

**CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
June 29a, 1983
PB PARAS; OVERSELF**

TOPIC: PB Paras
SUBJECT: Overself

SUBSUBJECTS: Evolution of Ego, I AM Principle, Evolution of World-Idea, Soul in Nous, Selfhood of the I AM, Tropes

CONTENTS:

- # HOW CLASS DISCUSSIONS WILL BE RUN**
- # ONE MUST LAY DOWN THE EGO IN FULL SURRENDER TO PENETRATE INTO THE BEING OF THE OVERSELF**
- # KNOWING CAN'T KNOW ITSELF; WHEN IT DOES, IT'S SUPER-COGNIZANCE**
- # THE SHORT PATH IS WHEN YOU HOLD ON TO THE FACT THAT YOU'RE THE KNOWER; TO BE IT WOULD BE ACTUAL SPIRITUALITY**
- # WHEN YOU RECOGNIZE THE CONSCIOUSNESS THAT PERVADES THE EGO, YOU GLIMPSE YOUR I AM (GOD)**
- # IF THIS I AM KNOWS ITS SELFHOOD, IT'S THE SAME AS NOUS**
- # THE OVERSELF AS THE I AM IS SIMILAR TO, BUT NOT IDENTICAL WITH, GOD—THE OVERSELF IN THE NOUS**
- # WE CAN'T LEGITIMATELY DISTINGUISH THE SELFHOOD OF THE I AM FROM THE ABSOLUTE**
- # IT'S THE PURPOSE OF MENTALISM TO BRING YOU TO THE BEDROCK FOUNDATION—YOUR MIND, THE I AM**
- # THE EGO HAS TO DEVELOP AWARENESS OF THE I AM (THE OVERSELF)**
- # THE PERSON, THE EGO, NOT THE I AM PRINCIPLE, GOES THROUGH THE STRUGGLES ON THE PATH**
- # THE EGO WITHIN THE WORLD-IDEA IS EVOLVING WITH THE WORLD-IDEA**
- # THE I AM CONSCIOUSNESS REMAINS IMPASSIVE AND DOESN'T TAKE SIDES IN THE STRUGGLE THAT TAKES PLACE WITHIN THE EGO-COMPLEX**
- # THE ULTIMATE EVOLUTION OF THE WORLD-IDEA, WHICH INCLUDES ALL THE CREATURES WITHIN IT, IS PREORDAINED**

IT'S THE PERSON THAT'S BECOMING AWARE OF THAT INFINITE CONSCIOUSNESS; THE INFINITE CONSCIOUSNESS DOESN'T COME DOWN AND SAY, "I AM THIS PERSON"

IS EVERYTHING ORDAINED?

THE ACTIVITY OF THE I AM IS TWOFOLD: IT KNOWS THE EXTERNAL, AND IT KNOWS THE PRINCIPLE ABOVE ITSELF

THE BODY, WHICH IS A CONGLOMERATION OF TROPES, LIVING MATTER, FOISTS ITSELF UPON THE I AM AND SAYS, "I AM THIS"

THE WORLD-IDEA, WHICH IS PROJECTED BY THE I AM, IS WHAT'S EVOLVING, AND IT INCLUDES ALL THE EGOS THAT EACH HAVE THEIR HISTORICAL CONTINUITY

NOTES ON THE I AM AND EGO

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*
- Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*
- Bible, John (8:58, 14:6), King James Version
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)

PLOTINUS QUOTES READ OR REFERENCED: I.1.8, II.1.5, III.2.16, IV.1.1, IV.2.1, V.3, VI.7.5

DIAGRAMS referred to (not with this transcript version) [Transcriber note: [diagram] means the speaker is referencing a diagram as he or she is speaking. If someone is drawing or writing, with audible sounds of chalk on a blackboard, I indicate this by [drawing] or [writing].]

NOTES:

- This is **1983 06/29a, PB Paras; Overself evening class, and the first entry associated with this date. 1983 06/29b = afternoon Plotinus seminar**, for which we have no audio, just JF notes.
- Large chunks of the first hour and four minutes of the class are not transcribed due to poor sound quality and no AD commentary.
- I use the 22-page Pat Campbell partial transcript for this class to supplement or stand in for parts that are partly or completely inaudible. The use of the partial transcript is noted accordingly. There is a page of rough after-class notes that is included at the end of this transcript which is taken from the partial transcript as well.

TRANSCRIBED Verbatim by IT 2019. Reformatted by JRM & JF 2019-2020, with Subheads and Table of Contents added by JRM. In 2023, IT fixes prefatory matter and footer, updates audio file name, fixes/completes Book List, adds Plotinus quotes section, adds new notes within transcript, fixes minor errors. In 2025, MW alters and expands Subsubjects and alters Subheads to make more accurate. **Archival verbatim transcript – V14.1a.**

AUDIO FILES: 1983 0629a, 1983 0629b. [Note 1: “Tape” and “Side” refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files. Note 2: Both audio files originally had very poor sound quality, especially the first one. Also, AD speaks very quietly throughout. In 2024, REP Studio improved the sound quality, but the transcript was done before this so certain words may be mistranscribed and student and AD comments that were marked as partially or completely inaudible may now be audible. All time markers are for the audio files used to transcribe.]

1983 06/29a at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Overself
Archival verbatim transcript

[Audio File 1983 0629a Begins]

RC: --he did (say them) over and over again.

S: Yeah.

HOW CLASS DISCUSSIONS WILL BE RUN

RC: And that part of the way we should make that possible is to appoint a referee whose job it'll be to call on people whose hands are raised. So that if you want to say anything, you should raise your hand. (bit of laughter) And if somebody else is talking and your hand is raised but he doesn't point at you, you don't say anything. (bit of laughter) So there's--

MB: Or-- (laughter, student words)

S (amidst laughter): He's answered it.

RC: Oh wait a minute now.

S (faint): (Sound byte.)

S: (You/Let me) write this on the board.

RC: So that if some-- (laughter)

VM: Quiet down, come on. (bit more laughter)

RC: So that if somebody does start talking, they reasonably suspect that they might be able to finish saying what they're saying before somebody else [couple words inaudible]

S: I can't hear you Randy. (bit of laughter)

RG: Did you raise your hand?

AB/S(?) (simultaneously): (But he) was outside. (laughter)

RC: And, we thought Dickie would be real good to do that. (laughter)

S (very faint): So he won't talk that way.

S: That means he can't talk though.

RG: Yes!

S: It could solve your problem.

BS (very faint): (But Dickie--) (student laughs a bit)

RG: But does-- am I allowed to call on people who don't raise their hand? That [one/two words inaudible]

RC (simultaneously): Oh yeah, that's the other half of it. The other [S simultaneously, faint: Oh no, call--]
half of it is that if you don't raise your hand, you're-- (bit of laughter)

LC(?): [one/two words inaudible]

S (very faint): [one/two words inaudible]

RG: We-- that would, I mean--

RC: You can get drawn upon anyway. But you won't get interrupted. (laughter)

RG (amidst laughter): Yeah. Well, promises, that's my [couple/three words inaudible]

RC: So what we're going to try to do is start a review and go over quotes that we've talked about at least once, some of them we've talked about three or four times, and pick on the ones that seem to have the most important information (in regard--) Just see if we got anything communicated, bring some questions out.

[30¼ second pause]

ONE MUST LAY DOWN THE EGO IN FULL SURRENDER TO PENETRATE INTO THE BEING OF THE OVERSELF

PB [V12, 18:4.96, RC reading]: "No man can penetrate into the being of the Overself and remain an ego-centered individual. On the threshold he must lay down the ego in full surrender."

[15¼ second pause]

S (very faint): Once again if you don't mind.

S (simultaneously, very faint): Right, yeah.

PB [V12, 18:4.96, RC rereads]: "No man can penetrate into the being of the Overself and remain an ego-centered individual. On the threshold he must lay down the ego in full surrender."

[25¾ second pause]

[student discussion, no AD, 0:03:57.1-0:33.41.0]

RG: Anthony, do you want to have anything to-- could I call on you?

S (very faint): Go ahead.

AD (very faint): Well, I'm just minding--

S: [one word inaudible] yeah. (bit of laughter)

RG: And I'm allowed to call on you. (laughter)

AD (amidst laughter, very faint): You are.

S (faint): Well, I think we should go on to another quote.

[short pause]

RG (very faint): Unless you don't want to be called on.

PB [V14, 22:3.313, RC reading]: "There is a point where the human meets the divine, where the conscious ego emerges from the all-encompassing Void. That point we call the Overself."

S (very faint): [few words inaudible]

PB [V14, 22:3.313, RC rereads]: "There is a point where the human meets the divine, where the conscious ego emerges from the all-encompassing Void. That point we call the Overself."

AD(?) (very faint): [few words inaudible]

S (very faint): Well, go ahead. Go ahead. (bit of laughter)

[17 second pause]

DH: What-- to me it's like find a-- a notion of-- notion of point that comes up in geometry that's not the usual notion but--

S: Louder David?

RG: Louder David.

DH: That there's a notion of point in geometry that I think is coming up here that's not the usual notion of point but sort of a-- a dual notion that point is being a-- is defined by lines. Normally we think of two lines entering a point but this is more like two lines entering a point and you can really-- and it's a way of thinking of those lines as actually being a part of a point in geometry and that's-- that's sort of-- it's up here, I mean, there is-- the point is where they meet but it's not just a meeting but it's a containing of the things met. That's what I-- but it--

S (very faint): That's what I've gone through.

[9¼ second pause]

[student discussion, no AD, 0:36:23.9-0:46:47.0]

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1983 0629a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

[student discussion, no AD, 0:49:43.1-0:52:54.7]

[short pause]

KNOWING CAN'T KNOW ITSELF; WHEN IT DOES, IT'S SUPER-COGNIZANCE

PB [V14, 22:3.186, RC reading]: "Although awareness is the first way in which we can regard the soul or Overself, the latter is also that which makes awareness possible and hence a sub- or super-conscious thing. This explains why it is that we do not know our souls, but only our thoughts, our feelings, and our bodies. It is because we *are* the soul and hence we *are* the knower as well as the act of knowing. The eyes see everything outside yet do not see themselves."

S (very faint): [few words inaudible]

PB [V14, 22:3.186, RC rereads]: “Although awareness is the first way in which we can regard the soul or Overself, the latter is also that which makes awareness possible and hence a sub- or super-conscious thing. This explains why it is that we do not know our souls, but only our thoughts, our feelings, and our bodies. It is because we *are* the soul and hence we *are* the knower as well as the act of knowing. The eyes see everything outside yet do not see themselves.”

[student discussion, no AD, 0:54:32.2-1:03:58.5]

RG: He says the soul can't-- you can't know the awareness because you *are* it. And you could o-- you-- If you knew it, it wouldn't be it because you-- you are-- it is your being. [AS simultaneously: No but how--] If you make--

AS: By knowing.

RG: But if you make it a-- he know-- by knowing in this case he seems to mean objective knowing, [AS assents, faint] a relational knowing. We're not denying that there's a knowing by being, [AS, faint: Right.] which seems to be the kind of knowing demanded in awareness.

AS: That's the point, yes, right. Like you have to define what you mean by knowing. If you mean knowing the way you know anything *within* that principle, of course you can't know that I AM the same way you know anything that's *within* the I AM. And yet, in a sense, whenever you know anything that is within it, of course you're aware that you're knowing, [RG: Right.] or you-- that-- being aware-- the very fact of being aware that you are knowing is a kind of awareness that the principle is operating. [RG: Yes.] But it's not-- you can't make it objective.

RG: Right.

AS: On the other hand, to really know that knowing means a knowing by identity which means you must be [one/two words inaudible] must be identified with itself. And then you know both its principle and you know the awareness [few words inaudible] you know that you *are* the awareness, but you don't know it as objective. [S, very faint: Definitely not.] You *are* it.

RC: Let me follow up on-- [S: What's it called?] follow up on what I was trying to ask before in the sense that, like *asmita* to me is just an imported word. I don't-- it doesn't really mean anything [one/two words inaudible] (bit of laughter) But, when you-- when you distinguish between being aware of things and being aware of being aware, I'm wondering to what extent that awareness of being aware is what is pointed at by *asmita* in the sense of having appropriated this sense of being an aware being, that-- that that's really what that *asmita* is. And that the more fully you become conscious of the fact that you are in fact a center of awareness in the midst of this universal existence, if that's not really a much more direct declaration of the meaning of I AM than the words would ever be--

AS: I think that *is* what we point to [few words inaudible] Like that Vedantic definition that [one word inaudible] spoke about. And I think there it seems that [few words inaudible] I don't know but, the power of knowing any-- the power-- the I AM has a power of knowing anything that's within it, manifesting the world and knowing it. It's also-- it's-- similarly it's self-luminous in the sense that it doesn't take another

awareness to light up the fact that it's aware. When it's knowing the object it is also aware of the fact that it-- that it *is* what's knowing the object. You can't assume that it's not unaware of what its activity is. And that filters forth from that kind of glow or whatever is what we're calling our being aware of the world.

RC: But normally in our experience, normally in our experience, the more vividly we're aware of an object, the less vividly we're aware of the fact of our own being, in fact become totally extroverted just (so/for) that awareness and attention could become totally rapt in the object-- in the object.

RG (faint): And if you could really do that, you'd know the awareness too.

S (very faint): What was that, Dickie?

RG: If you really got rapt in the object, you could know it right there, you would know the awareness too.

RC: I don't know that you would know the awareness, you might know an idea. I don't know that you would know the awareness.

S (very faint): [couple words inaudible]

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

RG: Yeah, ok.

DR (very faint): I didn't give up. To me I mean [few words inaudible] concentrate on one. The ideas could be on that one and (not) the other one.

S (faint): Yeah.

S (faint): David--

RG: Right, I mean-- yeah, yeah I--

S (faint): Hm.

S (very faint): [couple/three words inaudible]

RG: Yes.

LR: Then you're not aware that you're aware.

RG: Then you're not aware, you're just--

LR: If you're aware that you're aware you're reflecting.

DR: (very faint): No. But we're not talking about us.

RG: Right that's not-- but we don't mean that way of aware, we mean aware of aware-- we mean the being aware.

S (very faint): Yeah.

S (very faint): But see--

RC (very faint): He says the eyes [couple words inaudible] (bit of laughter)

S: That the eyes [one/two words inaudible]

S (simultaneously): Seems to be this diffuse low-level neuroses about-- about knowing. (RG laughs)
When you-- when you-- when you--

RG (laughing): Very high level neuroses!

S: Well, whate-- when you are this, you don't need to know it, you *are* it. Listen you don't need this objective knowledge where you got to point to it and say that's what it is.

LR (simultaneously): What's knowledge that is-- [RG simultaneously: Right.] what's knowledge?

S: And I don't think that's an issue anymore when you're immersed in it.

LR: Well I'm not so you want me--

S (simultaneously): Why do you want to be-- (RG laughs) When you're already there why do I-- why do you want to put your finger on it and look back on it and identify it? [LR simultaneously: What's self-knowledge?] As soon you do that you'll lose it.

LR: Why do you want self-knowledge?

S: You just--

LR: What is it, what's self-knowledge?

S: Don't worry about it when you get there! (bit of laughter) You'll *be* it. (RG laughing)

AB: Can we hear the quote again?

LR: Next quote. (laughter)

S (amidst laughter): Yeah.

S: You don't have to worry about that Alan.

BS: Excuse me? (bit of laughter)

S: So unaware though (Tony). (bit of laughter)

PB [V14, 22:3.186, RC rereads a part of]: "Although awareness..."

MB (simultaneously, very faint): Randy, before you read the quote may I request [couple words inaudible] request. Before you read the quote.

RC: Would you request [S simultaneously: Can't hear you.] that what?

MB (faint): The whispering in the back, (I'm really sorry to ask for the people).

S (very faint): Something (joyful)?

RC: Yeah. [S simultaneously, very faint: Completely.] Yeah if-- if it's necessary to talk, why don't you go outside. [student assents, faint] Then Myra can hear. (bit of laughter)

PB [V14, 22:3.186, RC rereads a part of]: "Although awareness is the first way in which we can regard the soul or Overself, the latter is also that which makes awareness possible..."

DR (faint): Well right there it seems like a distinction between the awareness and the soul which makes that awareness possible in the first place.

RC (faint): Yeah.

DR (faint): And the first awareness doesn't seem to be (some/something) [one/two words inaudible]

RC: Yeah.

RG: Right.

DR (faint): It seems to be the first perception of the soul.

RC: Yeah I've been trying to get at it a number of different ways in terms of how-- in terms of analyzing my experience epistemologically, it seems that I could bring everything back into being rooted in the fact that I am. But what I can't explain is how I came to be in the first place. And it seems that I can't-- there's no way I can turn my-- my mind and keep it as the same kind of mind that normally has this [9 second pause] polarized experience, I mean, one pole being aware and the other pole being lighted by that awareness.

PB [V14, 22:3.186, RC rereads]: "Although awareness is the first way in which we can regard the soul or [RC adds: the] Overself, the latter is also that which makes awareness possible and hence a sub- or super-conscious thing. This explains why it is that we do not know our souls, but only our thoughts, our feelings, and our bodies. It is because we *are* the soul and hence we *are* the knower as well as the act of knowing. The eyes see everything outside yet do not see themselves."

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

DR (very faint): I don't understand (the paragraph). It doesn't fit [few words inaudible] cannot know our souls (anymore).

RG: Inso-- but David, it's knowing in-- in the sense it's not knowing-- real knowing. You can't know it by making an o-- [AS simultaneously, faint: I think (couple words inaudible) that soul.] You can't make an object out of it. You cert-- you can know it in a more intimate way than that. It's not not-knowing the other way, it's just a conventional use of knowing here that he's trying to point out that it's of an order different from that. It's an order different than what-- how you know thoughts, feelings, and body. All of those are objects to consciousness. To know consciousness is entirely different order (of not visible) order.

RC: It seems that when Plotinus reserves-- when he says that soul normally has the function of knowing the external and you get to that whole dialogue about is it possible for the soul to become a self-knower. And then he gets into that thing of how the soul has to drop its own proper act and allow the Nous to have [one word inaudible] [Note: See Plotinus, V.3.] Seems that it's that lower kind of knowing that he's

talking about can't have the soul itself as-- can't be a self-knower, can't know the soul itself as a-- as a content of Nous, not the activity. I mean, do you agree with that?

AS (very faint): I (know) Richard, yeah but, I get that. Like just as we clearly think of content (of) consciousness or of consciousness [few words inaudible] content of consciousness to be aware of, you can't be aware-- you can't really be aware of the awareness, that's why [few words inaudible] And that awareness is what's going to (get very) [one/two words inaudible] that is what is [couple words inaudible] So to trace that awareness back you would have to [couple words inaudible] I mean, I AM-- I AM [few words inaudible] I AM [couple words inaudible]

BS (very faint): So is it possible [couple words inaudible] awarenesses (or like) also joins a sensible [one word inaudible] in a sense?

RG (faint): Is it a different awareness aware of sensible objects and it goes through the awareness by which, you know--

BS (very faint): All the faculties [couple words inaudible] (all the faculties).

RG: Anthony. Could I call on you now to say something?

AD (faint): He said it, you said it: *knowing can't know itself*. When it does, it's super cognizance.

[short pause]

THE SHORT PATH IS WHEN YOU HOLD ON TO THE FACT THAT YOU'RE THE KNOWER; TO BE IT WOULD BE ACTUAL SPIRITUALITY

RC: I wonder, we've talked a few times before about trying to make clear the difference between spirituality and mentality like [one/two words inaudible] and um-- Do you think it would make sense to talk about the awakening to the fact of one's own awareness is the-- the beginning of what's called the spiritual life? And, that as long as a person is awake to the fact of their own being aware--

AD (very faint): What he's aware of is an idea. He's not aware of awareness, but an *idea* of awareness.

RC: I don't mean formulating it verbally.

AD (simultaneously, very faint): But-- but, if he is that awareness, then he's awoken to spirituality.

RC: Ok. Now, insofar as whatever else goes on, that being aware isn't broken, say like that's what it means to hold to one's spirituality? [10¾ second pause] Not getting swallowed up?

AD (very faint): Yes. You know that you are the knower. You hold on to that.

[9¼ second pause]

AH (very faint): May I ask a question?

RG: Yes.

AH (very faint): Well Anthony I don't-- I don't understand the import of what you just said. We first described this awareness as not (ruled) by knowledge [one word inaudible] that spirituality. Now you

described it as something to hold onto it as an object. That seems to be a contradiction in the description, that on the one hand it's not an object but on the other hand it is one to be held onto.

S (very faint): Right, yeah.

RG (faint): Yeah that's obvious. That was just a way of speaking, Andrew.

AH (faint): Well that's what I didn't understand is the way of speaking.

RC (simultaneously, faint): More its self-presence [couple/three words inaudible]

AH (very faint): Sorry?

RC: More-- maybe a better way of formulating it would be to call it self-presence not to be [one word inaudible]

AH (very faint): Still are speaking of it as an object [one/two words inaudible]

RG (very faint): You have to speak.

AH (very faint): As some thing apart from the psychic stream.

RG (faint): (Difficult) psychic stream.

AH (faint): As an object.

RG: No.

AS: No. Psychic stream is the object [RG(?): Object.] to it.

[short pause]

AS: Or to *you* because you are it.

RG: Yeah right.

S: Always.

S (very faint): To you because you are(--/.)

AS: But I don't see-- object doesn't explain anything 'cause-- you know, if they speak about you have to hold on-- so-- so to speak, hold onto that in all the states you have [one/two words inaudible]

S (very faint): (Uh-hm.)

AH (simultaneously): I'm just curious about what--

AS (faint): [one/two words inaudible] one where he says no object.

AH (very faint): I'm just curious about holding on to something that you described as non-objective. [AS simultaneously, faint: Yeah.] See, that seems to be hard for me.

AD (very faint): That would be the Short Path [one/two words inaudible] You're holding on to the fact, the understanding, that you are the knower, that would be the Short Path. Now to be it: that would be the

actual spirituality. It's only an idea. In other words, you say that you are the knower; it's only an idea. Like you're practicing the Short Path, but spirituality isn't achieved.

AH (very faint): That was my question.

AD (very faint): If the spiritual-- if-- if the-- if there's an identity in the statement when you say, "I am the knower," you're not saying something theo-- theoretical, but you *know* that you are the knower. That kind of knowing, like he says, is identity. Then that is actual spirituality.

AH (very faint): The other case it's an idea?

AD (very faint): Other case it's a case of practicing the Short Path. You imagine or you conceive of yourself as the knower, as the Overself.

AH: Is that the As-If exercise?

AD (very faint): (You bet.)

[10¾ second pause]

WHEN YOU RECOGNIZE THE CONSCIOUSNESS THAT PERVADES THE EGO, YOU GLIMPSE YOUR I AM (GOD)

PB [V16, 25:1.31, RG reading]: "The little centre of consciousness that is myself rests in and lives by the infinite ocean of consciousness that is God. The first momentary discovery of this relationship constitutes a genuine religious experience, and its expansion into a final, full disclosure constitutes a philosophic one."

S (very faint): Ok.

S (very faint): Would you read that again?

RG (faint): Yeah.

PB [V16, 25:1.31, RG rereads]: "The little centre of consciousness that is myself rests in and lives by the infinite ocean of consciousness that is God. The first momentary discovery of this relationship constitutes a genuine religious experience, and its expansion into a final, full disclosure constitutes a philosophic one."

S (very faint): The first few [one word inaudible] [13 second pause] I would think.

RG (faint): I mean I don't see how you could--

S (very faint): He means that the-- I mean the reason why I asked you that, it would put a-- a certain value on consciousness.

RG: Yeah, I don't-- I don't see how you could develop the Nous.

S (simultaneously, faint): A religious practice.

RG: Yeah.

S (very faint): Oh no.

AS: But-- but he said *genuine* religious experience.

RG (simultaneously): A genuine religious experience.

S (faint): (And with that) could I--

S: Well religion is genuine, I mean you can't [one word inaudible] not be.

AS (very faint): That's a case of defining there what genuine religious is, the act-- that actual experience or--

RG (faint): Well he-- yeah, what is-- what do you think he means by that? What is the "The little centre of consciousness that is myself rests in and lives by the infinite ocean of consciousness that is God"? And the second part?

AS/S(?) (very faint): Mercury.

RG (faint): What do you mean by Mercury?

S (faint): What?

S (simultaneously, very faint): [couple words inaudible]

RG (faint): What do you mean by Mercury?

S: Well, those guys [three/few words inaudible]

RG (simultaneously): Don't use those words.

S (faint): Anthony?

JfL: That a-- (bit of laughter)

S: Yeah.

JfL (faint): That the-- the ego is suspended by the second soul. And that the mystical experience is a genuine experience of that. That glimpse is glimpse of a little taste of it and that it gets its culmination in the identification with the I AM. That would be the philosophical.

RG (faint): Severin?

SD (very faint): Wouldn't it be better to move a little bit (close), because perhaps the culmination and it goes all the way up to knowing that that I AM is part of the absolutely impersonal [one/two words inaudible] that the I AM, the actual-- that could be the ego and it could ultimately be seen also as the I AM or the soul.

RG (faint): Yeah that's different from-- yeah I would-- I'll score for that, and (at) the infinite (price). I mean the infinite o-- ocean of consciousness of God seems to have some sort of a focus on what you say, beyond the I AM.

S (very faint): [couple/three words inaudible]

RC/S(?) (very faint): What was it [couple words inaudible]

S (very faint): Seemed like--

RG (faint): Just think of that unknown. 'Cause I think the I AM is a-- is a defined point, or to the (Oversoul/Overself), it is a defined point in the infinite ocean of the Void or of God in this-- in this [one word inaudible]

AD (faint): If I understood Jeff, Jeff was saying something to the effect that when you recognize the consciousness which is pervasive of the ego, separated out from the ego, you'll get the glimpse. [student assents, very faint] That is a glimpse of your I AM. (Until then), [Pat C. partial transcript reads: And then the full] philosophic enlightenment would be to understand the extent of that I AM consciousness. Is that what you said Jeff?

JfL: Yes, that's very good [AD, very faint: Or--] paraphrasing. (laughter)

AD (amidst laughter, faint): I figured it out.

PC (very faint): Yes, that's it.

RG: Yeah.

AS (very faint): That's what he said.

IF THIS I AM KNOWS ITS SELFHOOD, IT'S THE SAME AS NOUS

AD (faint): From what we said before, if you understand the true implications of the I AM consciousness, it is both the knowing and the selfhood of that knowing. So that would be philosophic consummation. [short pause] [few words inaudible]

S (faint): How could you--

RG: But do you-- alright.

S (very faint): All of it?

RG: Do you want-- I mean but you want to call the infinite ocean of consciousness the I AM?

AD (very faint): Go back, repeat.

RG: That it--

S (very faint): (Right.)

[short pause]

AD (faint): I'm not call it-- I'm not going to call it a pond.

RG: But why aren't you going to call it the O-- the pure Overself?

AD (faint): We just pointed out that if this I AM knows its selfhood, alright, it's the same as Nous. [student assents, very faint] Knowing cannot know itself. But when it does--then it's what? Then it's the higher knower.

RG (faint): Right.

AD: So in one and the same principle you have both of them.

RG (very faint): But there's some--

AD (faint): I mean that's the way I would interpret it with Jeff, I'm not saying--

RG: No I-- I mean [one/two very faint inaudible AD words simultaneous with RG] I could see it either way. Ok.

S (very faint): Yeah.

RG: No that's why I like Severin's sliding scale because you could-- you could interpret it either way. Red, what do you think?

S (very faint): Yeah [one/two words inaudible] (bit of laughter)

TS (very faint): [couple words inaudible] (RG laughs)

S (very faint): Right.

RW: I think I might agree with Anthony. (laughter)

RG: I think you're a chicken. (laughter)

RC (faint): What would you mean by it if you did that? (laughter)

S (amidst laughter): [couple words inaudible] even if you did that.

AD (very faint): Story about this meal so good. (laughter)

JfL/S(?): His days are out of here, there's some way to that [couple very faint inaudible AD words] God. (RG laughs, some laughter)

RC: That's the "I ate". (laughter)

AD (amidst laughter, very faint): [few words inaudible]

[few seconds of laughter, background student talking]

AD (very faint): Ok, go ahead.

S (very faint): What's he doing there?

S (very faint): Go ahead.

THE OVERSELF AS THE I AM IS SIMILAR TO, BUT NOT IDENTICAL WITH, GOD —THE OVERSELF IN THE NOUS

PB [V14, 22:3.311, RG reading]: "It is true to say that the Overself possesses properties which belong also to God. But because one man is *like* another, we do not claim him to be identical with that other. The Overself is Godlike in nature but not in identity."

S (very faint): Go ahead, Richard.

S (very faint): Would you read that again now?

PB [V14, 22:3.311, RG rereads]: “It is true to say that the Overself possesses properties which belong also to God. But because one man is *like* another, we do not claim him to be identical with that other. The Overself is Godlike in nature but not in identity.”

RG: Carol?

CDA (very faint): It seems that we’re speaking about the I AM. That’s all, (and-- literally.)

S (very faint): Yeah.

RG: Why?

AS (very faint, possibly part of background): Don’t drop it.

CDA (very faint): Ready? Because of the [few words inaudible]

RG: And why would it be “Godlike in nature but not in identity” with it?

CDA (very faint): Because it’s an eternal emanant.

RG (faint): What is that, how does that-- What do mean by that? What Anthony?

AD (very faint): I only said that it would be one reason: that it’s an emanant. Evidently he’s saying they’re not identical in essence.

[short pause]

RG (faint): Well they’re identical in nature but not [one/two words inaudible] I mean it is Godlike in nature but not in identity.

S (very faint): Nature would--

RG (faint): In essence. [three/few words inaudible]

S (very faint): Would you read it again?

PB [V14, 22:3.311, RG rereads]: “It is true to say that the Overself possesses properties which belong also to God. But because one man is *like* another, we do not claim him to be identical with that other. The Overself is Godlike in nature but not in identity.”

AD (very faint): It is similar to the Overself in Nous but not identical. It can’t be identical because then it wouldn’t be the emanant.

[students assent, very faint]

RG (faint): Right, that’s the thing I said. It wouldn’t be a separate principle if it were separate. I mean if it wasn’t separate it would be the same. David?

DB (very faint): [inaudible] [Pat C. partial transcript reads: Is it possible to get some idea of the characteristics referring to the nature they both share?]

S (very faint): [few words inaudible]

DB (very faint): Right.

S (very faint): Yeah.

DB (very faint): [one word inaudible] what (you/she) said.

[few seconds of highly inaudible student talking]

RG (very faint): Go ahead.

AD (very faint): Godlike nature of the I AM. (Ok), for instance, before we spoke about it as universal consciousness. Some people object that I refer to it as universal, because they point out that the Soul in the Nous is universal. I would simply point out if you could distinguish between the two you let me know. (RG laughs) So it has a lot of these characteristics [couple words inaudible]--properties, traits, attributes--that you would ascribe to the Nous too. But they are numerically distinct.

DB (very faint): It's all the-- part of the question.

RG: Louder David.

S (faint): Yeah,

DB (faint): Alright. Is part of it a-- [short pause] a question of power [couple words inaudible]

AD: Well that would be one of them, sure.

DB (very faint): I mean the condit-- well one of the-- it would not be identical in power. They would both have power but--

LH (very faint): Right.

RG: Louder Larry. Nobody can hear you.

S (very faint): [inaudible]

[short pause]

RG: I don't think you would say that 'cause the Overself is always the Overself and it's always Godlike.

S (very faint): [few words inaudible]

RG: Why is it not identical?

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

RG: 'Cause it--

S (very faint): [one word inaudible] identical.

RG: Why isn't it identical? (I have to think so.)

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

RG (faint): I mean there a lot-- I mean there are a lot of reasons. It's the principle of manifestation which provides the framework for the world appearance and in that-- in this sense as the-- God-- God does not-- does not provide an [one word inaudible] for manifestation.

S (very faint): [few words inaudible]

RG: He's saying it's not identical. You could never become identical, you never-- you could never completely merge the Overself with God. Because it is-- it is Godlike in nature you could be-- you can become a Sage. But you could never become God, I mean--

S (very faint): I understand they're separate principles.

LR (very faint): I think they're both authentic principles, they both have an authentic status (in/of) reality but they're actually [few words inaudible] I think they're actually defined as [few words inaudible]

S (very faint): What--

S (very faint): It's different.

S (very faint): I-- I think--

LR (very faint): And I think it's because some of the [one word inaudible] about soul and Intellectual-Principle. And they're authentically-- they're both principles, both of them, but they're not necessarily [few words inaudible] At first we said soul [three words inaudible] In fact Overself may be a concentration of the Nous, that's true, but we can, (you know--)

S (very faint): Yeah.

LR (very faint): Go ahead, Richard.

RG(?) (very faint): Go ahead.

LC (faint): And PB's analogy to that is that one man, like the life in that man but it's not that it's so few that the [few words inaudible] there might be some [couple words inaudible] more mundane [one word inaudible]

[18 second pause]

JB (very faint): Yes. I don't get that there's something either usually more profound 'cause there's life (that--) I'm trying to think of a-- why Dave's answer was [one/two words inaudible] I mean what is both Godlike and hence defined as Nous? And I always thought [few words inaudible] soul and Soul in the Nous had to be some separate (manifestation). So I really only have the-- (added) the way with a blank term. I don't have a way to understand Godlike. [S, very faint: And then--] So I don't really see that that's a--

S (very faint): [one word inaudible]

LR (very faint): Well for instance is the soul manifests. And it manifests Ideas that are the property of the Nous. And that's one. It doesn't need soul, the Nous [couple words inaudible] need soul(.) that manifests (Ideas). The soul is either manifesting [one word inaudible] I mean there's a lot of distinctions I've heard about [few words inaudible] that--

S (very faint): Ok.

JB (very faint): But my c--

LR (very faint): I-- I don't know, I think to try to respond to it--

S (very faint): (How about Plotinus though?)

S (very faint): In Plotinus.

RG (faint): Well motion is one. The soul is self-motive though, and it is (still/the) soul [couple/three words inaudible]

LR (very faint): Soul [one word inaudible]

RG (faint): Yeah the soul is [one/two words inaudible] or--

S (very faint): (Ok.)

HS (very faint): I AM, is that--

S (very faint): Yeah and there's also the thing--

RG: Well, true, there are two ways to interpret the quote, Linda was sort of going for the principal [LR: Oh I was just--] level.

LR (very faint): I'm not interpreting the quote that way. I was-- I was actually just [one/two words inaudible] I was asking (if) that is ultimately the Overself [one/two words inaudible] that it would be-- ultimately is between World-Idea and [one word inaudible]

S (very faint): What is it?

RG (very faint): That's true.

LR (very faint): [few words inaudible] I don't know if this individual, that's a liberal view. It would be a union (at some point/of some sort) 'cause we're still talking in the Overself.

[Audio File 1983 0629a Ends]

[Audio File 1983 0629b Begins]

LDS (faint): --of the Overself is to a man. But there is this other aspect to the Overself would be considered identical essence with the "I" but not identical. I think that would be a difference. Saying-- saying identical in essence doesn't mean--

RG: He's not saying identical. But there's [LDS simultaneously: (No.)] (only) the [one word inaudible] where he says identical in essence.

LDS: I know, in this quote they aren't but, I'm just saying *in* this quote the interpretation is this is the I AM that he's talking about, it's Godlike in nature. But there are other quotes, or even in the *Wisdom* where he says the Overself is-- is identical in essence with the World-Mind or God but not in scope or (creative) in nature.

RC (faint): I (always) thought it was with essence.

RG: With essence.

LDS (simultaneously): I'm not sure.

RG: Right, I agree with you Randy.

S: The point--

LDS (simultaneously): When I-- when I heard Anthony's interpretation I didn't think that nature was the same as essence at this point.

RG: Can I rehear Anthony's interpretation?

AD (very faint): All I simply said was similarity does not comport identity. That's all.

RG: Right.

AD (very faint): That's all, you get what you get. Bringing in the [one word inaudible]

RG: But what do you-- do you think he's referring here, Anthony, to I AM and Overself or Overself and Nous?

AD: The I AM or the Overself in the Nous.

RG: So both of them. (bit of laughter)

AD (amidst laughter): [couple words inaudible]

RG: Ok. (RG laughing) Alright, so we should look at it on that level now.

LDS: Well could we see it both way?

RG: Alright, well the object-- the I AM is Godlike in nature but not in identity. Why? Because the I AM is the one that goes forth and-- and oversees the world and the O-- pure Overself in the Nous doesn't and that's a clear case of why it's not identical.

LDS: Where is the Overself introduced in this quote?

S: I don't know.

S: You try that.

RG (simultaneously): The Overself possesses properties which belong also to God. The I AM possesses qualities that also belong to the Overself in the Nous. What are the qualities that are alike? Awareness, eternity, [LDS simultaneously: Oh (Dickie) I follow that, I follow.] intelligence, being. What are the ones which aren't alike?

S (very faint): Just that.

RC (faint): Function.

RG: Function, right, rulership and it contains [couple/three words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): It's not the (Intellectual principally/Intellectual-Principle).

S (very faint): What's that?

LDS: I follow that [AD simultaneously, faint: It's--] Richard. You're going to say in this quote the aspect is his God or his highest aspect is the Overself.

RG: The Overself in the Nous.

AS: And it *is* the (Intellectuality).

LDS: Yeah.

S (very faint): Awareness.

AS/S(?) (very faint): I see.

RG: David.

DB (very faint): Could it be said that the pinnacle of the I AM's self-knowledge would understand itself as being Divine Being, but not understand itself being the totality of all divine beings? You know, something like that.

RG/S(?) (faint): Sure.

DB (very faint): To recognize (its) relationship to the soul and the-- the (infinite) soul and so on. But it does imagine itself.

AD/S(?) (very faint, possibly part of background): [couple words inaudible]

DB (very faint): Anything which does not-- doesn't imagine itself to be that [one/two words inaudible] I mean-- [RG, faint: Yeah.] I mean is that a legitimate distinction now?

S (very faint): I don't know.

BS (very faint): What's less the [couple words inaudible]

S (very faint): Nice.

WE CAN'T LEGITIMATELY DISTINGUISH THE SELFHOOD OF THE I AM FROM THE ABSOLUTE

AD (very faint): (Even though I asked for legitimate), that's not legitimate. We said that the selfhood would be identical with the Absolute, (would be in) the Absolute. It's not a legitimate distinction.

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

[few seconds of highly inaudible student talking, possibly part of class]

DB/S(?) (very faint): Is that [one/two words inaudible] legitimate distinction?

S (very faint): So at that level of power the--

AD (very faint): It wouldn't be legitimate distinction.

S (very faint): Understand, so that that--

AD (very faint): We said it is both. It can be the higher knower, metaphysically like the higher knower, and it *is* the Nous. We said that it can also be the faculty of knowing, alright, which knows. It can be either of these and both of these. Alright?

S (very faint): Ok, alright.

AD (faint): And so we cannot say that-- we cannot establish the distinction between these two on the basis that it isn't the knower or the Intellectual-Principle. So we have to look for something else to establish a distinction between the-- the Overself as an emanant and the Overself as Nous, or as Intellectual-Principle. And there I think you would have to recognize that, he brought out, scope of power would be one thing. The other thing would be to say like for instance, Soul in the Nous is the author, Plotinus called it, of our excellences, but the-- the lower soul is the author of our existence. [Note: See Plotinus, II.1.5, last para.] So there's differences between each of them. And there's also identity too.

S (very faint): Right.

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

IT'S THE PURPOSE OF MENTALISM TO BRING YOU TO THE BEDROCK FOUNDATION—YOUR MIND, THE I AM

HS: The lower soul which is the author of our existence is the I AM?

AD: Yeah.

S (very faint): Ok.

S (very faint): I was wondering about that.

HS (faint): Just sort of like, you're using a lot and I don't really-- Like what is happening or what is it--

S (very faint): It's [one word inaudible]

HS: Is it-- is it-- Well what is it, it's that out of which everything in the universe comes out of, just this--

AD (very faint): (What does it matter, Herbie?)

HS: This I AM. Everything comes out of this I AM?

AD: Yeah, for you.

HS: For me. For the universe too?

AD: For you, everything comes out of your Mind. For me, everything comes out of my Mind. The world is *my* experience and I don't look to you to get an experience of my world. And similarly for you, your Mind is the basis from which your experience comes.

HS: Does this I AM (require/refer) the universe as an entity also, its I AM?

AD: Your Mind projects forth from within itself the universe that you live in. There is no other universe that you can speak of except the one that is projected forth from within yourself. The Mind-- your Mind is the most immediate thing you can experience. Everything else would be an inference.

HS: And this Mind from which the whole universe is projected forth [one word inaudible] for me, this is what you're calling the I AM? And everyone has one?

AD: I hope so. (bit of laughter)

S (very faint): Exactly.

HS: Ok. Now in terms of-- and would you say that--

AD: I don't know about Siamese twins, Herbie. (laughter)

HS: They have a "We Are". (laughter)

AD (amidst laughter, faint): Well, I don't [couple words inaudible]

S (amidst laughter): That works for now. (some more laughter)

HS: Now, the universe itself, didn't it-- does it have an I AM or there's no I AM for that other than--

AD: Yes, the universe itself has sprung forth from the lower phase of the cosmic soul.

HS (faint): Then I don't understand.

AD: But for that you have to come Friday.

HS (faint): Oh no, I don't want to be--

S: Get his autograph.

HS: Now does-- how do you-- the I AM for the person is the root of his subjectivity in terms of its real, the person who's manifesting the ego's real being? Is that person (who)?

AD: Well, I don't know why you say "ego's real being" but I think I-- I'll agree with that.

HS: The entity.

S (very faint): Right.

AD: Your I AM is Intellectual Being; it's real Being. You remember the remark Jesus made: "Before Abraham was, I AM"? [Note: Bible, John, 8:58.] The other remark Jesus made: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life"? [Note: Bible, John, 14:6.]

[short pause]

HS: So for me the creation of the universe in my own Mind and the universe is, so to say, from its own side is a creation-- is from this principle, I AM?

AD: It's from the principle I AM of the cosmic soul. In other words, the universe itself *is* the fabrication of the cosmic soul. This is prior to your Mind projecting it forth. It is *given to* your Mind. But it's not given as what you see.

[14½ second pause]

HS: So this I AM contains everything necessary to fabricate a universe in-- in a proper local--

AD: Your Mind has got everything it needs. Everything. [short pause] You don't have to go outside of it. And you *can't* got outside of it. (bit of laughter)

RG: Right.

AD: There's no way you can get outside of it. Even when you believe that there's something outside of it!

HS: But you can penetrate, so to say, up to the part where the awareness lies within the I AM as principle prior to manifestation?

AD: Yes, you can ascend that high. [short pause] You *have* to ascend that high in order to reach what PB refers to as insight.

HS: And at that point you reach a place prior to manifestation of the universe-- would you say you reach a place prior to manifestation of the universe?

AD: Yes, you could put it that way or you could put it in the way this-- you've reached its passive perfection. [short pause] Stillness.

[16¾ second pause]

S (very faint): Go ahead Lou.

S: I mean--

S (faint): Well maybe I can't.

TS (very faint): [few words inaudible]

[19½ second pause]

AD (faint): It's the purpose of mentalism to bring you to the bedrock foundation: your Mind. [24¼ second pause] Let's go on.

THE EGO HAS TO DEVELOP AWARENESS OF THE I AM (THE OVERSELF)

PB [V14, 22:3.4, RC reading]: "[The other part of the answer is that] the Overself is always here as man's innermost truest self. It is beginningless and endless in time. Its consciousness does not have to be developed as something new. But the person's awareness of it begins in time and has to be developed as a new attainment. The ever-presence of [RC adds: the] Overself means that anyone may attain it here and now. There is no inner necessity [to] travel anywhere or to anyone in space or to wait years in time for

this to happen. Anyone, for instance, who attends carefully and earnestly to the present exposition may perhaps suddenly and easily get the first stage of insight, the lightning-flash which affords a glimpse of reality, at any moment. By that glimpse he will have been uplifted to a new dimension of being. The difficulty will consist in retaining the new perception. For ancient habits of erroneous thinking will quickly reassert themselves and overwhelm him enough to push it into the background. This is why repeated introspection, reflective study, and mystical meditation are needed to weaken those habits and [RC adds: to] generate the inner strength which can firmly hold the higher outlook against these aggressive intruders from his own past.”

[short pause]

S (very faint): Once more.

TS (very faint): [couple words inaudible]

PC (faint): That was the next paragraph.

PB [V14, 22:3.4, RC rereading a part of]: “[The other part of the answer is that] the Overself is always here as man’s innermost truest self. It is beginningless and endless in time. Its consciousness...”

AD (simultaneously): Follow that Herbie? Herbie?

HS: Yes.

AD: You followed that--they’re beginningless and endless in time.

PB [V14, 22:3.4 cont., RC rereading a part of]: “Its consciousness does not have to be developed as something new. But the person’s awareness of it begins in time and has to be developed as a new attainment.”

S (very faint): Yeah right.

AD: How about up to there Herbie? [9 second pause] Its consciousness doesn’t have to be developed but the *person’s* consciousness has to be developed.

[student assents, very faint]

S (very faint): (The ego.)

S (very faint): [couple words inaudible]

RG: David?

S (faint): Yeah.

DB (very faint): Well, does he mean here my Overself as being the I AM principle [inaudible] and it’s not-- (doesn’t) involve a person’s awareness of that consciousness which is to develop in him which will then also develop.

AD (very faint): It’d be hard to do. Who has to develop it?

DB (very faint): I AM.

AD (very faint): Ok. The ego. The I AM doesn't have to develop that but he does. [DB, very faint: Well--] But the ego has to.

[short pause]

S (very faint): Wait could you read the rest?

PB [V14, 22:3.4 cont., RC rereading a part of]: "The ever-presence of Overself means that anyone may attain it here and now. There is no inner necessity to travel anywhere or to anyone in space or to wait years in time for this to happen. Anyone, for instance, who attends carefully and earnestly to the present exposition may perhaps suddenly and easily get the first stage of insight, the lightning-flash which affords a glimpse of reality, at any moment. By that glimpse he will have been uplifted to a new dimension of being. The difficulty will consist in retaining the new perception. For ancient habits of erroneous thinking will quickly reassert themselves and overwhelm him enough to push it into the background. [RC adds: And] This is why repeated introspection, reflective study, and mystical meditation are needed to weaken those habits and [RC adds: to] generate the inner strength which can firmly hold the higher outlook against these aggressive intruders from his own past."

AD (faint): It almost sounds as though he's saying, "Alright, you had the glimpse. What did you do since then?"

[short pause]

S (faint): Oh yeah.

S: (Play fort.)

S (very faint): Yeah. (bit of laughter)

S: Uh-hm.

S (very faint): Read it.

[short pause]

S (very faint, possibly part of background): [couple words inaudible]

RC: So, the first volume is 12.

[18¾ second pause]

LD (faint): I-- I don't understand what this-- we're speaking (to) David said. The ego has to develop its consciousness. What do we mean when we say that if-- if we think of the ego as pure content, how could content, a matrix of possibilities, develop consciousness of its prior? What-- what is its making?

AD (faint): It becomes aware that it is an offspring of that higher "I", that it reflects that higher ("I").

LD (faint): The ego itself becomes aware of that?

AD (faint): It's just like the first quotation where you have the first quote. (And if he basically--)

AS (faint): Conscious ego.

LR: Who surrenders.

S (simultaneously): Yeah.

AD (faint): Huh?

RG (faint): Who surrenders.

THE PERSON, THE EGO, NOT THE I AM PRINCIPLE, GOES THROUGH THE STRUGGLES ON THE PATH

AD: Who surrenders? If you don't know that you've got two souls in your breast that are fighting for domination, then there's no sense talking about, you know, who surrenders.

LD: Yeah but, I see that but there's like two forces always fighting. But like there's something outside of that doing the choosing.

AS: I think-- Louis if I might venture, I-- maybe this is off.

LD: I mean I'm not trying to speak theory.

AS: Yeah but--

LD: I-- I'm trying to--

AD (simultaneously): You're just-- you're just trying to get out of a predicament. (some laughter)

AS: But developing-- again, who develops that consciousness. And then he asked who is it that surrenders. The one that surrenders is the one who develops the consciousness, the-- the ego, I mean, the way to develop the consciousness [LD simultaneously: Speak slower, I just (don't--)] is to surrender that position. That *is* the developing of that con-- If the-- if the consciousness is always there, he's saying-- he said, who develops-- develops this consciousness, now in this funny language. The ego develops it. The I AM or the Overself doesn't develop it, it always has it. [S, very faint: Yeah.] Who surrenders? My Overself can't surrender, it's like you said, so it's ego that surrenders. Seems that in the long-- ultimately, the ultimate [couple words inaudible] the surrendering of that ego *is* the development, *is* what he calls the development of consciousness, 'cause only when that ego surrenders can it-- can-- can it be said to develop real consciousness.

LD: But I think I can show quotes to the contrary, where he says this emanation from the Overself, or the high Overself, this emanation which we call the asmita, now it creates an ego and then gets caught up in its creation. And so if *it* is getting caught up in its creation, the ego, then it seems *it* is what has to become free of getting caught up, not the ego. If we call the ego *content*, how can content become consciousness?

RC: So you're saying the I AM has to become--

LD: Yeah.

AD: You want to try?

LD: I have the quotes home, I don't have them here.

AD: Well let me-- let me try this-- try this long way. If we take a person A, there's no awareness that there's a higher self of any kind, he lives the purely animal life. And this goes on for a while and now we find him at life C, alright. There's the first glimmerings that there's something higher going on in him but he can't figure out what the dickens it's all about. But he pursues it a little bit. So certain tendencies-- certain tendencies get developed in him which now become habitual ways of him understanding life. These habitual thought patterns, fixed thought patterns, will get carried into the next life, because that's one of the things you do carry, fixed ideas. So, as you go on doing this, alright, there builds up in the complex, what you call the ego-complex, a certain set of tendencies that are now contradicting the former tendencies, alright, higher tendencies, tendencies to be devout, be religious (and seek the Truth to) that (in) [Pat C. partial transcript has: to seek the Truth-- all that, in] contradistinction to the animal tendencies. Now struggle takes place between these two. Sometimes one dominates, sometimes the other. But ultimately the struggle is going to take place *in* you. You're the one who's going to go through the struggle. It's not going to be the consciousness out there.

LD: I follow (that/though).

AD: Alright? Now, if you follow that far, then there comes a point where the ego development has reached a level where it *seeks* the source of its *own being*. It knows and recognizes that in order to reach that, it must eliminate itself. The struggle is still taking place within your ego.

LD (faint): That makes sense, I mean I--

AD: Doesn't make sense, it's tragedy. (bit of laughter)

S (faint): Right.

S (very faint): Right.

LD: But it's-- still the question comes, what-- what is it that builds up the-- what in me will try to develop *one vasana* to offset *another vasana*? It's not those vasanas themselves which are doing the choosing.

THE EGO WITHIN THE WORLD-IDEA IS EVOLVING WITH THE WORLD-IDEA

AD (simultaneously): That's because it has to develop *with* the World-Idea. The ego is part of the World-Idea. It is given to it. In other words, the body is given with the world. It's given to an individual soul to manifest. So the body that is being given is part of the World-Idea. The World-Idea is evolving and so the individuals within it has to evolve too. So the ego within the World-Idea is evolving *with* the World-Idea. Now the soul can come in there and go forward with that. It's a little different than the way you're saying it. The ego is part of the World-Idea, it *belongs* to the World-Idea. When-- when the time comes and the body perishes, the-- like we said, the tendencies are retained by the soul, alright, and it seeks a body similar to these tendencies, incarnates again and again.

If it has to seek a body with similar tendencies, then obviously the psychosomatic organism is *not its production*. It's not something it makes, otherwise it'll simply make another body for itself. But it must seek a body that will provide it with those tendencies or with that-- That's part of the World-Idea, that body that it's going to inhabit, alright. Now if you imagine the World-Idea and that body, which is included as part of the World-Idea, are progressing and evolving, then the soul that inhabits that body cooperate with the World-Idea, try to evolve the ego alongside of it, or retard it. But the struggle is going

to go on within that ego. In other words, like these-- this matrix of thoughts, they're in conflict [someone drawing] with one another even though the consciousness doesn't belong to it but illuminates that conflict. But it is experienced in the psychosomatic organism, in the ego you experience this conflict.

**# THE I AM CONSCIOUSNESS REMAINS IMPASSIVE AND DOESN'T TAKE SIDES
IN THE STRUGGLE THAT TAKES PLACE WITHIN THE EGO-COMPLEX**

LD: Ok but, I-- I buy that but the conflict-- a conflict can go on. It's like two forces can be opposed to each other, two currents of water can be opposed to one another. [AD simultaneously: Yeah (few words inaudible)] But the consciousness of that opposition is not within the two opposing currents.

AD: I'm sorry?

LD: But the consciousness of that opposition is not within opposing currents.

S (very faint): Yeah.

AD: Where is the pain felt?

LD: In-- in my-- I would have to say but then you would say--

AD (simultaneously): That's the consciousness as associated. (laughter)

S (amidst laughter): Body.

AD: You'd have to say the consciousness as associated with that psychosomatic entity.

LD: Yeah, so then I could trace it to the I AM principle.

AD: Pain?

LD: Yes, it-- it would seem so.

AD: The pain isn't-- the I AM is impassive to *any* sensation.

LD: The I AM views it, just like I view a movie--

AD (simultaneously): The I AM doesn't-- yeah the I AM views it, it doesn't have pain.

RG: Right, then there wouldn't be pain. If the conscious principle wasn't invo-- in the body you could never account for pain.

RC: If the I AM didn't associate with it, there wouldn't be any experience of pain.

[student assents, very faint]

LR (very faint): So it's the [three words inaudible]

S (very faint): That's right [one word inaudible]

LR: The I AM (isn't always) [one word inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): So you get to that mysterious definition of soul. It's a unique indivisible essence, alright, and it's also an essence which divides itself about body, and which is totally present at any point in the body. [Note: See Plotinus, I.1.8, IV.1.1, IV.2.1.]

LD: So that's what experiences the pain.

S (very faint): No.

AD: But the way you understand that is that's *your ego*.

S (very faint): [couple words inaudible]

RG: Right, Louis--

RC: But that's not a misunderstanding.

LD: Then we have to go back to reading ego it seems in terms of co-- well at least to my point of view.

MB (faint): From your point of view that sounds like you're viewing these tendencies (we got) as they have no relation to any underlying continuity. I mean, you're saying one tendency can't know the other, they can't get together enough experiences to cause the pain. I think you're making them [AD: Yeah.] too autonomous, the ego is still--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah he's-- he's abstracting the ego from the consciousness.

RC: I think there is a very real question here now that-- that's-- I mean extremely pivotal in the sense that, what is it if not the I AM that allows for the ego to have such strength? Isn't it because, even though like my I AM can identify with any one of these three levels within itself, it has identified with the ego? Or isn't it because I am identified with the ego in the very stuff of my own I AM that the ego continues to have that power? And wouldn't it be that that-- that the I AM that I am has to actually withdraw its power from those tendencies?

LD: Yeah but they can account for that power through what we call, you know, the vasana, you roll the paper up and put it under the bed and you always-- the self-will of the ego. It's self-perpetuating. That-- I mean that would seem like that would be an argument against what you're saying.

RC: No I'm-- I'm asking like, is the strength of the-- you know, vasanas that we're calling the ego to be attributed to the-- to the World-Mind? Or is it to be attributed to the fact that my I AM really is saying "I *am* this"?

AS: Randy, you're almost saying that the-- say the so-called good tendencies are more sattvic and the I AM identifies more with those, and therefore gives them some power, whereas the so-called bad tendencies are getting their power from the Dragon.

RC: Ok.

AS: And that the presence of that I AM *is* a kind of extra-evolutionary force that *is* moving the development of that ego along more than it would normally (say). It *can* [RC simultaneously: Yes.] be-- it can be an extra-evolutionary outside of the stream of the cosmic evolution. It's going to move it along or-

RC (simultaneously): I'm really asking rather than asserting.

AS: Yeah, and so that's what you're asking.

RC (simultaneously): Because the point is not clear to me.

AS: That could, yeah, (I mean--)

RC (simultaneously): And whether I should think of these vasanas as imposed upon the I AM and the I AM remains indifferent, or the fact that these vasanas become powerful at all is because the I AM invests them with its own soul power.

AH (very faint): Isn't that-- isn't that always a mistaken position, like of the ego having some kind of power?

RC: Well--

AH (very faint): Isn't that always shown in terms of the reasoning, (the balance), the ego can have no power really?

AD: Just try to stop it.

AS (very faint): Yeah. It has a (ton).

S (very faint): (Uh-hm.)

LD (simultaneously): Experientially you can say that?

AH: Oh no, I'm not--

S (very faint): Yeah. (bit of laughter)

AH (faint): I'm not suggesting that experientially myself, I'm just saying that whole-- that seems to be-- that seems to be a theme that permeates most of the doctrines that I've read about.

LD: Well, I don't understand the reason.

AH (faint): There's an *appearance* of selfhood. It's not really selfhood.

LD: It's the most powerful thing I know, (from the beginning).

AH (very faint): But if you didn't believe that that was an appearance, a (reflection) [few words inaudible]

RG: Yeah but you know, if it's an appearance, it's an appearance of some principle.

AH (very faint): Although I don't think--

RG: Well, then it's nothing. If it's an appearance, then it's appearance of something. Otherwise it's just a complete illusion and I don't think we hold that, that it's complete illusion.

AH (faint): Who doesn't?

RG: You might. I don't think that's the view PB's unfolding. Go on.

RC: Yeah but--

DH (simultaneously): Well just--

S: I don't think [one word inaudible]

DH (simultaneously): Yeah I'd like to(--/.)

RC (simultaneously): --stick on that [one word inaudible] stick on that point of appearing though because it's really-- it's something I don't follow Anthony on is the-- what the--

AD (simultaneously): That's because you're bringing in the I AM consciousness whereas I'm not, that it remains impassive, and only under certain conditions will it-- will it make its presence felt. But prior to that, it's-- it's impassive. Ok, and the struggle that takes place takes place on the level that you're functioning at with that ego complex.

RG: You know, one way to do it is when he says conscious ego, we say awareness, they're not the same term and (the extent) he uses-- he distinguishes very carefully in the *Wisdom* states of consciousness from awareness. And the I AM can remain aware and there could still be the appearance of consciousness in-- in the ego and they're not the same.

S (very faint): I hear you.

RC: Why does the I AM have to remain aware of *these* vasanas? Why isn't it free to make itself aware of some other vasanas?

AD: You're ignoring karma, the whole evolutionary trend of this matrix of thoughts.

S (faint): Uh-hm.

RC: I'm not trying to ignore it. I mean I'm actually trying to follow on the quote that we're reading in terms of how it is that, although the Overself consciousness is not a new consciousness to be developed, our awareness of it does begin in time, it has to be-- has to be developed as a new attainment.

AD: Yes, but our awareness is referring to who? [S, faint: Me?] Isn't it the person? Isn't this this-- the person that is developing this? Now if we stop right there, alright, we say that we're speaking about this ego wants to develop the-- wants to gain a glimpse, and go beyond that even. Now that means that immediately there's polarized within it a conflict between tendencies, [RC: Yeah.] among the various tendencies. [RC: And in--] To speak about the higher I AM coming in and taking sides is to stop-- is to stop your development.

RC: But isn't the conflict essentially what I'm going to be aware of, I mean, am-- is my awareness going to associate with A or with B, isn't that really the conflict?

AD: No, I don't think so, because like we pointed out that this consciousness is *impassive*.

AS: You're aware that they're different also.

AD (faint): Yes, that's (true).

RG (simultaneously): The awareness doesn't associate it with it, that doesn't--

AS (simultaneously): And whatever comes up it lights it up.

AD: It's a Witness-I which views what's going on.

RC: Then what I don't understand is what is it that we would say, what principle is it that is going to determine whether or not the I AM is identified with one of these three levels or comes to awareness of its own higher self? It seems that-- that the I AM is what we talked about as being present in the dominant phase, [S, faint: Ok.] that that *is* the dominant phase.

AD (faint): I'm sorry, I lost track.

RC: I don't mean the words 'I AM'. I mean the actual bringing of oneself into identity with something. And that declaration--whether it should be "I am this ego" or "I am this Soul in the Nous" or "I *am* these soul powers".

AS: Randy, isn't it sort of like when he says that soul is near to the image to which it tends [AD, faint: Yeah.] by its very essence, having made the life choice in a way, that then, you know, that-- the circuit can take over.

RC: Or that life choice--

AS (simultaneously, most very faint): And the tendencies would fight [one/two words inaudible] and so on.

S (very faint): There you go.

AS/S(?) (very faint): In this case it (happens/happened) to be what he said (happens/happened).

RC: That life choice--would you say that life choice is made by the I AM or that the I AM is indifferent to that life choice?

AS: Made by the memories stored in it.

AD (simultaneously): Choice-- choice here-- you'll misunderstand choice, it's the working out of your karma. [AS, faint: Exactly.] Not a question of choice.

RC: Is it the I AM's karma?

AS: But, when we said those-- what its-- the essence is memorized, it's retained from a previous life, that seems to have a certain momentum. It's not a conscious-- it doesn't have to decide [couple/three words inaudible] does it according to the very-- your essence of those--

RC: Yeah those things of which I-- it seems to me that those things of which I am most frequently and most sustainedly aware make the deepest impression. But-- but entertaining them in my awareness seems to be what makes the attention-- or makes the impression.

AD: Would you say it is the tendencies *themselves* that are bringing that about? In other words, let's say you have a complex: you like to study philosophy, over and over again. Alright, it builds up into a complex. It's an idea that will persist and carry through to the next incarnation. You'll carry that along

with you. [RC simultaneously: Ok now if you're-- yes.] It is this tendency that again will struggle with former tendencies to go on achieving what it set-- what it wants to do.

RC: Exactly, now "carrying it on", like I want to make that more meaningful, carrying it on to other lives, what does that mean except a tendency to continue to turn awareness toward that, regardless of what body I'm in?

S: Towards what, what is the "that"?

RC: Toward philosophic study.

AS: But maybe, maybe-- suppose I do a lot of philosophic study this life. Now I die, now the *essence* of that is like taken back up into the I AM. The next life when this I AM again is associated with a body, that tendency, that idea of philosophic studies will have a great influence [couple/three words inaudible] life. And if the body I inhabit happens to have certain other desires than ones-- that tendency to study philosophically might even war with those recalcitrant of that body I'm in. But that tendency won't be the I AM, it's [couple/three words inaudible] [RG simultaneously: And that has nothing-- right.] the residue of the previous philosophical study of that.

RG: And that has nothing to do with the consciousness side of the I AM, it may have something to do with the content side of it. But the con-- to think of the I AM consciousness you'd be-- is just-- is its *witnessing* all of that. So it may contain all the karmic history that is going to be unfolded. But would you say that it's that consciousness that is actually going through the experiences of identifying with the mind that's doing it?

RC (simultaneously): I definitely would, I mean [RG simultaneously: Ok, good.] just to take a position now.

LD: Yeah that consciousness is becoming aware of its own content.

RC (simultaneously): But, I definitely would say that the I AM is transforming its own substance into his world.

AS: Plotinus would say it's like the reason-principles at a higher level, say, that are represented there. Like he says somewhere the higher soul came to reason-principles of the man, tendencies of the personality, right at the seeming of that lower guy but still not-- not the I AM, it would be like, you know, in that diagram (you/we) drew there that they would be like *rational* principles rather than *irrational* tendencies. I mean you could talk about rational versus irrational. [Note: See Plotinus, VI.7.5.]

LR: But--

S (faint): [three/few words inaudible]

RG: Linda, yeah.

LR: There's one other way, like I mean either-- either the I AM is the subjectivity or the consciousness which is what you're-- what is aware in (you/me) when it *is* associated with [one/two words inaudible] but you always take the [few words inaudible]

AD: You gotta speak louder. [couple/three words inaudible]

[short pause, bit of laughter]

LR: Either-- [S simultaneously, faint: Say it.] either the I AM is always the subjective. Even when we're completely immersed in the ego, the consciousness of anything is due to the I AM present-- excuse me, present identification, which is I think what Randy said, but it's-- it's still identified with the being but it's still--

AD (simultaneously): Read that first sentence, read the quote.

LR (simultaneously): Or-- or--

S (faint): Yes, yes.

AD (simultaneously): Before you go on to the "or" read the first sentence from the quote.

PB [V14, 22:3.4, LR rereads a part of]: "...Overself is always here as man's [LR reads: as the] innermost [truest] self. It is beginningless and endless [in time]."

AD (faint): And he goes on.

PB [V14, 22:3.4, RC rereads a part of]: "Its consciousness does not have to be developed as something new. But the person's awareness of it begins in time and has to be developed as a new attainment."

AD: So why should this consciousness develop itself?

LR: The ego develop-- is what gets developed.

AD: Yeah.

LR: Or it--

AD (faint): [one word inaudible]

RG: Or--

LR: Or-- I mean I can see this idea as equally valid, what we take to be our own subjectivity is *not* our own true subjectivity. It is as we spoke of the Dragon or the Earth's memories living themselves out, it's-- And it's re-- well-- I mean that consciousness which is living in us we say is ourselves, I mean is in no way our true consciousness.

RC: I'm just saying, what entitles us to make that mistake?

DB (very faint): The "us" is we. I mean insofar as you want to distinguish ourself from the Dragon--

S (very faint): So the Dragon [few words inaudible]

DB (very faint): The us and we, that sort of starts off the person, I mean, and that is not exclusive of the ego, I mean it's a part of this process of thought [couple/three words inaudible] here is going to have to coincide while--

LD: Yeah the e--

DB (simultaneously): And--

RG (faint): Wait, raise your hand.

DB (very faint): This-- this would have-- (come into aware) of the Overself's consciousness.

LR (very faint): Exactly.

S (very faint): [few words inaudible]

LD: No we may [RG simultaneously: Wait, wait, hold--] take-- the ego becomes developed, more polished, [AS simultaneously: After ten it's ok.] a smooth-- a smoother [RG simultaneously: Alright.] mirror to reflect the light of the Overself, [DB simultaneously, faint: I mean it's just very (polite).] not-- how could the ego itself be conscious? [few inaudible student words] [S, faint: Let's go.] It's a mirror.

DB (simultaneously, very faint): If it isn't, if it isn't then some way you're--

AS: That's [RG simultaneously: Yeah.] (helped with) all the thoughts [one word inaudible] that's true.

S: What?

AH: That-- that's it Avery. (some laughter)

AS (amidst laughter): Yeah, I think so.

RG: Alright, go for it. (RG laughs, laughter)

LR: Come on Louis. [few words inaudible] talk.

LD (simultaneously): I would like to--

LR: Yeah.

LD: I would like to say-- (laughter)

S: Right.

LDS: If I could respond immediately. (much laughter)

AS/S(?) (amidst laughter): Wait a minute, wait!!

THE ULTIMATE EVOLUTION OF THE WORLD-IDEA, WHICH INCLUDES ALL THE CREATURES WITHIN IT, IS PREORDAINED

LDS: Now I lost my thought. (more laughter) It seems like what-- what was-- what is that [one/two words inaudible] attempted is that-- is that the momentum or the continuity of this ego matrix of possibilities does have this lawful unfoldment, and that unfoldment or karmic unfoldment that cannot be--except maybe through grace or something--interrupted by the Overself or the asmita principle. That stands alone and integral and untouched and passive let's say. And, why can't we entertain the idea that this unfoldment, this lawful karmic unfoldment is in the way of some kind of development and growth, and that in no way touches or has anything to do with the Overself itself, like-- Why can't this entity that's in time and in process be thought of as going through this growth and development?

AD (faint): Why restrict it to just that entity, why not, so to speak, multiply that to all the entities, and then see that the World-Idea is accomplishing itself?

S (very faint): Ok.

LDS: Anything under the law of karma, anything that is in some way a process or in time.

AD (faint): Both.

LD: It can grow and develop but is it going to grow consciousness?

RG: Not [PC simultaneously: Wait but--] an arm or a limb.

PC: My question--

AD (simultaneously, faint): I think-- I think you're missing the point, the point is that the ultimate evolution of the World-Idea is preordained and it is going to happen, and each and every one of us in future times is going to evolve an ego through all this turmoil that is going to be part of that beautiful world order. Not Hitler's world order.

PC: Then Anthony--

AD (faint): We're leaving the whole point out.

S (very faint): Yeah.

RG: And Louis, [S simultaneously: Yeah.] just you *can* develop consciousness, you can't develop awareness, so maybe if you hold that distinction.

AD (faint): Well let's say you develop vehicles that ultimately would be part and parcel of the World-Idea as it's reaching its fulfillment, turning you into super-human creatures.

PC: Then Anthony, is even the decision to generate certain tendencies part of that karmically preordained evolution?

AD (faint): But that's all included under the World-Idea. And it's not only the question of individuals within it but it's a question of the *whole* World-Idea evolving.

PC: And there aren't even moments of choice when you could go [S simultaneously, very faint: No.] one direction or another?

AD (very faint): Why not?

PC: Well I mean that's what you're-- that's the question that this whole discussion brings--

AD (simultaneously): Well that's a question that can't be answered because I'm not a seer or a prophet or-- a prophet answers those questions, if you have a choice about certain things.

LR: Or--

S (very faint): Oracle.

RG: Or what?

AD (very faint): Not [one word inaudible]

LR: The oracle.

S (very faint): Right.

S: Ah-ha.

S (very faint): Yeah.

AH (faint): Let's go over this [few words inaudible] like the appearance as the evolution of the World-Idea. What's the context for that growth? AI-- is it always and forever out of the context of the I AM? Isn't I AM [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): No, it's within the I AM.

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1983 0629b Ends; Side 2 Begins)

[Note: The following paragraph is from the PC transcript, not on this version of the audio files.]

IT'S THE PERSON THAT'S BECOMING AWARE OF THAT INFINITE CONSCIOUSNESS; THE INFINITE CONSCIOUSNESS DOESN'T COME DOWN AND SAY, "I AM THIS PERSON"

AD: --of every individual, because each I AM is going to evolve in that World-Idea a means by which... each I AM will have a representative within that World-Idea, and that representative will act in accordance with its higher ideal, or with its higher being. All this takes place within the impersonal consciousness. It's not the impersonal consciousness coming down and saying "I am that person".

AH (very faint): How shall it remain impassive is describing--

S (very faint): Right.

AD: It's the person that's becoming aware of that infinite consciousness, not the infinite consciousness coming down and saying, "I am this person".

AH: So then his growth takes place *outside* of that.

AS (faint): *Inside* of (this).

RG (simultaneously): *Inside* of it.

AH (faint): It is expressed I think, is [couple words inaudible] the being that I have?

S (very faint): Yes.

RG: It's the opposite, very difficult.

S (very faint): Yeah we'll (take two).

RG (faint): The development takes place in this, but it itself is not in the [one word inaudible]

PC: So then when we go around thinking that we have something to say about what we're going to focus our attention on or what tendencies we want to generate and what tendencies we want to ignore, that all really is given within the World-Idea from the first.

IS EVERYTHING ORDAINED?

AD (faint): Well now you're touching a very sore point in my psychology. (laughter, student words) And, I think, I think Timothy knows a quote that is one of my favorites. You remember about the orbits, Tim?

TS: I'm trying to get it now.

PB [V6, 9:4.141, TS reading]: "The sun, planets, and stars must move in their regular orbits. They are not free to change their course each day. Can this little creature, man--a mere speck on one of them--claim a larger freedom than theirs without being insane?" (laughter)

S: That gets it right there.

RC (very faint): Ok.

S: Oh.

AD (faint): But if you keep the two views together, you'll come out with the right (one).

RG: [couple/three words inaudible]

PC (simultaneously): Well I'd like to know what the metaphysical justification for the other view is. (bit of laughter)

RG (faint): There isn't any.

AD (faint): We have to have it.

S (very faint): It's grace, isn't it?

AD (very faint): Grace [couple words inaudible]

RC: Yeah but, we've also talked about grace as being the soul, not as being something outside the soul.

S (very faint): (Ok.)

RG/S(?) (faint): Yeah.

AD (faint): Yes. So we have to keep the two together. I mean, I-- I've stated: this is my psychology. I don't believe in it. I think everything is ordained. And yet I go around trying to make out it's not. (RG laughs)

THE ACTIVITY OF THE I AM IS TWOFOLD: IT KNOWS THE EXTERNAL, AND IT KNOWS THE PRINCIPLE ABOVE ITSELF

RC: I guess just-- there's some words that have just become meaningless to me, like I don't know about what it means to say that the I AM can be associated with any part of these three levels or can be-- or can recognize its own selfhood in the Nous. It seems that the way you've been speaking of it tonight, the I

AM is *only* aware of its own selfhood in the Nous and everything else is something of an entirely different order.

AD (faint): No. It is the very nature and the function of this principle of the I AM to be aware *of* that which it manifests, [student assents, faint] give its attention to that in the sense that it is conscious *of* it. When we say it is conscious of it, we're saying that it manifests this World-Idea. That is not the naked person when-- when you're saying that. (I'm an expert in it.) [short pause] I'm sorry, Randy [couple words inaudible] (resist).

RC: I'm trying to get some meaning for saying that the I AM can associate with any of these three levels of manifestation, or can turn itself inwardly and be aware of its own selfhood in the Nous, as if these were choices to be made.

AD: Well, again, I don't really know what you mean by choices but, in a general-- general way we-- the description that's given to us about the activity of this I AM is that it's twofold: in one sense it is the faculty by which it understands that which it manifests. As we said, it can be aware, or it could know that it knows. But it cannot know knowing itself. In order to know knowing itself, alright, then it would have to be the higher principle. [RC, faint: Ok.] These two exist together in it. When the-- when there is that awareness that it knows, and it knows its own selfhood, then we say "insight". When we say that it is *not* aware of its own selfhood but only knows the external, whether that external are the Ideas or the rational processes or perception of the sensible world, then we say that it is the faculty of understanding or the reasoning faculty or the reasoning soul which knows what it is manifesting and deals with it. [RC, faint: Ok.] But it has both these-- these aspects. Now if we think of the I AM as manifesting the world, associated with a certain historic-- you know, historicity of bodies, evolving a personal representative within what it is manifesting as the vehicle or the medium for itself, its own representative *in* that World-Idea, then it deals with all these external factors. As it evolves in its understanding, and then the understanding includes, let's say, an understanding of the doctrine which tries to inculcate self-awareness into this principle, that is, teach it to become aware of its own selfhood, then you're going to the next level where it appropriates the Intellectual-Principle which is within itself and it's both: it's a double knower. It knows the external, alright, knows the principle above itself, and in these two it is both the lower knower and the higher knower.

RC: The I AM is both?

AD: Yeah.

RC: Ok. Now when-- when we say that-- that the soul is present, the dominant phase, ok, we say that we're dealing with an irrational principle. Now, I mean, it's not rational. Would you say that his I AM is present there, and that's what makes it the dominant phase?

AD: The I AM would be present even if he started off as an amoeba, and he evolves all the way through the World-Idea to the level of a highly refined ego.

RC: Ok now would that evolution that you're speaking of be precisely the Logos that you also speak of as the I AM?

AD: I'm sorry. Would it be the Logos of the Overself?

RC (simultaneously): What's-- Seems on the one hand we speak of the I AM as being certain center of individual consciousness which is universal. On the other we also speak of it as a specific Logos, [student assents, very faint] which to me means a specific ordering of ideation.

AD: A specific ordering of the way the World-Idea is going to be manifest within it.

RC: Ok like for instance, first an amoeba, and then something else, and then something else, and then maybe finally a person, that these are all contained within the Logos of that I AM, or the Logos that that I AM is.

[student assents, very faint]

AD: Correct.

S (faint): Ok, right.

THE BODY, WHICH IS A CONGLOMERATION OF TROPES, LIVING MATTER, FOISTS ITSELF UPON THE I AM AND SAYS, "I AM THIS"

RC: Now, the actualization of any of those phases--like that at this moment in time amoeba is, at this moment in time cat is, at this moment in time the person is, aren't these like actual transformations of the I AM into identity with particular ideas? Isn't it saying like when the-- when the amoeba comes forth, isn't it saying "I am amoeba"? When the person comes forth, isn't it saying "I am person"? Or is there some other agency that's bringing this about?

AS: You know Randy, we say that the I AM is present 'cause it's also indivisible. So it's present in whatever manifestation goes on. I think it's below those you're speaking of that determining sequence of the manifestation. And then if we go one step more and say that that Logos for the individual is not separate from the World-Idea, that in fact the World-Idea in some way has a totality of these Logoi or [one word inaudible] or [one/two words inaudible] and again, that whole evolutionary process is part of the World-Idea. In some way his Logos, that Logos principle that is the soul that he is, together with developing that whole (life).

RC: Oh definitely, I mean we speak of the Overself as part of the World-Mind, as being one with the World-Mind without being lost in it. And these same ideas that we're speaking of are going to be present in the World-Mind or the Overself for the I AM of each individual person. Now the sequencing and the ordering and stuff seems to be--

AD: But, you should rephrase it this way, because you're constantly thinking like the I AM is identifying with, let's say, a particular body. But if you reverse the phrasing you'll be much more accurate. There *is* a particular body which *is* the conglomeration of tropes, the living matter, and it is this that foists itself upon the I AM and says, "I am". [RC: Ok now that's--] It isn't the I AM that says, "I am this".

RC: Ok. That's one point of view that I'm-- that I'm definitely aware of. The o-- the other one that I'm trying to balance it with is, when he says each soul goes forth at its own proper time, it doesn't need to be pushed, it doesn't need any counseling.

AD: It doesn't even need daimons to bring it to the place where it's got to be.

RC (simultaneously): Exactly. Now isn't that precisely-- when you take that point of view, isn't that precisely because the-- the awareness of the individual actually becomes fascinated with that particular ego structure?

AD: But why would you find that contradictory to the previous remark that those tropes and that living matter foists itself upon the I AM? They're not-- they're not contradictory, they're complementary aspects of one and the same thing. [S: And--] You no sooner-- it-- it isn't a question of only the I AM having this representative because it is, you know, the result of a previous historicity, but it's also the result of the inherent life which is foisting itself upon this I AM.

RC: Ok. So the one point of view (say--)

AD (simultaneously): So you have-- that's why you have to keep the two things together, you've got to keep the consciousness or the I AM as the principle, and the World-Idea within which is evolving, alright, and which has its own matter, and in projecting forth that matter, that matter that belongs to the World-Idea is foisting itself on the I AM which is manifesting it.

RC: Ok. Well the-- then the two points of view seem to be, on the one hand, of the-- the matter foisting point of view seems to be that these dead soulless things foist themselves upon something which is alive and real, and there's an echo of I AM that runs through those things that somebody believes.

AD: Yeah, ok.

RC: Who believes it?

S (very faint): Us.

S (very faint): [couple words inaudible]

AD: *You* answer it. I got *my* answer, *you* answer it. When you answer it you'll see where the conflict lies.

[short pause]

RG: I think there's a real problem here in distinguishing awareness from the appearance of awareness, from the states of consciousness that-- that one's mind takes, and that the taking of those mental states as equivalent with the awareness that lights them up. And that Anthony keeps saying there's a representative of the I AM in-- in the being but it's not the I AM itself that becomes the thing.

LD: But-- yeah, like PB said when we were doing the ego quotes, the ego takes this light to be itself. It takes itself to be a separate enti-- entity.

RG: But that doesn't deny that the ego [LD simultaneously: Yeah.] could be con-- a consciousness being also.

LR (faint): I accept.

LD (simultaneously): You're not divided.

RG: You're not separate from--

LR (simultaneously, faint): No, you're not separate from the I AM. Ego couldn't be a conscious-- wouldn't be separate.

RG (simultaneously): But not sep-- right. But not separate from, that's right [one/two words inaudible]

AD (faint): Abstractly you could speak about the ego without a consciousness, alright, appropriating the consciousness. The point that we're getting to is that the conflict is within that (blooming) set of tendencies and not in the disembodied consciousness. That's the whole point here.

S (very faint): That's right.

AD (faint): The whole point. (some laughter)

AS: That-- like--

AD (simultaneously, faint): I think [one/two words inaudible] those are what [AS simultaneously: Yeah.] people are confused about.

RC: I guess the basic--

LR (simultaneously, faint): That's not where the conflict lies, the conflict is obviously [few words inaudible]

RC (simultaneously): The basic problem I've having conceptually is that I guess I really have a hard time honestly conceiving of this Mercury phase as [LR, faint: (Conscious.)] not associated with body in some way. I think that's where I'm having the problem. I-- I guess that's it.

RG: Well, we said it wasn't associated with, it's a funny, you know--

PC: But it's completely impassively associated is what he said, (right)?

RG (simultaneously): But I think in the differentiation of the idea of the Logos of the I AM and the consciousness of the I AM you have the answer, that the Logos portion, the Idea part of the I AM *does* unfold the vehicles and do-- *is* what's evolving itself.

AS (faint): And is in conflict, according to all those quotes in Plotinus, the reason-principle itself is a thing of parts and in conflict [couple words inaudible] [Note: E.g., Plotinus, III.2.16.] And that sets up that whole (conflict). The reason-principle including, you know, the-- the ego [couple words inaudible]

LR (faint): But I just-- It's in support of something Avery just said which is, when you take your own experience and you think of yourself as you were as a child, when you think about all the different experiences that you've gone through in life and the fact that you've possibly [couple words inaudible] change, whatever, because you've gone through thirty years of experience, when you remember all that, when you remember it having had certain tendencies that you don't want to [one word inaudible] to have or gotten rid of or whatever, you don't think about it as something else that was there and now you're s-- you're-- I mean there's a certain-- you remember that person as yourself.

AS: That's right, you-- but this--

LR (simultaneously): And--

AS: But what's--

S: What's the point?

AS: Yeah.

LR: Point is--

AS: And you're going to say that's through this presence of the I AM.

LR: I'm saying there's some meaning [AS simultaneously: And the--] there that is *always* there whether you're [AS simultaneously: Absolutely.] ten years old or you're [one/two words inaudible]

AS (simultaneously): But-- but we already made the point that even if you're an amoeba that presence of the I AM must be there or you're not a-- or you're not.

LR: Yeah but there, right, all the way through every single stage, it's not something (that/that's) [one word inaudible]

S (simultaneously, faint): Skipped.

AS (faint): I agree.

LR: Ok.

AS: That--

LR: So wouldn't it be its consciousness which is always [AS simultaneously: Ultimately yes, the awareness is--] taking itself to be two years old, four years old--

AS: Yes I-- I wouldn't quite agree with Richard on that point, I would say the consciousness or the awareness *is* the presence of that I AM. But that awareness is not changing. That's what you're saying too.

LR (simultaneously): That's what I'm saying.

AS: And that's that whole Vedantic and the Buddhist argument again. [LR simultaneously: So that even in the ego.] The Vedantists say that there's only this unchanging awareness. The Buddhists say that there's alway-- only this constant process going on.

LR: [couple words inaudible] the same boat actually.

AS: It's the same boat.

THE WORLD-IDEA, WHICH IS PROJECTED BY THE I AM, IS WHAT'S EVOLVING, AND IT INCLUDES ALL THE EGOS THAT EACH HAVE THEIR HISTORICAL CONTINUITY

RG: But the question still is about who is the evolving entity.

AS (simultaneously): Yeah.

LDS: Yeah that's good.

AS (faint): Yeah.

LR: Ok.

S: If--

LR: Well in that example.

AS: Yeah, in the example you're saying-- (well--)

AD (simultaneously): (Does the) consciousness evolve?

RG: Does consciousness?

AD (faint): Yeah.

RG: Awareness, pure awareness evolving?

AD (faint): Yeah, yeah. Does that evolve?

RG: Awareness isn't evolving anywhere. Is the emanant of the I AM evolving? Yeah.

AD (faint): I mean if you read the first quote he says it's this consciousness is Godlike in nature, alright, [RG: Right.] has no beginning in time, no ending; [RG assents] and it doesn't evolve.

S: Right.

RG (faint): It's not evolving.

AD: Well then why-- why speak about it as evolving? [RG simultaneously, very faint: I don't-- I don't s--] It's quite a contradiction to what we just said. So then *what's* evolving?

RG: An emanant of that.

S (very faint): It's that which reflects it.

RG: Yeah.

AD: I don't know [LR simultaneously: Awareness.] that it's an *emanant*.

RG: Ok. Then [one word inaudible]

S (simultaneously, faint): The Logos in it.

S: So--

AS: That which reflects it.

S (faint): That [one word inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Isn't it-- isn't-- isn't what evo-- what is evolving something which is part of the World-Idea?

RG: Yes, and would you say in your language that is the Logos of the I AM, *that's* what's evolving? Or that the--

AD (simultaneously): No, no I'm not saying that it-- Leave that out, that will only blur the distinctions. [S, faint: Right.] We're saying that the World-Idea, which we say is projected by the [RG simultaneously: That's what's evolving.] I AM, that's what's evolving, that World-Idea is evolving.

RG: And within that World-Idea is all your little worlds, is all the little individualized worlds.

AD (simultaneously): Within that, within that World-Idea is going to be all the egos, let's say, that have a historical continuity; that's what's evolving.

RG: Ok. What is the link-- in that view, what is the link of the evolving individual to his consciousness?

AD: What is the link between one ego and the next?

RG: No, what is the link be-- well-- Or between one ego and his own sour-- and the source of his being. If you say that it's only the World-Idea that's evolving, what allows for the continuity between an evolu-- the-- the awareness that's present in the ego and his ascent back to his own source?

AD: I'm sorry? (Again.)

RG (simultaneously): What provides for his ascent? If it's only the World-Idea that's unfolding and that is not consciousness, and yet the ascent of man is an ascent *to* the conscious principle, how do you put those together if there's such a sharp distinction between what's evolving as the World-Idea and what you're evolving to which is becoming aware of the principle of your own nature.

AD (simultaneously): Well-- well then, do you-- do you think you're going to *evolve* to that principle?

RG: No, I think you always are that.

AS: Yeah. And that's what he has to eventually recognize.

AD (simultaneously, faint): Well, well wait now.

S (faint): [couple words inaudible]

LDS (simultaneously): No he has to abdicate (to that).

RG: No I don't think you can evolve to that principle. You only evolve the organs so you can perceive what's always present.

AD (simultaneously): In other words, there's this historicity, one ego following upon another. That's evolving.

RG: Yes.

AD: The I AM is *not* evolving.

RG: Correct.

AD: So it's just this *vehicle* that's evolving.

RG: Ok.

AD: It is part of the World-Idea too that's evolving.

RG: Ok. And the link is that when those vehicles get developed sufficiently, then one can-- then they can reflect the I AM consciousness which never changed in the first place.

RC: So Richard--

AD (simultaneously): And until you reach the stage of humanity, you're not going to be able to do that.

S (faint): See that version of--

LDS (simultaneously): Dickie--

LR (faint): Can (you/we) reach that then?

LDS (simultaneously): I-- how about Samkhya when they [LR simultaneously: Is this a--] talk about that?

AD: Never mind Samkhya. (AD laughs)

LDS: No. You know they talk about three-

AS (simultaneously): (In) the Samkhya that was-- that was--

RG (simultaneously): That's-- that's utterly Samkhya what you just said.

LDS (simultaneously): Yeah, where the buddhi [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): It's utterly Samkhya? Why, you think (they're/there)-- it wasn't around before Samkhya?

RG: Sure, that's I--

LDS (simultaneously): But Samkhya was the first-- (laughter, student words)

RG/S(?) (amidst laughter): Maybe not. (more laughter)

S: You accept it.

RG: The I AM was around, but not the form of [one/two words inaudible]

LDS (simultaneously): Oh the I AM was. (RG laughs)

S (amidst laughter, faint): [few words inaudible]

LDS: The one--

PC: Anthony, when you've reached the--

BS (simultaneously): [couple words inaudible] my higher self from.

S: Sure.

S: It's-- [S simultaneously: Yeah.] so it is [one/two words inaudible]

S (simultaneously): Come on, Bert.

S (simultaneously, faint): [few words inaudible]

S (faint): Just yell.

AS (faint): Go on Bert, sure.

BS (simultaneously, faint): With the content of-- seems to me that the content of each (life) or each ego would have to be within [one/two words inaudible]

S (very faint): The principle ego.

BS (faint): That is [students assent, faint] each representation, each manifestation of the I AM as an ego would be a partial or manifestation of the I AM. And if we're going to say that the I AM [couple words inaudible] anymore. I'm trying to find some kind of a content of what we call the [one word inaudible]

AD (very faint): [few words inaudible]

BS (very faint): If the I AM is an eternal principle, but it is the-- the principle of awareness for each-- each evolving entity, that each life [few words inaudible] seems to be [one/two words inaudible] so to speak, from the I AM or appropriated from the I AM to a psychosomatic organism. But the I AM itself [three words inaudible] would totally [few words inaudible] every possible content by which eternity there will be identity within it, but only partially appropriated if you'd like.

[9¼ second pause]

AD (very faint): I don't follow. Just do it once more. [few words inaudible]

AS(?) (faint): Yeah I know, it's ok.

BS (very faint): Say that (one more time).

AS (simultaneously, faint): See I think-- you're trying to say Bert that not only the eternal I AM but there's this-- like an eternal Idea within that I AM through all the lives, that's like [three words inaudible] each life partially is [one word inaudible] partially [one word inaudible] out of all the lives considered as partial expressions of this one vision of Idea. That's a certain kind of unity.

BS (very faint): Totality of the e-- totality of the Idea. It's not just the Idea [one/two words inaudible]

AS (faint): That would-- that would seem to confuse this side of manifestation with [couple words inaudible] other side of manifestation. In other words, the World-Idea is, I mentioned, Intellectual Idea, there's no reason why the Idea won't-- individuals shouldn't have their Idea on the other side too and then that would-- well, that would be over on the other side. (RG and another student laugh) I mean [RG simultaneously: Is that where we want to--] [couple words inaudible] know anything of outside of manifestation or are you implying--

BS (very faint): That [couple words inaudible]

S (very faint): The other--

AS (faint): The other side.

[short pause]

PC: Anthony, when you talk about the World-Idea evolving in the asmita (or talk about--) are you speaking about the various levels of it above the ego all the way up to the Augoeides? You speaking of all those levels as part of what is evolving?

[short pause]

AD (very faint): Isn't it enough to be concerned about this one here?

PC: Well, I'm just wondering--

AD (very faint): The World-Idea, this one here?

PC (simultaneously): Yeah.

AD (very faint): This World-Idea is evolving.

PC: Ok then I guess what I'm asking--

AD (simultaneously, faint): I mean why worry about this rational soul or the planetary spheres or the inerratic sphere? Why worry about them? Isn't it enough that this World-Idea?

PC (faint): Well if we-- what I'm wondering is if this-- well, if there's a glimpse(.) the source of a level of like an intelligence prior to the ego as operating in the soul, is that intelligence something like that?

AD (very faint): Again, the whole point that I think is being made here is that the evolution of the World-Idea is primary and foremost. This is the whole point in the evolution of the ego. Insofar that you evolve-- the ego evolves, your ego evolves, other ego evolves, just think of what that does to the World-Idea, or in terms of the atmosphere of the world itself. If you think of, let's say, the very nature of the tropes changing their status from one level to another. Why-- why worry about anything else?

[short pause]

PC (faint): I guess what I'm trying to ask is--

AD (faint): In other words what we're saying is the evolution of this atmosphere, this life-belt of the Earth, is what essentially has to evolve out of the condition it is in now. [short pause] Well it's pretty late. We kept you overtime, yes.

[Audio File 1983 0629b Ends]

NOTES ON THE I AM AND EGO

--Rough notes from after class: (Pat C transcript only, pp. 23-24)--

AD: Your free choice is included in the plan of the World-Idea.

The I AM--they personalize it, all the time, make it some sort of possession.

As soon as you say "I AM", it takes on a personal quality; it might be better to say "impersonal consciousness".

It's quite misleading to say "I had the experience."

Soul choosing a vehicle--quite misleading--it's not a matter of choice. There's a continuity of the habits that finds its fulfillment in another psychosomatic organism.

"I AM" really means that it's qualifying the absolute Nous.

S: Re: PB: "There is a point where the human meets the divine, where the conscious ego emerges from the all-encompassing Void. That point we call the Overself." (PB, V14, 22:3.313)

AD: To me what comes out of the Void is the I AM, the emanant, not the ego. Perhaps what he means is if the World Idea is part of the I AM, it's coming out of the Void.

The ego surrenders itself if it's concentrating on the I AM. That's why it's so paradoxical.

The awareness is not directed--by definition awareness is infinite--the mental faculties are that which is directed--a chain of reasoning. The mental faculties are grasped by the will and forced to concentrate; the same consciousness illuminates that and also illuminates when you're in chaos. That's why it's necessary to develop the vehicle. It's a tendency within the ego that directs the mental faculties. If you have the tendencies to be religious and say the mantram, then those tendencies will certainly take over.

Haven't you noticed that there's a plurality of I's in you?--But the ego is the core of all of them.

If at some time in the past you have lived out the higher tendencies, it becomes a proclivity.

Ego--the depository in which many great ideas have found their way down to the dregs.

The "ego" a Sage has is a pseudo-ego: no kind of ego you understand or know.