse ourselves intently and silently in this notion of an infinite life that is eternally and intrinsically complete and perfect.

"Any description of this perfect One is, admittedly, "as if"--to accommodate that level of mind that is constantly in the process of instantiation and transformation. The net result, however, of this exercise in ingenuity, this attempt to see the complete perfection from various angles, is an approach to one of the most mysterious, difficult, and yet absolutely pivotal ideas in the Plotinian teaching--that is, Power, or the Dyad.

"Plotinus characterizes the infinite and indeterminate Power of the One as both identical with the pure undifferented knowledge of the One and radiating from it. He seems, on the one hand, to treat the Power and the undifferented knowledge as synonymous. And on the other hand, he distinguishes them. The One must remain a simplex and yet it is the source of all distinctions and substance found in the All. Any approach to defining the One and explaining how it produces the all must call upon its power to simultaneously fulfill and sustain this double view, or ultimate paradox, which is ultimately non-dual. The way in which it is able to so becomes available through a proper understanding of this power."

LR: Would you read that again, the last, the part (inaudible)?

AS: You want to-- This actually gets into the next number.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): “The net result of this exercise in ingenuity, this attempt to see the complete perfection from various angles, is an approach to one of the most mysterious and difficult, and yet absolutely pivotal ideas--that is, Power, or the Dyad.

“Plotinus characterizes the infinite and indeterminate Power of the One as both identical with the pure undifferentiated knowledge of the One and as radiating from it. He seems, on the one hand, to treat the Power and the undifferentiated knowledge as synonymous. And on the other hand, he distinguishes them. The One must remain a simplex and yet it is the source of all distinctions and substance found in the All. Any approach to defining the One and explaining how it produces the all must call upon its power to simultaneously fulfill and sustain this double view, or ultimate paradox, which is ultimately non-dual. The way in which it is able to so becomes available through a proper understanding of this power.

“Power, as spoken of here, has a twofold meaning. It coincides with, and is the same as the One as when Plotinus refers to it as a “completing power” [VI.7.40, third para] which produces no new thing within the One. And secondly, the second meaning is that, that same power flows forth or emanates from the One. Excluded from the Godhead is any personal volition; the process is completely impersonal. Now the power that goes forth from the One is the ‘matter’ that is being shaped, and that means that this emanating power contains and reflectively includes the transcendent models and paradigms and the ideas.”

LR: Avery, could you reread that sentence again? I think I heard it wrong.

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): “The power that goes forth from the One is the ‘matter’ that is being shaped, the power that goes forth from the One is the ‘matter’ that is being shaped, and that means that this emanating power contains and reflectively includes the transcendent models and paradigms and the ideas.”

S: That word ‘reflectively’ there--

AS: He says the power that goes forth from the One-- I think that it means that it contains a reflection of those unities which are in the One.

S: Ah.

AS: Reflexively, maybe reflexively, that it, the emanating power contains a reflex, or a reflect, of all these unities.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): “Therefore, we may speak of this power as an externalization, or efflux, of the complex interiority of the indivisible aspects of the Supreme Perfection. This outflow of power thus includes self-determination that is, it is stamped from within and in this manner the Intellectual-Principle may be said to be molded or to be the matter of the One.”

S: Would you do that again please?

AS: Yup.

S: By self-determination, is the One taken to be the Self as determined?

AS: No.

S: No?

AS: Well, let me read--

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): "Therefore, we may speak of this power as an externalization, or efflux, of the complex interiority of the indivisible aspects of the Supreme Perfection."

AS: We start off--we said power has a twofold meaning: it coincides with the One and it's also this radiating or emanating power. Now in this second aspect, the power that goes forth from the One--

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "We may speak of this power as an externalization, or efflux, of the complex interiority of the indivisible aspects of the Supreme Perfection. This outflow of power thus includes self-determination, that is, it is stamped from within and in this manner the Intellectual-Principle may be said to be molded or be the matter of the One. The One imparts Being and Essence and the power to know--to whom does it impart it?"

VM: It seems that the Intellectual-Principle got identified with the Power or the Dyad.

AS: Yes, only in its out-- I think what he's saying is that in this outflow of power, the outflow of power takes shape as the Intellectual-Principle. Let me finish the last sentence. Consequently-- there's a star that says see the reverse side (inaudible).

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "Consequently, the Intellectual-Principle in its entirety will exhibit the transcendental paradigms or indivisible aspects of the super-knowledge, from which all the unities within Being are suspended."

S: What do you think that self-determination means? (inaudible)

AS: "This outflow of power thus includes self-determination"--Well, it's the outflow of the One, it's the emanation from the One and it's not determined by anything outside of itself, it carries within itself its own determination, the determination from the unities from which it outflows in the first place. And that's what will establish all the unities within Being-- like saying this power is this link. So within, it's an outflow from that interiority of unities in the One that is going to give rise to the unities within Being, the whole of Being.

S: So, again, does the self then refer to the One and the determination to Being? So the One determines Being in some sense?

AB: You would have to say that.

AD: Sure.

AS: Yes. That's reasonable. I don't know if I would take apart that word self-determination like that, but it sounds like the self is the One and the determination is the Intellectual-Principle. Or referring both to the power, and saying that the power itself is self-determined.

RG: Avery, could you elaborate the first aspect of the power? (AS inaudible) Okay.

AS: I'm pretty sure it's going to elaborate the first aspect. But the first aspect is just where the One, where the power coincides with the One and doesn't flow out, doesn't emanate.

RG: Right. But it's somehow a completing power.

AS: Somehow a completing--

RG: That's what you read.

AS: Remember that phrase--

RG: No-- yes, I don't know, I don't understand that. I don't know why I don't--

AS: Oh, maybe that will be elaborated.

RG: Okay, I'll wait.

AS: Completing, completed. There was that phrase was used before also--"the completing completed".

JfL: Yes, it was used for the outflowing, which is why it's (creative).

AS: No, I don't think it was.

JfL: No, not here but before--he said the completing aspect of the (inaudible).

AS: I know there was something on that last week with the completing completed but-- I don't believe it was on the outflow-- Well I think that part of the point was in this previous paragraph where it says, talking about the "attempt to see the complete perfection from various angles is an approach to the one of the most mysterious, difficult, and pivotal ideas, that is, the Power." In other words, in any approach to this interior perfection of the One, you're required to have some understanding of the meaning of the power. And not just power as outflowing, but power as that internal completion. And then further to say that that power which is an internal completion is not other than the very One itself, but it's the simplicity of the One, in reference to the infinite nature of the One itself. I think that's the only connotation right here to the completing power, I don't think it's yet elaborated that it's anything other than the One's completion or the unity of aspects. There's a lot, a lot of ways. The second one?

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "We are tentatively establishing this verbal distinction between the One and its issuing act for the sake of clarification, for these higher principles will be majestically duplicated within the realm of universal manifestation, and then again within its parts. Consequently, this distinction will ultimately give rise to the practical truth alongside the Only-Truth, and this will be the cause of much confusion and semantic obscurity in the relative sphere, if it is not made available to us now. For the problem of understanding the very nature of these principles and their precise application to the practical questions of philosophy is necessary in order to answer them.

"For Plotinus, then, the One and its Power stands first and foremost above all and simultaneously sustains and includes lesser levels of reality which are neither self-sufficient nor illusory. (AS to someone: There's more of it.) Through an understanding of this principle of Power, we can first make available to our minds what we refer to as the double truth--that is, the non-dual reality does not exclude the dualistic but includes and supports this value which is not annihilated by a blind and omnivorous, affectively supported intellect."

(short discussion about pronunciation of omnivorous)

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "--is not annihilated by a blind and omnivorous, affectively supported intellect.

"In tractate V.4.1 Plotinus tells us that: 'If the First is perfect, utterly perfect above all, and is the beginning of all power, it must be the most powerful of all that is, and all other powers must act in some partial imitation of it... the First Good, the Power towards all, how could it grudge or be powerless to give of itself, and how at that would it still be the Source?' And in V.5.11 he says that 'this unseen First is the source and principle of Being and sovereign over Reality.' And again in VI.9.1 he begins a discussion of the One with the statement that 'it is in virtue of unity that beings are beings.'

"We can see from these passages, chosen from among many others on the same theme, that, for Plotinus, perfection and self-sufficiency imply an abundance of power. When its concentrated fullness is described as an utter stillness, that stillness is not meant to imply any sort of corpse-like passivity or immobility, nor is it to be thought of as a luminously quiescent matrix of mere potentialities that must be brought to actuality by another agent. The One is fully actual. Inwardly pregnant with all that is ultimately true, it **produces** by its very perfection and infinite power, not through any need for a completion to be attained beyond or outside itself. It does not **need** creation; creation is the inevitable result of its super-abundance. Not only has it no need of its products, it has no need even of producing. Throughout all the production that inevitably ensues, the One remains unmoved; all possible production is already transcendently actual and accomplished within its own infinite power. This is Truth."

AS: Go back a little bit? To "The One is fully actual." (S: To before that to "unlimited possibilities"?)

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): "--nor is it to be thought of as a luminously quiescent matrix of mere potentialities that must be brought to actuality by another agent. The One is fully actual. Inwardly pregnant with all that is ultimately true, it produces by its very perfection and infinite power, not through any need for a completion to be attained beyond or outside itself. It does not **need** creation; creation is the inevitable result of its super-abundance. Not only has it no need of its products, it has no need even of producing. Throughout all the production that inevitably ensues, the One remains unmoved; all possible production is already transcendently actual and accomplished within its own infinite power. This is Truth."

DB: The final sentence where all production is transcendently actual --could you just reread that one sentence?

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): "Throughout all the production that inevitably ensues, the One remains unmoved; all possible production is already transcendently actual and accomplished within its own infinite power."

DB: I guess the question I have, is what does the transcendental there refer to in that sentence?

AS: No matter what emanates from the One it's already actualized, transcendently within it.

DB: Right, that's-- on the one hand you speak of the emanation from the point of view of the One, that's already internally or transcendently actualized. So does that mean that the emanation would be something other than the actualization within the One? Is that so?

VM: If you say transcending the point of view of emanation you see that the One has all possibilities completely actualized, simultaneously. Don't you think that transcendent could be understood in that sense?

DB: Well, the problem is that when--on the one hand I don't want to see the matrix of potentialities, it's more than that (inaudible) From the point of view of the One all its production is actualized, okay, but on the one hand what it is transcendent to is to is the production, so that it is-- I guess I don't understand problem, because I don't know if there are two things or one thing, which from the point of view of the One it's completely actualized. Do you see what I'm talking about?

RC: I wonder if there's an analogy at a much lower level. But if you had a vision of something that you were going to manifest, the fact that your manifestation is going to be short, there is always something missing at a given moment, that wouldn't deny that that what you were trying to manifest was completely actual, that's the realm that you were trying to draw upon as you manifest.

DB: I think I see what you're saying, Randy, but the problem is the question of the actuality of the vision, because from our perspective in that example there would be distinction between-- that vision would be in some sense potential whereas there's an actualized production or the production that you've spoken of as being actualized there. So on the one hand, if it's a production I don't see how it can be--

RC: The laws of manifesting would limit it, so in manifesting you would have to obey certain laws that apply to the realm of what you're trying to manifest is actually realizable. (hard to hear)

DB: So then on the one hand we have to speak of this transcendent actuality within the One and then speak of its manifestations, both--

AS: It's both--I think that's the point he is going to make, you have to have both points of view available and they seem contradictory at first. Because if you say if everything is actual within the One, then what need do you have for the manifestation? On the other hand you do have the manifestation or the emanations even while the One remains complete in itself. And these two views are brought about by that very first description of the Dyad, of power, that it remains within the One and it also emanates. (inaudible)

LdS: The point is that actuality is being used for both modes, but that's the point that the actuality means one thing for the One and actuality for manifestation means another thing. You can't use the same word actuality and be talking about two modes and mean the same thing by actuality.

RC: One of the points that he makes here is that it's really important to avoid making the One needing some other agent to bring it into completion. That actuality-- you have to conceive of it as being fully actual and fully complete, independent of any type of manifestation, any type of determinate Being.

S: Yet we don't want to get outside of the One. So how--

AS: You have to get outside of the One.

S: Well apparently in the words-- But is it meant that way? The question would be, and it's hard for me to phrase it, but is this manifestation or production of the One or of the power of the One, as Louis said there's a certain actuality about that, that seems to be distinct from the actualities we think of in the power

of the One. But does it also fool (student chuckles) --fall into the manifestation--does manifestation fall within the One itself? And if it doesn't, I'm having a hard time keeping the distinctions.

AS: I think the point of this paragraph anyway, it was already said, was that the One is fully actual is what he's saying. The point here is any manifestation can't be an actualization of something which is a potentiality in the One. In other words, you can't take any point of view which says there's some --let's say Being is potential in the One, the Intellectual-Principle is there but only potentially, and then that the actual being is an actualization of some potential within the One. And therefore that would imply that there could be some change of some state from what's within the One to what's out of the One. But I think he's making the point--

S: Or a lack.

AS: Or a lack, right. But he's saying that the One itself has to be conceived as fully actual, no matter what manifestation goes on, is irrelevant totally to the state of the One, to its full actualization. It adds nothing to it, it take nothing away.

JfL: Well, I thought more the point was that probably the emanation theory, I thought you were getting at how you could have the issuing act, and sort of have it distinct but still connected to the One. And in that way the issuing act wouldn't be independent but it also wouldn't be distinct. And I think emanation is what satisfies--I thought that was what --

AS: But then that question would become the next --this is talking more to the point of view of the One, from the point of the One, rather from the point of view of the emanated principles.

S: So when you speak of manifestation do you have a technical understanding of that as being something that refers to potentiality rather than actuality?

RC: Aristotle does this interesting thing--

S: Because that might not be--

RC: Aristotle does an interesting thing when he introduces the *Metaphysics*. He talks in terms of how, when you're speaking of a soul coming into knowing being, then it's appropriate for you to talk in terms of the movement from potential to actual. But that whole discussion you have to presuppose, you have to presuppose the permanent actuality of primary being that that transition from potential to actual is the way the soul is forced to operate, but the soul being about to operate that way presupposes the permanent actuality of what the soul's contemplating.

S: This being would also be potential? (several people talking at once)

AS: The being, knowledge-- I don't think the question here is one of being and knowing.

LR: You know that sentence where it says that the power is actually the matter and you had matter in quotes?

AS: Yes.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): “Now the power that goes forth from the One is the ‘matter’ that is being shaped, which means that this emanating power contains and reflectively includes the transcendent models.”

LR: Just that part, Avery. I think that’s important in what all these questions are about. I’m not sure-- I grasp what’s meant by matter there, but if you call that power which is both the same as the One and at rest with the One and also radiates out from the One, if you call that matter, then are you going to subsume everything that you later call matter under that power? Is that the implication? And if it is then it’s not as you saying there outside the One, the stuff which is being molded.

AS: I think your point is good, but I don’t think all those questions are at the point of the paragraph.

LR: No, I was talking to (inaudible). I thought by bringing in the word ‘matter’ there, there was an awful lot implied.

AS: But that was earlier. But right here I think the point of this paragraph is just to understand what it means by the fully actualizations within the One, or the perfection of the One. Because he says: “For Plotinus, perfection and self-sufficiency imply an abundance of power.” And he’s really getting his point of what is the nature of the One still, and not what is the nature of the emanation yet. First, this is back on the first view of power, the power remaining with the One, and not yet on the point of view of the power emanating from the One. As soon as you speak of the power emanating from the One, then you’re going to have to take a slightly different perspective although it’s based on that. But here it seems to just be talking about the power within the One. “The One is fully actual. Inwardly pregnant with all that is true” -- the production--It absolutely has no need of any production.

VM: On the other hand, that production is still included as one of the actualities in the One.

AD: No. Perfection.

AS: No, that’s --pardon--

AD: It’s the perfection. The truth of the Intellectual-Principle is in the One, the truth of Soul is in the One.

VM: When you say that all possibilities are actual in the One, you don’t mean by that to include the actual manifestation.

AD: The perfection, and the truth of that principle which you speak about, the Intellectual-Principle, its *truth* within the One. The truth of Soul is in the One.

VM: I want to keep everything in the One and I guess it’s kind of crowded in there.

AS: But if that’s so you wouldn’t need another point of view, if that were so, you’d reduce everything to One.

LR: No--

AS: Yes, because I think later you’ll see later that where these two--Linda, you’ve got to have two views--

VM: (inaudible) tending to the same point of view, she's saying look the power can be understood in some magical way or in some, let's say, clarified way as the matter, so then therefore all of manifestation is really taking place within this matter which is primarily an aspect of the One. So this way you keep it all in one nice bubble, and you don't have to worry about what's going outside the One. But he clearly doesn't want that--

AS: Well, that notion of matter as he said-- my other interpretation is bringing in of that as matter to the One is already talking the emanation. When you talk about power as emanating, or you talk about anything as emanating from the One, there you're going to bring in the notion of an analogy, to the so-called matter of the One. But in this first view of power where it's joined with the One and inseparable from it there's no notion of matter--because here is where there's absolutely no distinction. You're just talking about the perfection, and from this point of view you can't even speak of within the One any kind of manifestation. You have to bring in that other--the second aspect of power.

RC: Well, wouldn't you also say that the truth of anything manifesting is going to be in the One.

AS: Yes. That's what I think that Anthony was saying--the truth of Intellectual-Principle is there, the truth of Soul or the perfection of Soul or the unity of soul or the unity of the Intellectual-Principle. I think it's an attempt not to reduce everything -- the result of saying that not only the truth of Intellectual-Principle is in the One but the manifestness of it is there, is to reduce manifestation to an illusory manifestation.

RC: Why would that make it illusory?

AS: Well, then because it doesn't have a reality as a distinct principle.

S: Which is manifestation--

AS: Well, the Intellectual-Principle, the Soul, I think you're getting--

S: I hear what you're saying, but I think I wouldn't make the distinctions though.

LC: Do you have a sentence that mentions 'lesser powers'? One and its power stands--

Plotinus V.4.1 (AS reading): "If the First is perfect, utterly perfect above all, and is the beginning of all power, it must be the most powerful of all that is, and all other powers must act in some partial imitation of it."

AS: It doesn't say that there are no other powers. It says that they all act in some partial imitation of it.

LC: There was also something that said something about lesser powers-- not Plotinus?

VM: I thought it was lesser realities.

LC: I thought it was the paper. (AS: That may be--in this paragraph.) (inaudible) And it's saying something about the One and its power which kind of stand together and--

SC: Stands above and simultaneously contains them all? (AS inaudible)

JfL: I think it's the One and its powers sustains and indicates the lesser forms of reality.

AS: That's earlier, yes, the previous paragraph.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): “For Plotinus, then, the One and its Power stands first and foremost above all--”

AS: Now that’s the point of view of the power as inseparable from the One, the first view of power.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): “--and simultaneously sustains and includes lesser levels of reality which are neither self-sufficient nor illusory.”

AS: That’s elaborated later on, that’s that problem these two extremes of (inaudible). (LC inaudibly talking at same time) I think that’s elaborated later on, exactly how the lesser levels of reality are neither self-sufficient nor are they illusory. They’re not self-sufficient because they depend on the One’s power; they’re not illusory because they are real levels.

LC: Yes.

AS: Although of lesser reality.

JfL: Well, that’s the whole issue of the emanation, it’s not stretched out a One--yet they’re not distinct. (LC keeps saying “right”) I think that’s what everyone was confused about, picking up on.

AH: You know, tonight’s discussion provokes the same question that I had in last week’s discussion, the notion of Infinite Life, and the Infinite, I think Louis touched on it earlier tonight. The context --the words--there seem to be a necessity to change the meaning of words for the point of view of the One and for the point of view of its emanation. But at the same time retain --well, the only thing left to say is that it retains some kind of meaning to have to have you change the meaning in words. And I guess I still don’t understand what that means. Just the most general sense, like-- I’m just very confused about how one should approach and understand this issue. In my case, is it to be approached from a logical standpoint? Or, from the suggestion earlier in tonight’s reading, at some point the rational process has to concede its inability to grasp this meaning.

AS: I think, Andrew, relevant to that previous, was one of the first ones of the paragraphs where he says, “We proceed in an unorthodox fashion to subject each of these indivisible aspects to itemization and description.” So that’s his methodology, how he’s going to proceed. And of course this is rational (inaudible): “We will try to understand each and every one in a certain relative manner, and then we may take one of either two approaches to begin adjusting for our initial error” --the initial error being that there aren’t really different powers.

VM: From the perspective of the One.

AS: From its perspective. So how are we going to adjust for this? We have two possible approaches to adjust-- “We may on the one hand speak of these various aspects fusing and interpenetrating” or the second approach “we may try to take each mode or aspect of unity as entirely itself.” As an entirety itself. “Now once we have done all this, and only after this, we cancel out the whole process of reasoning that has brought us so far and seek to plunge beyond our rationality.”

AH: So prior to the plunge is the necessity to approach this issue in the unorthodox way of training the understanding in one of-- in two ways. Can you articulate again what those two ways are?

AS: Well, after trying to understand each indivisible aspect, alright, itemizing them and describing them, then you somehow have to try and see them all fused or merged back into unity. And you can either do that through trying to see how all of these aspects, all views interpenetrate one another.

RC: So the distinctions within the plurality all lapse--all together.

AS: Right, the meltdown. Or--through a second approach, may "try to take each mode or aspect as the *entirety* itself."

RC: All of the One being implicit in each of these aspects.

AS: "And then see how they *must* necessarily merge as undifferented Unity. Only after we have done this, then we can cancel out the whole process." So it's really three steps-- First you have the distinct--the paper says (inaudible) distinguish all of these distinct aspects as if we were examining something that really did have different parts and aspects to it. Then, we have to cancel out that error, namely the One isn't such a thing that has distinct parts. So how are we going to take all these things we just examined as if they were separate, and try and put them back into the One. Well we could either understand it, as Randy was saying, melt them all down together, or take each one as being the entirety in itself, and seeing how they like coincide internally, or that they melt down externally.

RC: It seems that you're doing that not so much as to get a clearer concept of the One, but that you're trying to change the mode of your own consciousness into a mode which is capable of being identical.

AH: Yes. It's a transformative way of using the concepts for sure, because those two ways that are being suggested are actually contradictory.

AS: Um--

AH: (You have--)

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1983 0325a (formerly 1983 0326a) Ends; Side 2 Begins)

S: (What is this?)

RC: And so for something to be true and to be a paradox was for it to be beyond the reach of that mode of intellect.

S: But implying that you have to hold both in mind while you're making (that decision) and apart from that mode of consciousness.

RC: Yes.

S: Yes. Holding both.

AS: You have to see whether you actually *can* do both.

AH: This is very helpful to put (it) in this context, (looks like) make one further comment: is it as if, in case of all dilemma(s) that have to be dealt with logically, there's A and B. The only way reconciliation occurs is a third point of view that (S: Includes (inaudible).) includes the bulk of that. (some chuckling)

AD: Includes-- No. No. Go on now. No. That would be Hegel's synthesis.

AH: Well, I was going to suggest, Anthony, that third point of view is not a point of view in the same qualitative way this dilemma's being presented here.

AD: If you say that the third point of view is not a point of view, alright--

AH: It's a resolution but not at the level of A and B.

AD: It's a resolution because it's *not* a resolution.

AS: It leaves it a mystery. I mean so that's the-- PB makes that point a lot in his notes there. The resolution can't resolve it, it has to leave it as a mystery. I think this-- I think that maybe it gets into that later on.

AD: Go on a little bit more. Go on a little bit more.

AS: Okay. So, we're on this point of power.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "In considering this Power which we conceive as identical with the One's own nature, a two-fold character of the One is observable. On the one hand, we see it as the utter stillness or passive perfection of the Transcendent. On the other hand, we see its infinite Act, its sheer indeterminacy, and the profundity of its infinitely unlimited activity as a self-tendance eternally achieved. And this he tells us in VI.8.16: 'That his being is constituted by this self-originating self-tendance--at once Act and Repose--becomes clear if we imagine the contrary; inclining towards something outside of Himself, He would destroy the identity of his being. This self-directed Act is therefore his peculiar being, one with Himself. Thus, he created Himself because his Act was inseparable from Himself.'

"Here we find a presentation of these two ultimate principles, act and repose, within the One's own self-nature. Unavoidably polarized by our own thought to make them available to our understanding, these two ultimate complementarities must nonetheless be recognized as **coinciding** within the One's absolute completion. This paradoxical theme is an exquisite mystical vagary, one that is universally diffused in statements of the perennial philosophy. Our appreciation of it can be broadened or deepened by correlating it with similar views such as active and passive perfection, yin and yang, substance and function, and so on. The words of Lao Tzu also have a similar flavor: 'How unfathomable is Tao! An infinite depth, the Source of all that is--the Ancient Progenitor, before all things. Yet how pure and still is Tao!' [Shrine of Wisdom, "The Simple Way of Lao Tzse," v, no. 18, p. 10]

"When Plotinus attempts to describe to us something about the eternal status and completeness of the interiority of the Simplex, his speech accommodates our limited mode of understanding. That which is eternally achieved is expressed in terms of temporality and causality. But these terms must cancel themselves if we are to be graced with some intuitions into the timelessly fixed, perfect, and complete interiority of the One. If we do not keep this in mind, we will arrive at the mistaken notion that the Eternal One is in the process of evolving and improving along with the development of the World-Idea.

"In seeking, by means of these passages, a glimpse of the incomprehensible nature of the One, the intellect must be like a bird which leaves no trace in flying through the air: the intellect's own operations must dissolve back into the stillness into which it is advancing.

"It is axiomatic, then, that the One-Only and the totally complete perfection must be taken as literally synonymous. Within the One itself there can be no changes or processes, no operations, arrangements, or combinations of any sort--not even the universal relativity of Forms found in the

Intellectual-Principle. Bearing all this in mind, we must hold firmly that the One is in no way becoming anything. Therefore, when Plotinus speaks of the perfection of the One and the Act included within it, we are not to conceive that *first* stillness reigns and *then* it is rearranged, as though a fixed number of blocks in a container are shuffled about until the contents are perfectly ordered according to some plan that involves time. Such thinking is inadequate to the notion of the One's perfection and the Act that is indivisibly included within it.

"It may be possible to supply our demanding egotistical intellect with a description or definition of the One that will swallow up the intellect. Let us consider an example. If we could take the totality of all ideas, for instance 10 or 100 and permute and combine them so that each and every possibility is actualized and fully exploited, we would arrive at a sum total that represents in essence their final product. Further, if we could then think of this final product as the undifferentiated, homogeneous unity of the substance of these ideas, we would have produced in our thought an inconceivable, unthinkable, ungraspable, indescribable intelligence that would repudiate all its prior elements, *including the power* necessarily involved. In this coinciding of unlimited function and infinite substance, active and passive perfection are identical, and now we have a view that permits us to conceive of Nirguna Brahman or the mystery of the One."

LR: Can you read that example again, Avery?

AS: Sure.

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): "If we could take the totality of all ideas, for instance 10 or 100, and permute and combine them so that each and every possibility is actualized and fully exploited, we would arrive at a sum total that represents in essence their final product. Further, if we could then think of this final product as the undifferentiated, homogeneous unity of the substance of these ideas, we would have produced in our thought an inconceivable, unthinkable, ungraspable, indescribable intelligence that would repudiate all its prior elements, *including the power* necessarily involved. In this coinciding of unlimited function and infinite substance, active and passive perfection are identical, and now we have a point of view, a view that permits us to conceive of Nirguna Brahman or the mystery of the One."

AD: Just a little bit more.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "But let us reverse the position; let us assume, or rather reaffirm with the philosophic mystics, that the First--pure intelligence--is, in other words, that the Idea of Ideas is. What consequences would follow? Would the other aspects of Brahman be transformations of the First, or would these lesser principles be part of the First, and thus making of the One a thing of parts, or would the lesser principles be illusory manifestations of it?"

MW: Can you reread those possible consequences? (AS: Yes.)

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): "Let us reverse the position; let us assume, or rather reaffirm with the philosophic mystics, that the First--Pure Intelligence--is, in other words, that the Idea of Ideas is."

AD: In other words, the totality of those possibilities which would combine to produce the whole. In other words, Michael, you think of all the Ideas, ten Ideas, combined in all these various ways to produce this

homogeneous idea. So you walked up to it, so to speak. Now, make **that** your starting point. Alright, do you follow the point?

MW: Yes.

AD: Now, you can't, you can't, so to speak back off, you can't say well now I'll **decompose** these things and find out what constitutes the One. That's what I mean when that you use conceptual thought to bring you to a position alright, where once you see that position then it cancels out everything that went before it. Now you have the concept of a pure intelligence.

MW: So these consequences that are being described are all basically incorrect ways--

AD: Now you if you say that the Intellectual-Principle is an illusory modification of this, or if you say it's a transformation of this, you can see how absurd the results are going to be. We're going to go right into that right now.

AS: And these two, the example and the consequent reverse position should also give rise to these two points of view that we would have to keep in mind. One the point of view of the absoluteness of the One, and the other the point of view of the multiplicity of aspects, the ideas.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "What consequences would follow, of starting from the reverse position? Would the other aspects of Brahman be transformations of the First, or would these lesser principles be part of the First, and thus making of the One a thing of parts, or would the lesser principles be illusory manifestations of it?

"To try to illustrate this theory more clearly before going on with our discussion, we will use two examples as possible ways of understanding how Absolute Mind can give rise to a many. The first example, the first is the much used example of pure gold being made into various trinkets. In this example, Mind itself has the power to modify or transform itself into these various forms, and the Pure Mind, or gold, through its own functioning, has a running identity in the various appearances or aspects of itself. Its being or substance (gold) and its function or production (the forms) are only nominally distinct. All the trinkets are actually the gold--which stands here for the Absolute--and there has never been anything but the gold, the forms being illusory modifications of the gold.

"As a second physical example, we can consider a very hot semi-transparent body and think of the glow or radiation of that body as its emanation. We must imagine that the body has its source of energy internal to and inseparable from it, heating it to the point of incandescence and causing it to emit a light. Even though it is inadmissible physically, we must imagine that the power source of this body is infinite and unfailing. Now the emitted light, an offspring of this body, will disclose a great deal of information about the structure of the glowing body. The spectrum or precise amount of light emitted at each frequency can be analyzed, and it will depend only on the nature of the glowing body. The modern description of the emission would be in terms of quantum mechanics, which, with its very Pythagorean use of numbers, would characterize in precise terms the structure of the glowing body. We can quite accurately say then that the emitted light is a direct emanation of the structure of the glowing body, which is revealed through spectral analysis of the light, and, at the same time, we can see that the emission is quite clearly distinct from the original.

"In the example, the second example, the glowing body is the analog to the One, with the infinite energy representing its inherent, inseparable Power. The glowing body itself--for example, a star--is

unavailable in itself for analysis, although it has a complex internal structure. The radiating glow is analogous to the emanation of the One--the Intellectual-Principle--which, as in the example, includes a structure that is coordinated by Number. In the example, the emanation is distinct from the original, and this is the first point. Secondly, the structured spectrum of the emanated light does reveal to us something of the inner nature of the glowing body, representing the One, which was otherwise unavailable. Just as the physicists study the emitted light to investigate the nature of the radiating body, that nature being internal and homogeneous with the body, so the philosopher contemplates the Intellectual-Principle, the emanation of the One, to obtain some insight into the inaccessible interiority of the One."

S: Avery, um--

AS: Let me just finish this paragraph and then we'll go back to the quote (inaudible) and tie them together.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "In these two examples we find models for two views of how the many arise from the One. The first example, in which the modifications of gold are only illusorily distinct from the gold substance, would seem to relate one of the primary Vedantic theories--that Brahman remains intact while the illusory forms present Brahman in apparently distinct guises. This example, however, properly seems to apply to the One itself, as remaining in itself. The inner nature of the One is such that, in spite of its immense complexity, it is like the gold taking on an infinity of apparent completions or aspects, but remaining always itself. There are no other principles available in this view, for the One is self-constitutive. The second example illustrates the view of emanation: the glow of the hot body is distinct from the original, and yet it is exhibiting the very formal characteristics that are united but hidden in the nature of the original. In this theory we can consider other levels of reality as distinct emanations from the One, as traces of the One, and this does not in any way diminish or detract from the One's intact identity."

LR: What did it say that the first example was illustrating, Avery?

AS: The first example of the gold illustrates the vivarta theory "that Brahman remains intact while the illusory forms present Brahman in apparently distinct guises."

LR: You see, I-- it started out by saying, are any of these possible? Transformation, parts, and illusory manifestation.

AS: Yes.

LR: And then the example was given of the gold and trinkets. Right? I can see how the gold and the trinkets example illustrates the idea that the One, it's a transformation of the One, but I don't see how it illustrates the illusory manifestation. I don't think that's an example of it.

AS: Well yes sure it is.

LR: You have the gold--

AS: Well, you got three examples. you got rings, you got bells, you got anything you want to call them, all kinds of things, and you say, oh here's rings, here's this, there's that, but it's like all you really got is gold.

LR: No--it's not--

AS: Well, then (interrupting LR)

LR: I mean, it transformed the gold, I don't see that that's an analogy for it.

LdS: The gold doesn't inhibit the forms, right?

AS: The gold doesn't inhibit the forms, and the forms are always exhibiting just the gold.

LR: But you can't deny the forms.

S: It seems to be a combination of substance and function, in that example. and it always confuses me too.

AB: From the point of view of what the gold is, the forms--

AS: They're both there. Now Louis-- I think that the point of what it says here is that "the being or substance, the gold, and its function or production, the forms, are only nominally distinct." They cannot be separated, that's more the point, rather than saying that they're illusory.

LR: It's not the One. Right. That I follow.

AS: It illustrates the absolute inseparability of the substance--

LR: Of the One from its forms.

AS: And this illustrates the other point that the One --that it's simultaneously actual or complete--

LR: Right, I just don't think it illustrates illusory manifestation. I think there has to be another example.

(several people interrupting each other)

RG: The question is, what is illusory?

AS: The illusoriness is taking the forms as something other than the gold. That's what's illusory. It's not taking the forms are illusory--they're only illusory if you're taking them something as other than the gold. As soon as you see that they're all gold the whole thing collapses.

RG: From the point of view of essence. Isn't that what the Vedantists would say?

LdS: That also doesn't cancel out--

RG: But you don't think this example illustrates that?

RC: One thing, though, that seems very nice about that particular example, was that when you say you want to come up with an image for how can you say that the One isn't evolving, that if you look at that one from the side of the gold, it's gold and it's gold and it's gold, it's not changing into anything else, and the ring doesn't add anything or take anything away from its gold. That you really--

S: It would be that change would be illusory in this example. (S2: What?) Change itself would be illusory in this example. Because you can never say that the gold is changing. But the thing you can say is changing is the appearance of the gold, that being only an appearance and in some way that being an illusion.

RG: The theory does not say that things don't appear. (S: I like it that way.) The theory only states that the appearance taken by itself as an appearance is illusory.

AS: Or taken as distinct.

RG: Or as distinct.

LR: The 'taken as distinct' is the part that's illusory, not changing--

RG: Right, so is the changing the-- (people interrupting)

AS: But then you go one more step and you see that the forms of the gold are also illusory.

RG: Right, right.

AS: Because it's just gold.

RG: So you're talking about looking at the gold ring on your finger, right-- You say, "boy! this is a beautiful ring!" And you don't realize when you're contemplating the ring as ring, you're not contemplating it as gold. And if you contemplate it as ring then you're contemplating it as an illusory modification of the gold. You've separated it and made it separate from the its substance.

S: I'm sorry it's not change that's illusory, I modifying my previous thing. Change itself can't be illusory because that could be coincident with the very nature of the One itself.

LR: Right.

S2: But-- But the fact that there is, let's say, an eternal change would mean that that this constant appearance which never stays the same to that extent, it would have to be illusory.

AS: It's not change so much, let me just read, the first line-- "how the Absolute Mind can give rise to a Many." That's the original question. "Two examples of possible ways of understanding how Absolute Mind can give rise to a Many."

AH: You'd say the gold doesn't change, is that so? But the forms certainly do. The gold doesn't change into a ring or into a bell. The gold remains itself but there's an appearance of the ring and the bell.

DB: And all the change is from the point of view of the appearance.

AS: But you know if you compare the two examples, in both examples the original does not change. So that in the example of the gold the gold does not change. In the example of the star emanating, the star does not change. But in both examples the original thing can stay remain what it is.

RG: But the star loses a little energy.

AS: I know but-- but you didn't hear the , but that's why it says here you have to use physically impossible situation with the power source being infinite.

RG: You're right, okay--

AS: So the point was there was that both of these leave that original intact. The question is exactly how this intactness can give rise to a many, and in the first case it doesn't give rise to any other many.

RG: That's right.

AS: And in the second example it does give rise to, in the example the Intellectual-Principle or the emanation. And in that case the emanation does indicate something of the One, and yet is distinct from it. Whereas in the first example those forms are not distinct from the gold. That's--

LdS: I think you're also saying that the first one is not really a production of-- of how the many are arising except in an illusory way, because the forms in no way inform you or indicate anything about the nature of the gold.

AS: Right.

LdS: If you focus on the forms they don't tell you anything about the gold.

AS: Exactly.

LdS: Where in the other example you do gain information by analyzing the--

AH: (inaudible) speak of the forms being distinct from the gold? I think the two examples are alike apparently--

RG: But Louis' point is good, you could contemplate ring as separate from bar, let's say you have a gold bar or a gold ring but the contemplation of ring or bar doesn't give you anything about the gold. But the contemplation of the light does tell you something about the star and the interior.

AS: Right, right, that is I think a real big point in terms of the illusory, in fact that might even be the main point, that in the one case it's not an illusory manifestation because it **does** have some indication of its source, it does have a trace of the source, and in the other example --

RG: Contemplating it doesn't give you--

AS: Contemplating it in a sense--

LdS: Obstructs--

AS: Obstructs the apprehension of the source.

LC: Unless you see that's gold.

RG: Well, then, you're not contemplating the forms. (AS: Yes) Then you shift contemplation.

LC: In all cases, they're right there, available forms.

AH: You do speak of a gold ring.

AS: Yes. Okay. So why don't--

AH: You do speak of a gold ring. Now we've already decided the gold can't change, the gold does not undergo change. But there is the presence of the gold ring. Does that not (inaudible) about the essential substance in the same way that the emanation lends information about the body?

RG: Not at all.

AH: Well. It seems to me--

RG: No. I don't think they are because if you contemplate the ring, even the gold ring, if you put your attention on the ring portion of it, the point that's different, it doesn't add anything to your knowledge of gold. You may get a lot of knowledge about the form of ring-- and the Intellectual-Principle--

RC: In that example if somebody took the ring and bent it out of shape you wouldn't feel the good about having the same amount of gold (inaudible)-- (some student chuckles)

S: Well, in these two examples, is one meant to be preferred over the other? (interrupting, overlapping comments, not all transcribed)

AS: No--

LdS: They illustrate two different points--

AS: At this point we can't say this is a preference over that, we need to have both.

S3: Well so far there's the emanating light to the One-- (students interrupt each other)

AD: At this point, we're just making the differences available, that's all.

RC: The second one, it's the first time that it occurred to me that that should be developed just a little bit more to say that when we think of this power source being infinite, it should also be stressed that the nature of the body is itself not evolving or going through change. Because then it would seem that, like when physicists for example study the star, the spectrum pattern, he is going to talk about the evolution of that star. Because you say you study something which actually is evolving.

AD: You're right there, but I guess then that would give us the One. Instead of a star. Yes, I see what you're saying, Randy.

AS: You'd have to include with the infinite, you already have infinite power source if that's possible (inaudible).

VM: Well, that would make it a static example.

DB: Yes, in the second example, right after the question of the spectral analysis of this glowing light you've talked about this 'it' and I don't know if 'it' refers to contents that are revealed by the analysis or the whole--

AS: Actually it was circled with a question mark.

DB: I haven't read it but--

AS: Let's read it and--

DB: I was listening--

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): "The spectrum or precise amount of light emitted at each frequency can be analyzed, and *it* will depend only on the nature of the glowing body."

S: The spectrum.

AS: The precise amount of light or the spectrum or the--

DB: So we're not talking about the 'it' as referring to the totality of the light but the specific characteristics--

VM: The structure of the spectrum depends only upon the nature of the glowing body.

DB: Right. But doesn't the glowing light itself equally depend upon the--

AB: But then everything about the light is derivative? Or contained in the glowing body, in this example? Everything about the light comes from the body--the light, the quantity, the structure-- Whereas in the gold example the form is extraneous to the origin. In this case everything is an efflux from the origin.

DB: And in addition--

AS: And in that respect-- But on the other hand if you look at it as the other way around the reality of those forms are just-- they have no independent status of any kind from the One gold. Whereas the form that's embedded in the light as it were has as its substratum as light, which is distinct reality from the original emanating body. So that in the second example, whereas the form does really reveal the original form, the reality of it, although lesser, is distinct from the original. In the first example, the form reveals really nothing about the substance-- but its substance is, as it were, directly or non-other than or absolutely non-distinct from the gold itself.

AB: Once the light leaves the body it stands by itself.

AS: It stands as distinct, although its form is completely, it completely mirrors the original. Whereas in the gold example if you take the forms as distinct, if you completely cut them off, they're like illusory, they fall off into nothingness.

LR: You can't take those as distinct.

AS: Well, you can, as Dickie said, it was a good example. You look at it as just ring, you look at it as ring.

LR: But-- Like you said, you can't always analyze the ring, you always got the gold there.

AS: But I mean you can-- I see your point, sure.

LR: Whereas with the light, you don't have to be thinking 'star' all the time when you're looking at the light.

AS: That's what I'm saying.

LR: If you're looking at the ring--

S4: Why can't the ring be the light? You don't need the gold. You could think of ring without the gold, it's like thinking of the light without the star.

LR: Yes. Well I'm not--

AS: Well both points I think are correct. You're just emphasizing different things, on the one hand--

LR: Your ring could be made out of silver--

CdA: You don't have to have a ring at all.

LR: Yes, but Carol-- (people talking at once)

AS: Linda-- (inaudible) There seems to be a complementarity, it's almost like a complementarity of definable characteristics. In the one case the form directly reveals something of the original star, but the reality of it is distinct, it's light, and not the original star. But in the other case the substance of it is identical--it is the gold--whereas on the other hand the form reveals nothing it is completely illusory distinct from the gold, because it reveals nothing of the gold and it's--

AH: Those two examples complement each other for a (inaudible) kind of analogy, I think if you approached it the way you just described.

AD: If you go on further I think you'll see the way Plotinus would reconcile *both* theories.

AH: Is it--can I just see if I understood what Avery described--the first example of the gold provides us with continuity with gold.

AS: Identity.

AH: Identity with gold, with the original substance. The second example provides us with information about the forms or the qualities that reveal something of the original--

AS: That we have a distinct reality.

AH: Distinct. Yes.

AS: I think in the example the power, in the one case you have it remaining in the One as he says, and the other example you have the notion of emanation, distinct levels of reality.

LR: But are you actually adding anything to?

RC: Oh yes.

AS: Adding anything to what? (student chuckles) (inaudible)

LR: When you think of the star and the light, is the light in any way an addition to one's comprehension, if you could call (inaudible) of the star.

VM: It's the only way to the star.

LR: Right. But here's what I'm thinking-- when you take--

AD: You're going to make the light now, you're going to make the light analogous to the form that the gold takes.

LR: No I'm not, no I'm not -- that exactly what I'm not going to do.

AD: Want to bet--

RG: Can I make books on this? (student laughter)

LR: No! When you take the gold and you put a lion there or take the gold and put a ring there you're really taking something completely other, you're taking lions--

AS: On the tip of your finger a lion appears!

LR: And you're juxtaposing that with gold, and there's really, there's-- you could think of lion, without ever thinking of gold. But I'm wondering about, I think it's very different in the example in the star and its light (RC: it is very different) can you imagine--

AS: I could say completely the reverse though, the--

LR: Can you ever think of the star without considering in some way considering light?

AS: And I would say you could do the whole thing completely in the reverse-- and say the forms of lion, and so on, can't ever be conceived apart from the gold, whereas the light can be conceived of as *distinct* from the original star. (several people talking at once)

LR: No I'm not talking about golden lion, I'm talking about (AS: --forms--) ring and the ring could be a circle, it could be-- it's bringing in-- whereas a lion is bringing in, it's adding--

AS: I think in the example--

LR: --one form to another, whereas the star and the light are integrally connected in a very in a very--

AS: Linda, if I could answer that and say you have to see the gold analogy as not somebody stamping the gold from without, but it's almost like the gold itself can transform itself into all these forms in order to be able to use the-- Because otherwise what you're saying when you're considering the analogy relative to the One, you're going to say, well somebody comes along from outside and imposes forms on the One. Maybe that's appropriate too, but that's our intellect that imposes all of these illusory forms onto the One, just as somebody stamps the gold with all these peculiar forms. But the other way of seeing it is that the first analogy means that the One itself has this whole completion within itself.

LR: I think that (inaudible, is interrupted) I think that what I really want to say that if I were to try to find or listen to the analogies for the One and the many, the star and the light is a far superior example. I think it gets much closer to the point of what emanation's all about--

RG & AS: Well that is the example of emanation.

LR: Well not just emanation, the first one isn't about emanation, it's not about illusory--

S5: Well yes it is.

LR: Well I know that--

RC: Well, the weakest thing about the first one is the something in the nature of the gold that seems to account for the arising of lion and the ring. But that like the phenomenon becomes like totally unaccountable.

AS: That may be a good point though.

AD: Oh, that's very important because that's one of the reasons I'll criticize the Vedantists, is when they say it *appears*, you know, the illusory, an appearance of an illusory modification everything depends on what the hell you mean by *appears*.

RC: The nice thing about the second one is that whatever phenomenon do appear, even though it's of a different nature than its origin, it's grounded in its origin, which makes its arising accountable.

AD: Well, I see that people are still suffering the effects of the *Golden Lion*. (student laughter) [Note: Reference to Fa-tsang's *Essay on the Golden Lion*.]

RG: Well the Vedantists would also say that maya resides in Brahman and that that does account for the arising of the illusory modification.

AD: Yes well I think, I think you're going to see though that the-- well, I point that out along the way within the--

RG: Okay.

RC: But don't they ultimately call it anirvacaniya?

RG: No, that's only the second level of maya. At the third level there was no maya at all.

AS: Right, at the third level you can forget yourself. You're gone.

RG: No, it's only the second level it's anirvacaniya.

AB: To ask where the form comes from, isn't that supporting from the analysis? The analogy is starting with a golden ring or whatever it is.

AS: No, no. In the first example, in which the modifications of gold are only illusorily distinct from the gold substance. Okay.

DB: Avery, just one quick question. What is the difference between the light which is analyzed by the spectrum and so forth and the star? I mean it's not-- I mean just on that level, because I don't really know.

AS: Well on the physical level, they're spatially distinct. They're physically separated-- they're-- I mean right, Vic? Using the analogy on the physical level, they are actually distinct, I mean you can't put the light back in the star. In fact, if you tried to think of a star *not* emanating light that's quite a different thing from a star that's *emanating* light.

DB: Well I thought that was the whole definition of star though. See that's the problem. From our point of view, anything that we know of star is that emanated light. And I'm just wondering--

AS: But that doesn't mean that that *is* the light-- that that *is* the star itself. The light is here, the star is there.

RG: Where?

DB: Well maybe I'm foolish but--

RG: The light's there with the star--

DB: The light's where?

RG: Where you see it.

AD: I'm waiting for you people to do some criticism of the ideas. I'm still waiting.

RG: You can't criticize the ideas.

AD: I want you to hit the ideas.

RG: There's no criticism of the ideas.

AS: You want to go on a little more?

AD: Go ahead, try.

AS: David, do you want to pursue that more?

AD: He just went off the gold standard.

AS: No, it just has the ring of truth to it. (student laughter and inaudible comments)

S: All that glitters is not gold.

DB: It's perhaps my really very profound lack of scientific background but I really don't get it. I mean--

AS: Well--

AD: I think you can distinguish between a star and its light.

AS: But don't use the star even. You know, we had the original thing was this hot glowing body, now--

[Audio File 1983 0325a (formerly 1983 0326a) Ends]

[Audio File 1983 0325b (formerly 1983 0326b) Begins]

AS: --its own internal infinite source, but that's going beyond the physical example, I mean that's--

RG: Well with a light bulb we could see it, I mean the light bulb stays what it is and it emanates light.

S: Yeah, okay. There's--

AS: It seems--

RG: Seems to me.

AS: Okay, well-- Think about it, David.

DB: I am.

AS: I think it makes sense. Well maybe, maybe the discu-- there's some little more discussion and maybe-- 'cause that gets away from the actual example to what it's supposed to-- you know, analogously the two views.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): “In trying to understand the inner intelligence of the One as remaining the One itself, we can resort to the example of the gold, for there is nothing that the One could become regardless of whatever forms the gold assumes, it is always the gold, and its forms are illusory.”

AS: Let me read it again.

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): “In trying to understand the inner intelligence of the One as remaining the One itself, we can resort to the example of the gold, for there is nothing that the One could become regardless of whatever forms the gold assumes, it always is the gold, and its forms are illusory.”

LC: Is this an example of act and repose?

AS: You have to take it as remaining with the One, the gold--

LC: The gold that’s always the gold that’s repose, the ring that’s act. (inaudible by AS/RG: No--) I mean is it--

RG: But isn’t that also a vision of the act of the One, of its self-nature?

AS: Yes. Well I think that’s what he’s trying to say, its the One remaining itself, it’s act doesn’t go outside itself, just remains itself, and any kind of forms you might talk about as being within the One are only illusory modifications of that One.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): “A consequence of this would be that any appearance--including the ego-- is the illusory modification of the One.”

VM: The ego’s an illusory modification of the One?

MW: This is saying the consequence if you take this to be a description of the how the many arise from the One, that would be (an essential point). Right? But the consequence of applying this to manifestation is you get the ego as a manifestation of the One.

AD: (inaudible) The ego is the gold, the ego is the One.

MW: Yes. So that seems to be an argument-- I don’t think this is where it [analogy] applies. (student laughter)

RG: I couldn’t get that train of reasoning.

MW: It’s not--it could be an argument by--

VM: Reductio ad absurdum.

AD: The ego --the One has taken the form of my ego.

RG: But if it’s an illusory modification then there is no ego even to talk about.

AD: That too follows and if you read, you’ll see the second.

AS: But that point you’d normally miss because if the ego’s one of these illusory forms it’s nothing other than the gold, you’re saying that your ego is the One.

AD: And believe me, many Vedantists do say that. But there was also the contrary hypothesis that you just mentioned.

AS: The ego is nothing.

AD: The ego doesn't exist. And both these statements are correct.

LC: According to that theory.

AD: Yes, according to that theory. Just go over it in your mind.

S: If you would reread it again first.

AS: You can't completely get it out of here, you have to get it out of what Michael and Richard just said. Okay. There's two consequences of this first view, right, in which "there is nothing that the One could become, namely because regardless of whatever forms the gold assumes, it is always the gold -A. And its forms are illusory -B." 'It' the ring is always the gold, so the ego is always the gold. On the other hand, the other point of view, the form is illusory, as ego it's absolutely nothing. Either one of these of these would be a consequence of this view of illusory modification.

RG: Yes. But I have trouble with the first one because when you say the ring is the gold, to say that the distinct ring is the gold, I would argue that to invoke the idea of ring is already illusory, and that therefore you can't say that, that the ring as ring is not the gold but--

AD: But my ego is only nominally distinct from the One.

RG: No, no. But in terms of the ego--if the ego is illusory, if the ego is illusory, then you can't say that the ego is anything, if it's illusory, if you come to see--

AD: Exactly, exactly. It would be the One.

RG: No, it wouldn't be, no it doesn't-

LR: It's either that or nothing.

RG: It makes the ego not illusory, not ultimately real, it doesn't make it the One.

AD: But it's an illusory modification of the One.

RG: Right. It's an illusory modification. I don't know what those words mean. Illusory modification of the One--

AS: They all say that you are the One, that's their other dictum, because in fact--

AD: How many of them do say that?

RG: Quite a few.

AD: 'I am the One'. It seems inevitable if you believe in the vivarta theory. I mean, what choices do you have?

RG: What do you mean?

AD: Well, if you believe alright-- (several people talking at once) --that Pure Consciousness modifies itself, and this modification is an appearance, therefore this ego which is appearing in front of you is only an illusory modification of the One. And also the reverse is true too. Since I don't exist alright, I don't have to pay my rent. (some student chuckles) Well what do you think the consequences of reasoning-- of that kind of reasoning are going to reap?

(several people talking at once, can't hear)

RG: I don't believe those are the consequences.

AS: But they're the logical consequences.

RG: I don't believe those are the logical consequences, that you don't pay your rent.

AD: They're not logical?

AS: No, no, no. Oh not the (inaudible)

RG: No they're evoking, they're--

AD: I *do* have to pay my rent, don't I?

RG: Yes.

S: Yes but you're starting with a model (inaudible).

RG: Whether you're Brahman or not you have to pay your rent. (RG laughs)

AS: No, Brahman doesn't pay his rent.

RG: Even Brahman would pay the rent.

AS: No, Brahman *is* the rent! (laughter)

AD: (inaudible) I'll say Brahman is paying the rent.

RG: That's right.

AD: That's right.

RG: Brahman's paying the rent to himself appearing as the landlord. (more laughter)

AD: Alright, you notice, there *is* a huge hiatus between the guy that pays the rent--

RG: That's 'cause we're living in illusion! (more laughter) If we saw the truth we wouldn't mind at all.

VM: It seems like in a hot iron ball (inaudible).

AD: Dickie, I got a feeling you're going to get thrown out of the store! (laughter)

AS: I think I-- all Anthony was saying is that--

S: Using what?

AS: Using the gold ring analogy, there's two ways to reduce this super-position. (inaudible)

RG: Come on.

AS: There are two ways to reduce the super-position of the ring with the gold and I think both of them are logically valid. They may not be the correct-- the ones Vedanta gives.

RG: Wait, let me try to follow, I don't yet follow. Alright, what are they?

AS: When you say gold ring you have to-- you have this illusory super-position here. And you can reduce it by pointing out that the nature of the ring is absolutely illusory. But you also can reduce it by saying that the nature of the ring is absolutely inseparable from gold. I don't see why logically you must reduce it just to one way.

RG: No, no, the one-- because it's not a compatible analogy. The illusion doesn't work both ways. I don't think it's proper. The illusion only works in the direction of the ring being separate. And when you say the ring *is* of the nature of the gold, the gold *is* the only reality and to invoke an equation between the ring and the gold is inappropriate, logically. You wouldn't use the two terms, doesn't make sense.

AH: You mean experientially. Like the ring example is not a good analogy for the way experience appears? We always see the ring and not the gold?

RG: Well, I thought this first explanation was how the One doesn't go outside itself. And it doesn't seem yet to be an explanation of the arising of the Many from the One. Just how the One retains its own self-nature. Right?

AS: I think the point is that using the analogy that way is valid. In other ways, the valid way of using the analogy is to speak of the One not going outside of itself.

RG: Right.

AS: The invalid way of using the analogy, this is what's being (inaudible) is that the invalid way of using the analogy is an explanation of how the world appears.

RG: Oh yes, I agree.

S: There is no explanation in vivarta theory.

AS: No, no. In the vivarta theory there is no explanation, and it seems part of the argument--

VM: --explanation for the appearance never occurs. (RG assents)

AD: There is no explanation of appearance, it actually is unexplainable according to the vivarta theory.

VM: But in some sense, wouldn't you say that there is no explanation because in some sense it never occurs.

AS: And in the example--

AD: That's where there's going to be an explanation of the unbalancedness of that view. (RG assents)
There is no creation.

AS: But the correct application-- that is a correct statement if it's applied to the One itself. (RG assents) And that was the other point, that the analogy works when applied to the One where there is the right level. (RG assents) I'm sorry, Andrew--

AH: I guess I didn't understand why Dickie's comment that the analogy is not applicable in both ways. I didn't see the two ways you described.

RG: No it only works-- I agree with Avery, yes I mean it works in the direction of establishing the non-distinction of form from essence at the level of the One. It doesn't work in the reverse way because in fact it isn't a description of how manifestation occurs. So the explanation only works in an applicable realm where there's only a pure view of substance, which would be a view of the One as pure substance. Once you try to invoke forms, the description and the theory don't-- it's not about that realm.

AS: Okay, well this-- So anyway there's this little explanation more.

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "A delicate balance is required here, for thought is walking a razor's edge. On the one hand, we can introduce a hiatus that leads to metaphysical dualism--which is proper and appropriate for the intellectual understanding, for the double standpoint demands recognition. On the other hand, thought must confront monolithic monism, a unique and unknowable all-encompassing God, the causeless cause, a view which is appropriate to the absolute stillness of the advanced contemplator--the initiate. The unique contribution of the philosopher-sage is the simultaneous grasp of these two views that exemplify the paradoxical nature of reality--the One and universal relativity. Adopting the poise of his understanding will supply our own with completion and balance. To understand that perfection engenders, that the eternally perfect engenders eternally universal principles which in their totality constitute manifestations at all levels from Being onwards will satisfy the most encompassing and demanding intellects."

S: Please reread the last sentence: "To understand".

Astronoesis draft (AS rereading): "To understand that perfection engenders, that the eternally perfect engenders eternally universal principles which in their totality constitute manifestations at all levels from Being onwards will satisfy the most encompassing and demanding intellects."

AH: I don't understand that sentence.

RC: Universal means general, the universal principles are eternally generated. Because they **are** eternally generated, and all else follows from them.

AD: You have to keep the two together, Mind and its expression. And not abolish one for the sake of the other.

AH: This is the point of view of the philosopher-sage.

AD: This is the point of view of Plotinus, yes.

AH: And how is this satisfaction for the intellect? (AD: Huh?) How is this satisfaction for the intellect?

AS: The half of that-- the satisfaction for the intellect part is the manyness view, the universal relativity view. The satisfaction for the contemplator in you is the unity view, the stillness view. But to put them together it would be satisfaction that the philosopher-sage would demand.

AD: As long as you have Mind, you will have its expression. Right? You think of Absolute Mind, there will always be an expression of that Absolute Mind. Is that so? Will there always be universal manifestation? Is there a beginning or an end to it?

S: No.

AD: Then Mind is forever expressing itself. Okay. Then there is the truth of Mind-in-Itself and there is the truth of the Mind's expression. The Mind expressing itself, that expression is also a truth. Now I could do one of two things, I could be like the Vedantists and say that there's only Mind, reduce everything to Mind, just like Freud reduces everything to sex. Okay? That's the reductive tendency and we all have a tendency to try to do that, you know we're looking always for the simple explanation. And then there's the other point of view that say no, these two are perpetually and eternally the paradoxical nature of the reality. This is what IS, it will ALWAYS be. There will *always* be universal manifestation, there will *always* be universal relativity, and there will always be the Mind, Absolute in itself. If I don't stand on these two, and take these two like the balance, you know, the scale, then I'm always going to go into one camp or the other. And why do I have to do that? Is there some need in my nature that I got to reduce everything to One?

AH: You retain the dual point of view.

AD: Yes, which does not exclude, which is not excluded by the non-dual point of view.

RG: (assents)

AD: In saying there is Mind-and-its expression I am not excluding or saying that non-duality doesn't exist, because the expression is the expression of Mind. So Mind would be the common substratum in both cases, alright? But insofar as there is always expression as distinct, distinguishable from the Mind, then there will always be that to confront, alright. Now anyone that's at all intellectual will **insist** on that second aspect. You're not going to say that World War I was going on 1822 to 1826.

RG: (These physicists.) (inaudible)

AH: It seems that we have the prerogative of the expression of the Mind's manifestation. We're allowed that, as people who want to think about these things. But I'm not sure if qualitatively meaning is retained when you couple that with the notion of Mind-in-Itself.

AD: When I say ocean do I necessarily abolish the waves?

RG: No.

AD: When I say Mind do I have to abolish its manifestations or its expressions?

AH: I-- wasn't asking that, I was asking-- (inaudible) the words of the One and the Many. How can the Many, how can a point of view from within manifestation encompass that which is not in manifestation?

RG: Who said encompass?

AD: I didn't say that. I didn't say that the point of view within manifestation encompasses mind.

AH: It speaks of it.

AD: Well of course it speaks of it--

AH: As equal balance to its unfoldment.

RG: Not equal, though, in the sense of self-justifying. When you--just by saying Mind and its expression implies a hierarchy of understanding. And one deals with beyond-Being and the other with the level of Being, so you still have distinctions within those two points of view, where you could understand one as the prior Unity-principle. They're not equal. They're not equal in the sense--

AS: Not in the sense of all or equal. They all of their just positions, not-- not equal.

RG: You wouldn't say the expression encompasses the Mind it expresses, I mean, and yet you have to speak of the expression as a state of that Mind, and give it its due.

AS: I think the main point is that you can't reduce one to the other. You can reduce either one of them to just the other.

RG: Well you couldn't though. But from the first point of view you do reduce the expressions--

AD: Yes, you can, because the substratum will always be Mind.

RG: But you can't do the second, you can't reduce the Mind to its expressions. But you can reduce the expression to the Mind and have one side of-- and have one point of view, but that wouldn't be the full--

AD: That wouldn't be the full view--

RG: --full view, right.

AD: And what we're arguing for is for sanity.

AS: For sanity?

AD: Yes, for sanity. (some inaudible student comments, then chuckles)

AS: This must be the sanity-clause.

AD: I mean within mysticism.

RG: Yes, yes. Right.

AH: It does seem this is like, this manner of expression, it at least seems to me the fullest possible view that the intellect could come to. But it also seems at once to absolutely cancel out both views. Like insofar as it's full, it also stops that whole process of developing the views.

AH: (inaudible) allows for?

RG: It allows for infinite views.

AD: You can see the consequences even at a much lower level. The consequences at this lowest level, for instance, is like when we speak about the Soul sending forth from within itself an emissary or a portion or a spark of itself, and that this spark from within itself is what is evolving in infinite duration and reflecting the properties of its prior, alright. Now the ordinary view is that, no, once it reaches self-realization it's over, then it goes back into the Nous, gets absorbed, that's the end of that. The other theory is no, this will never happen, that that principle which is sent out into the world, so to speak, the principle of manifestness, the Mercurial phase of the soul, will always there, will always be wandering around in the infinite of God's realms. Now if you say that it's going to be absorbed, then I would say to you the World-Idea will never evolve, will never get perfected. Because the perfection of the World-Idea evolve-- it insists upon the evolving of the creatures within it. That's what you mean when you say a World-Idea is going to evolve. You're talking about the creatures in it are going to become eventually supermen. Unless-- there's always the other choice, otherwise you can believe in the resurrection of the ego and the body.

AH: Anthony, would it be appropriate to ask-- from the point of view of this dual conclusion really, (inaudible) Like earlier tonight we spoke about the necessity for the intellect to develop fully.

AD: --develop what?

AH: It's necessary for the intellect, in this paradoxical way to develop along two lines, in order to arrive at a position where it's possible-- is this analogous (inaudible)

AS: I think I know what you're saying. In the earlier one, when we said we have to examine each aspect separately and then there were two ways to combine them, one by combining them all-- I think all of that was on the side of universal relativity. And then when he said after that then it had to like go beyond itself into the stillness, to really put them together non-conceptually. That would be the second view of the stillness or the advanced contemplator.

AH: That's not really a parallel structure--

AS: (inaudible)

RG: Although it's pictured within the intellect.

AS: Yes.

RG: You do picture the other one in the intellect.

AH: As pictured, it must remain in that way (inaudible) (RG assents)

AD: Alright, just a little bit more and then we'll call it quits.

AS: Actually, this might be a good place to stop and--

Astronoesis draft (AS reading): "From and within the unlimited view of the Ultimate, the Ultimate Reality, there is no other. However, from the point of view of the others, which may or may not be in identity with that ultimate point of view, there is the absolutely relative viewpoint that must be considered alongside of the non-dual."

DB: Avery, that's somewhere along the line of (inaudible) ability to know by what manner I distinguish between the expression of the Absolute. I mean I can see the points as I go along, but when I ask myself, well what am I using to distinguish between the two I can't anymore, and that's obviously--

RC: It was sort of brought out earlier, all the distinguishing goes on within the (inaudible).

DB: Right, yes. I can appreciate that, that it's only from the point of view of the appearance or the expression that one makes the distinction but even so, when we speak of thought and mind or something like that, we thought-- it's obviously not absolutely identical with Mind from its own point of view but on the other hand I don't know on what basis it's separate or distinct. I mean like--

RC: He spoke very early in the paper in terms of the argument-- trying to talk about the One, even though we're going to talk about it as having these distinctions, we're operating in a mode in which distinction is possible.

DB: Yes.

RC: Whereas the fundamental nature, I was starting to bring out, if you were to see it from the One's perceptive, that perspective is not a perspective from which those distinctions would appear.

DB: Okay, now--

AD: And you have to remember that this intelligence that you're operating with is coming from that One. And before you deny it, you ought to consider that, that from the prodigial [prodigal/prodigious] fertility of the spiritual principle within us, which is part of the Absolute, is *where* our knowledge is coming from that there is a distinction between the Absolutely Absolute and the Absolutely Relative. And to *deny* that is to deny the very thing that you are affirming.

(inaudible student comments)

AS: I got it, it'll take them awhile to figure that out-- (inaudible student comments)

AD: In other words, I've got a chance to run. Good--

S: Can I ask you (inaudible)-- though?

AD: You don't see that?

AH: But Anthony--

AD: You don't see, that you don't see it?

AH: Yes, I see it, yes I see what you said but if you affirm it by way of the mechanism of denial, it's not really an affirmation at all like the affirmation of that--

AD: --of that universal relativity.

AH: And its prior or its--

AS: Is affirmed by its prior itself, the Absolute. The affirmation of the universal relativity that you make is affirmed because of the prior.

AD: And if you understand what we've been doing during the week when we say that this principle of Asmita, or what we call this Principle of Manifestness, which we can refer to as the God-given Intelligence, the God here being your own higher self, is what's telling you this is so.

AH: You wouldn't try to affirm the prior from the point of view of its manifestation.

AS: Yes, that's---

AD: We said that that's what's telling you that there is a prior.

AS: That's the other half.

RG: Right.

DB: Wait a minute, now, this is all very well and good but it's been going on at 78. Could you just do it all a little (slower)? (student laughter)

AD: Let me add--can you see also it is non-dual at the same time!?! (laughter)

DB: No!

AS: Now the firing shot.

DB: No, I'm not trying to argue with it, all I'm trying to do is (stay) upon-- Yeah I mean like, the intellect-- I mean you started out from this point of view that the intellect is making these distinctions. We're trying to, you know-- it operates in a doxastic mode, we're trying to get to the point where we can appreciate the paradox and the two ways of comprehending this One. Now, all I'm really asking is, what is the basis upon which the distinctions we're making-- you know, what is that basis in the first place?

AS: You give it intelligence.

DB: Right but--

AS: An intelligence that is in fact guiding our understanding.

DB: Well yes, right, if--

RG: And the basis is the One and the Many. Right? The basis *is* the One and the Intellectual-Principle. Is that what you a-- what ontologically is the basis?

DB: Well-- no because-- well maybe that is it, maybe-- maybe that is it.

AS: Well he's going to claim (you could) fall back on anything.

AD: Well weren't we--

DB: Because I'm not trying to deny it, I'm just trying to-- asking myself well where does it come from.

RG: Well--

AS: Yes but I mean Richard's point is to the point. Like do you mean ontologically what's the basis or do you mean in terms of our actual understanding and intelligence to receive what's the basis.

DB: Well, upon-- I'm-- it's like with-- And we say well they're distinct, they're these-- they're distinct, okay, the One and the Many. But now, if we defined the One in such a very particular way that makes it possible for it to be the source of this Many, then-- and we say it's only from the point of view of the Many that we can make this distinction, what is the distinction that we're making?

RC: How about if you said the main--this is probably too sloppy--but if you said the main distinction between the two is that in the intellect the distinctions appear. And in what the intellect is talking about, the mode of consciousness is such that the distinctions do not appear.

LR: Yes, the main distinction is distinction itself.

RC: But in both cases, the (inaudible) that's being distinguished is said to be on both levels.

RG: But is that what's being said, that the distinctions are only being made in-- are being made in the intellect? And which intellect?

RC: Not that they're being arbitrarily created but they only appear as distinct in the intellect.

RG: I thought you were speaking-- well I don't understand that then if that's--

LR: The one getting distinguished.

RG: If that's the assertion, I don't understand that. I thought the understanding was that in fact, at the level of ontology there are distinctions which we're mirroring in our intellect, we're not creating them.

RC: Okay.

AD: Yes.

LR: Yes.

AD: Right.

RG: Oh.

LR: So that the very distinction would be the principle of distinction per se.

RG: Uh-hm. Which is to be found--

LR: (inaudible)

RG: Right.

LR: What's the basis--

RG: Of that. Well it's a category of Being. That's the basis.

DB: Yes but, see--

LR: In other words, you're ask-- what's the distinction of making the distinction between the One and the Many.

RG: The principle being Being.

LR: And what's the principle, and the principle is distinction.

RG: Uh-hm.

DB: Yes and no and-- But you see, the problem is then that it would seem, if as Richard said that distinction is a category of Being, which, you know, would be spoken of in that respect, we can use it in terms of being able to like distinguish one idea from another or-- at that point.

LR: Yes but it's more than the-- it *is* a category of Being, but its principle is also in the One.

DB: Oh yes, granted.

AD: Very simply put, what we're saying is the Mind expresses itself. And including *in* that expression, alright, is the fact that the Mind is distinguishing itself from its expressions. That's included *in* the expression. So you have at the same time both the non-dual and the dual. The non-dual is not going to exclude the dual point of view. But it maintains it and you have to maintain it. No matter how uncomfortable you get, you got to be like, you know, a tightrope walker but you got to maintain that.

S: Since this whole section is on the One, I was taking the distinction between the One and the Many, the Many being the Intellectual-Principle--

AD: No, the point here was that-- the point here basically is, what theory is really the most pregnant and fertile and encompassing to help us understand, alright, these two points of view. If we take the vivarta theory or we take the transformation theory of Samkhya, alright, and this is a good example, and I think it's written up there, the point will be something like this: If you think of Plotinus' double act, there will be no necessity for a conflict between these two points of view. The vivarta theory would be emphasizing the passive perfection, the transformation theory would be emphasizing the active perfection. Then if you understand the nature of the double act that Plotinus is speaking about, alright, you won't have to take *sides*. Which is ludicrous. Both points of view are included, alright, in the double act of the One. And so this ultimate dualism, alright, inherent in the Mind's expression is right alongside the dualism and now you can be philosophically *acute*, alright. You can understand that there is such a thing as an undifferented intelligence, a One that is utterly a One, and you can understand the validity of all these various cosmologies, epistemologies that have to be maintained in a sta-- in infinite duration. Otherwise you're going to say well sooner or later everything is going to return to the One and there's going to be only the One, only Mind and no more expressions. That would be the consequence. (Rings bell)

LR: Carol, ask your question.

AD: I beat you okay?

S: Call Karen, yes (inaudible). (CdA laughs)

AD: Alright, I've got a couple of good points, I think I'll try to insert them. Thanks for your patience.

S: Thank you.

[Audio File 1983 0325b (formerly 1983 0326b) Ends]