

**CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
January 25, 1984
PB PARAS; PHILOSOPHY**

TOPIC: PB Paras

SUBJECT: Philosophy

SUBSUBJECTS: Philosophic Yoga, Reasoning, Mind Essence, Glimpse, Intellection, Nirvikalpa Samadhi

CONTENTS:

- # THE WORLD-IDEA WORKS OUT ITS UNDERSTANDING IN YOU
- # WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE, YOU HAVE TO BE A MAN
- # TRANSCENDING THE WORLD-IDEA BY ABSORBING IT
- # REASONING HAS TO REACH MATURATION BEFORE THE MIND CAN REFLECT THE UNIVERSE WITHOUT DISTORTION
- # A QUIET MIND IS NECESSARY FOR OBSERVATION
- # THE MYSTIC GETS A GLIMPSE OF THE ARCHETYPAL WORLD (INTELLECTION); NIRVIKALPA SAMADHI
- # A PHILOSOPHER ACCEPTS THE WORLD
- # MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE AND METAPHYSICAL UNDERSTANDING ARE BROUGHT TOGETHER TO PRODUCE THE PHILOSOPHER

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, Notebooks. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives*.
- Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*
- Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)

NOTES:

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

TRANSCRIBED from Audio Cassette Tapes (and also using the original Pat Campbell 1983 transcript as a basis) by HP, et al. in 1993 as part of the set for *Living Wisdom*. V11 version 2018. Reformatted from V11 version by JRM & JF 2019-2020, with Subheads and Table of Contents added by JRM. In 2024, IT updates prefatory matter and footer, replaces tape markers

with audio file markers, adds Subsubjects, alters most Subheads to make more accurate, completes Book List, corrects typos/errors, reformats to accord with new conventions.

Readable edited transcript – V14.1r.

AUDIO FILES: 1984 0125a, 1984 0125b. [Note: “Tape” and “Side” refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

1984 01/25 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Philosophy
Readable Edited Transcript

THE WORLD-IDEA WORKS OUT ITS UNDERSTANDING IN YOU

[Audio File 1984 0125a Begins]

PB: "The logical movement of intellect must come to a dead stop before the threshold of reality. But we are not to bring about this pause deliberately or in response to the bidding of some man or some doctrine. It must come of its own accord as the final maturation of long and precise reasoning and as the culmination of the intellectual and personal *discovery* that the apprehension of mind as essence will come only when we let go of the idea-forms it takes and direct our attention to it." (Perspectives p. 262 and 20.4.67) (para reread)

VM: Where would you place this quote in the context of those three levels of meditation--concentration, meditation, contemplation? When he speaks of a threshold of reality, I can't imagine he's speaking about the stage where one is attempting to learn concentration . . . so he must be speaking about the genuine insight which must come about as a fruition of years, if not more, of reflection upon the nature of thought and its relationship to mind and so on. (pause)

RC: It seems that he must be talking about that irreversible lightning stroke that--after that happens--there really isn't any going back. And he seems to be saying that in order for that to happen, intellectual maturity has to have been reached. How would you answer that, Anthony?

AD: It's a process that once it gets started is irreversible and must work itself out to a conclusion. In other words, it's like the World-Idea working out, itself working out its own understanding IN you. And until that process reaches a culmination, it doesn't stop; it keeps on going.

RC: (Re-read the last long sentence of the quote.)

(8 minutes: much discussion about the state of discovery. Hearing is not enough. How does the discovery take place?)

LR: I got lost. I heard the quote and I heard the discussion about something being a process that once started must work its way out to a conclusion. And the word 'it' was used: "it is a process." What's the 'it' referring to? . . . What in the quote is the 'it' referring to? (pause) Is it referring to the intellect, where he says the logical intellect must stop at the threshold of reality? The 'it' refers to the intellect? 'It' is a process which must fulfill the World-Idea?

DH: I thought 'it' was the processes of getting (inaudible) (to) the logical.

LR: But he says you can't do that--because that will stop of its own accord when reasoning processes have reached maturation.

DH: (That is why) Anthony says that it is something that--

LR: What is the 'it'?

DH: Stopping: stopping of the logical intellect and going beyond that--

(More discussion: BS/AH/LR/RC/LR = 1-2 minutes.)

LR: The quote had to do with the logical intellect reaching a culmination through the reasoning processes and then stopping of its own accord at the threshold of reality--when one discovered that mind in its essence had nothing to do with the ideal forms within it--the idea forms--

RC: It wasn't "nothing to do." It was that it could only be apprehended if you let go of those idea forms.

LR: Ok, and Anthony said IT is a process that, once started, must achieve the World-Idea--work its way out--it's the World-Idea working its way out. The 'it' refers to the fact that you begin through thinking and you can't stop thinking until the entire process is fulfilled and you come back to the reality. Is that the process? "It is a process that once started": is this the evolution of the mind processes that he's talking about?

AD: If we remember what we said about the intellect: it was a tool, a tool for biological and survival, adaptation. The intellect is concerned with registering, classifying, naming, recording all the events that a person experiences. And we began to see that it is the very nature of the intellect not to be able to deal with the kind of formless thinking that the Overself works with. Remember that? If left to its own devices, the intellect would not be able to think its way out; it will always be in a cul-de-sac; it will always be caught in that realm. Something has to come in and start guiding the intellect, in the sense that it starts manipulating thoughts to produce certain concepts which further your understanding. And this is a process that keeps going on, and there'll be many obstacles because there'll be all kinds of interferences on the part of the ego, etc. But what the Overself has to do--which is the World-Mind working its understanding of itself out IN you--is to guide those intellectual processes until there's a fulfillment, until there are no more questions. When the questions stop--and this has to happen naturally, not because someone can tell you, or, as he says, the doctrine insists. But when the questioning has been fulfilled, all the doubts answered, there comes a cessation of the thinking process itself, because now the experience of that reality must be grasped, and that means that the intellect must stay in abeyance.

So all I'm simply saying is that what he's talking about here is that when the World-Idea or the World-Mind is working out the solution for you--and of course you understand I'm saying the Overself--when it's working out the solution for you, it will GUIDE you THROUGH the labyrinth, the cave, until all the basic formulations necessary for you to find your way OUT of the cave are given to you. And that could take a lifetime; it varies with different people.

PB--gave me--told me and told some others, too, that when he was writing *The Wisdom of the Overself* what he did was go through his notes, and there was this very careful selection of paragraphs, one following upon the other. Now, what was GUIDING him was a superior understanding, picking out this paragraph, and then the next paragraph, and then the next. It wasn't just a haphazard, you know--flip a coin, "I'll take this one, leave this one out." But there was this kind of guidance that was PREVAILING and was behind the choice of the various paragraphs as he was reading through his notes, and which would follow which. So there was this kind of guidance. Now, I'm only giving this as a kind of analogy.

In a similar way, when you're working out the meaning of the doctrine in all its implications, and you're trying to make it explicit, you'll find that you can't do it under your own power. It's only when this Higher Power within you, the Overself, starts taking a hand in the game, you start finding the material

that you need to answer certain questions, and you find other material to provoke you into asking certain questions, and so this mysterious process keeps going on. A person who's under that kind of, let's say, surveillance by the Higher Power, you could almost say the Logos is working its meaning out IN him, and he will become conscious of that. And EVERYTHING else is secondary. That's the process that is going to happen.

RC: . . . When you say looking within, hoping your understanding will be guided, that's a very different perspective than what's ordinarily called the activity of the intellect.

AD: Yes. But if a person has honestly made an attempt with his intellect to try to understand these things, he comes up (against/Q:=PC transcript only) a blank wall, because the intellect could take any position, any contradictory positions, and follow them through. It could agree and disagree about anything. Something higher has to come in to guide it through that. But you do have to initiate the process; you do have to start it. You do have to seek out. And it comes into play after awhile.

KD: Is that process what he's calling reasoning?

AD: Well, that too would be involved; the process of reasoning follows upon whatever intellectual activity you do. I mean, all these things are mixed up: your reasoning becomes more and more firm, and the intellect as we spoke of it becomes less and less prominent. But the interesting thing is that it is working itself out, the World-Idea is working itself out and becoming SELF-CONSCIOUS IN YOU. That's the amazing thing. And anyone who has experienced that doesn't go around saying "MY ideas."

AH: Anthony, is this process unique to each person? (& AD/AH question clarification)

AD: Oh, yes.

AH: If it is unique to each person, the understanding of a teaching, externally, serves as a stimulus to this process? Is that so?

AD: Yes.

(AH/AD question clarification)

AH: But the process must remain uniquely connected with an entity.

AD: Well, let's use the word 'intimate.' It's very intimate. And even if two people had similar experiences in the process of reasoning that's unfolding the doctrine, it will be very novel for both of them. Each one will feel as though it's very unique and peculiar and self-satisfying to him.

RC: I think too it is worth inquiring into when he says this: "the apprehension of mind as essence." I think there is a tendency to think that he's saying that having some kind of experience that's absolutely formless and uncharacterizable. That may be PART of it, but I think he means in all places, at all times. Like whatever is appearing, it's mind, whether there's no appearance, or there is appearance.

AH: That's a position superior to all others. It's a perspective that represents the apex of--

RC: Yes. Then mind really is essence rather than a desirable alternative.

AH: You're suggesting that it's the same to speak of mind as essence with or without thought.

RC: Yes.

AD: The apprehension that dawns on one, is the way you put it: that mind as the essence, at any rate, is uncharacterizable. And I think that's what he means there by 'apprehension.' To reach that understanding that mind is uncharacterizable, is not the same I think, is not the same, as the insight experience. Which is different than saying you reach the apprehension that mind is uncharacterizable.

Apprehension is still in the realm of relativities. Insight is not. I don't know if you'd like to read that section again. Maybe I fouled it up.

(Last sentence of PB para is reread by RC.)

AD: Yes. I would say that that apprehension is the result of a long, drawn out process of very precise reasoning, and it isn't something that you can parrot. When the person parrots that the mind is uncharacterizable, unseizable, etc., and it isn't a personal discovery, it isn't the result of a process of reasoning, through which he has sweated out this understanding. I think that the term 'apprehension' there refers to this fact, this personal discovery. And then he says now you can direct your attention to grasping or seeking an insight into what that mind essence is. That's the way I understand that quote. It IS a long, drawn out affair.

CdA: When you said you go through a process of reasoning to be able to--

AD: I don't know what you said--

CdA: Do you recall what you were referring to, about the process of reasoning?

AD: I usually don't recall what I said because I have no interest in what I said, but we could start anew and go over it.

The reasoning takes place on the data which the intellect is working with, right? The intellect is working with stored images. The reasoning will have to take from those stored images the implications that are found therein and draw out from those stored images certain, let's say, concepts, abstract concepts. And as that process continues, and the person becomes more and more attuned to the abstractions required in order to understand and reach that understanding that mind in itself is uncharacterizable.

There are people who will say mind is uncharacterizable, the essence etc., is it can't be known; they'll go through this whole routine. But they have not arrived at it through this process.

This process is like an organic process. You know, like when you eat food it's got to go through the process of digestion, go all the way through. In a similar way, when this process of reasoning or guidance comes from the Overself and starts working out its meaning in you, it's got to go ALL the way through, right to the very end, and convince you, almost through an organic process, that, through the intellect, you cannot get at reality. It's got to go that way. No amount of memorization is going to convince you at the gut level that mind is uncharacterizable.

RamS: This is like Plato's divided line: When we reach to the end of intellect and exhaust all the reason, then we are at the threshold of dianoa.

AD: Yes. He starts you off down at the bottom and keeps working you up, yes. Plato specifically worked that way. Start with the level of conjecture, work your way through opinion, then reason, and finally you start getting intuition, or intellectual intuition.

But the marvel of it is, of course, is that this is being worked out in you by a superior guiding principle, your own higher Self, naturally. Let's try another, Randy.

WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE, YOU HAVE TO BE A MAN

PB: "We cannot afford to dispense with mysticism merely because we take to philosophy. Both are essential to this quest and both are vital in their respective places. The mystic's power to concentrate attention is needed throughout the study of philosophy. The philosopher's power to reason sharply is needed to give mystical reverie a content of world-understanding. And in the more advanced stages, when thinking has done its work and intellect has come to rest, we cease to be a philosopher and dwell self-absorbed in mystic trance, having taken with us the world-idea without which it would be empty. We can only afford to dispense with both mysticism and philosophy when we have perfectly done the work of both and when, amid the daily life of constant activity, we can keep unbroken the profound insight and selfless attitude which time and practice have now made natural." (Perspectives p. 263 only)

DB: What does it mean to speak of taking the World-Idea in there?

RC: What do you think, David? (pause, then request to reread para)

PB: "We cannot afford dispense with mysticism merely because we take to philosophy. . . ." (para reread)

AS: I don't follow the terminology at all. Why did he use 'philosophy'? Why did he use it that way . . . We've been reading--he even puts the philosopher as this special type of sage. He said philosophy in its definition always included mysticism and metaphysics . . . Maybe that's irrelevant--

(LG/RC/AS/= 1 min.)

LG: It does seem relevant. It does seem interesting--

JG: But suppose it's the same. Then there is a stage that is higher . . .

JB: Is that what you're referring to, Avery, that you're not a philosopher any more once you've (inaudible)?

AS: Yes. The way he's using the terminology, when he's a philosopher he can abide in that reality whether he's thinking or not thinking . . .

PC: He uses the term 'philosophy' so comprehensively in most places. He equates it with a sage most of the time.

RC: I only have one association with it, and don't know if it's valid. But I remember one time trying to get him to distinguish levels of realization. He came up with something--he gave the answer of "Intellectually of course that would be correct, but you have to realize that the people who actually LIVE there wouldn't make that distinction . . ." The association . . . is that normally the philosopher would be able to elaborate all those distinctions, as distinct from the mystic who would not, but I don't know . . .

JB: . . .

DB: What does it mean to take the World-Idea into trance?

JG: . . .

AD: When all is said and done, you have to be a man.

CdA: Were you answering David's question?

AD: No--I was just telling you what the quote is about!

AS: His comment was answering my question.

AD: Yes.

AS: But David still had a question.

CdA: . . .

DB: What does it mean to take the World-Idea into that trance state, without which that trance state would be empty?

(St's/RC/)

TRANSCENDING THE WORLD-IDEA BY ABSORBING IT

AD: Would you read the next part?

PB: “. . . The philosopher's power to reason sharply is needed to give mystical reverie a content of world-understanding. And in the more advanced stages, when thinking has done its work and intellect has come to rest, we cease to be a philosopher and dwell self-absorbed in mystic trance, having taken with us the world-idea without which it would be empty. . . .”

AD: David's question was: what do you mean to take the World-Idea within?

DB: Yes.

AD: Do you remember the exercise on the serpent's path? What does he tell you to do there?

VM: Keep your eyes open.

AD: You transcend the World-Idea by ABSORBING it. You don't transcend the World-Idea by negating or denying it, but by absorbing and understanding it; you take it into yourself. Wouldn't that be the same thing here? And once, and if, that is so, then your understanding of the mystical states would be adequate; in other words, you would have the necessary background to understand whatever mystical state you may go through.

CdA: Um--

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0125a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

AD: The philosophic yogi must transcend the World-Idea. How? (Q: to here of T1, S2 not on tape but from PC transcript.) By understanding it and penetrating it and taking it into himself, which is the reverse of the ordinary mystic's procedure of negating the World-Idea and residing in himself. So, in the case of the philosopher who understands the mystical states, you have that person who has achieved, not only an understanding of his I AM, but the World-Idea, which is, so to speak, IN which the I AM is always involved. And these two would give him all that he needs to understand any problem, any situation.

CdA: The way we have referred to understanding is that the life itself becomes the ideas and assimilates the ideas. Is that the same as what you mean here?

AD: Yes, you could use that definition. Sure. (pause) Randy, are you picking out all the hardest ones?

RC: No, actually, I'm going in order.

AD: Alright.

RC: Shall I pick some easier ones?

AD: No, it's alright. I just was wondering.

DB: . . . We speak of absorbing this World-Idea into ourselves, this process of understanding, and then taking that into this state of thought-free consciousness and I just don't understand-- By this trance state-- he speaks of it--it's normally understood as Nirvikalpa?

AD: No, he didn't say Nirvikalpa; he said "trance state," didn't he?

DB: There are a lot of trance states, but I thought Nirvikalpa was one of them.

AD: Yes, but in Nirvikalpa there's no thought. There's nothing to understand.

DB: So what is THIS trance state that without which--without the World-Idea--is empty? If that's not the thought-free state it's some other thought-full state, but I don't get it.

JB: Do you mean what's the name of the state that would be empty except it's got the World-Idea in it?

DB: On the one hand you have mystical development which leads to the cessation of mental activity, on the other hand you have a philosophic development which leads to the refinement of that mental activity to a culminating point, where, of itself, it can cease . . .

AD: Without the fullness of the understanding that comes from having penetrated into the World-Idea. (pause) In the trance state there would be no understanding that the origin of the world. Do you follow? I'll repeat it. Without the fullness of understanding--in other words, the full development of the faculty of understanding, which comes to a soul through the World-Idea--in the trance state he would be UTTERLY UNPREPARED to understand the mysterious Void.

DB: . . .

MB: Are you talking about some understanding within that trance state itself, Anthony?

AD: I said what I wanted to say. I'm not going to say any more. You just repeat over and over again what I said (to yourself) (without) (inaudible) talk. These are no trifling matters. (pause)

Now we'll repeat it. Without the fullness of understanding which the soul acquires or achieves from its penetration into the World-Idea--without that, when it is in a trance state, and when it penetrates deeply into the nature of its own being, it cannot possibly understand what is there.

Or we could put it this way: it will take all the teaching that the World-Mind can bring to bear on the soul in order for the soul to understand its own origin, its own priors. Now, if you go back to the quote, when he speaks about the person who includes within himself the World-Idea, the understanding of the World-Idea, then you would see that that's what he's referring to in order for you to become that sort of a philosopher that not only understands the nature of the soul but also something about the prior principles that are, let's say, eternally generating it.

Alright, pick another easy one, Randy. (laughter)

REASONING HAS TO REACH MATURATION BEFORE THE MIND CAN REFLECT THE UNIVERSE WITHOUT DISTORTION

PB: "The mistake of the mystics is to negate reasoning *prematurely*. Only after reasoning has completed its own task to the uttermost will it be psychologically right and philosophically fruitful to still it in the mystic silence." (Perspectives p. 263 and 20.4.69) (reread)

(AH/RC/AH/ = 2 min.)

RC: The only good teacher I had in college put on the board a quote from Lao Tzu that said: "Nothing that can be said in words is worth saying." He was teaching a poetry writing course. And he said it's only as you become a poet that you can appreciate how true this statement is. This to me is a parallel to how only when reasoning has completed itself can it admit that it wasn't capable of producing what it is seeking. Then he went on to talk about how for him the beginning of poetry began after reason had been exhausted. You had to think something out as far as you could, think it out, and then rationally admit that a certain leap of faith has to be made. And when you enter that state then it is possible to actually get some inspiration.

AH: That is the way I understood the quote. It's a rational choice that is made to enter that state.

RC: Or at least to be receptive.

AH: It's not an exercise in will.

(RC/AH/RC/)

CdA: I don't understand how that entry into the Void is a rational choice.

AH: I thought it was understanding with absolute clarity that there is absolutely nothing else to do. That's the way I would understand Grace.

CdA: No, Grace is what gets you there. Grace means it is totally out of your hands.

(para reread/AH/CdA/AH/RC/ = 1-2 min.)

JB: There is another way to complete its task besides coming to the rational conclusion that the best thing to do is to terminate. The exhaustion of ideation is another way of interpreting completion. In other words, the content doesn't have to be "Ok, now I did all the reasoning that I'm going to do, the best thing

is to disappear.” I kind of understood it may not be a view of grace that when thinking is EXHAUSTED, it terminates, you did all the thinking. The last thought doesn’t have to be “And now I’m going to terminate.” It almost could be any last thought.

AH: I meant that that process, once complete, you wouldn’t be able to state it as termination.

JB: Good. So you weren’t saying it’s a content, it’s like the last content of thought is, “Well, now I’ll shut down.”

AH: The THOUGHT would shut down, but the choice would not be toward annihilation, the choice would be toward life rather than a facsimile.

JB: . . . I have a different idea which is that thought stops being finished, and Grace initiates a new way of rendering the existence. This is wild--

CdA: I don’t understand.

(JB/CdA/AB/)

AD: The fundamental question is built in. In other words, what does life mean? The fundamental question is built into you, and until it gets worked out, until every question is answered, you won’t stop. I didn’t hear what Randy said about his teacher. Would you repeat that? (inaudible)

RC: He said that he would take an idea and think it out as much as he could possibly think it out, until he couldn’t have any more thoughts about it, then he would rationally admit that he had exhausted his own resources and then he could actually open himself up to getting an inspiration. It didn’t guarantee that there would be one, but it would put him in the proper frame of mind that he could recognize it if it did come.

AD: I think I follow what he’s saying there. I would probably rephrase it, that once I have gone through the process of reasoning, brought it to maturation, exhausted it, now I am capable of observing.

Until then, I don’t observe, I select. But when a person has thought out, or reasoned through, what the fundamental meaning of life is for him, and the reasoning processes come to a slow halt, gradually just not bringing up the questions any more because they’ve been answered, only now is that person capable of observation. And I think that’s what we mean by a poet. Prior to that there’s that questioning attitude that the mind works with. But what you have to try to grasp again is (how to be/(inaudible)) and that is that this fundamental question which is inherent in or built into the very nature of the individual, is a question that goes on asking itself, and it must be answered. It doesn’t matter how long it takes--a hundred lives, a thousand lives--but sooner or later, it must be answered. And in that process of working out the solutions or the answers to most of the questions that arise, in that very process--you must think of that process as very, very natural: just like a tree grows, and it gets old and dies. Similarly, you must think of reasoning that way. The soul, by incarnating in so many lives and experiencing the totality of all the thoughts or ideas that made it to be what it is, is now DONE with, not only the contemplation of the ideas, but where it could not contemplate the ideas, it lived out the ideas, now it is done with all that. Now it can take the position of a poet--a poet here in the true sense of the word--that his mind can be a mirror in which the universe could be reflected without any distortion. (inaudible)

CdA: He does go further in this quote and says that it is better not to--er, to wait until this process is completed before entering the mystic--

AD: Doesn't he say it's better to wait 'til it's completed.

CdA: Yes, but why wouldn't it be alright to get there before? (Q: PC version for this and above CdA = 'Why wouldn't it be alright to get to the mystic silence before the process of reasoning has been completed, too?')

AD: You would have to go back and finish up the reasoning process anyway

CdA: But it doesn't seem like it would be harmful.

AD: No.

(RC/JB/)

HS: What do you mean when you say that the question is built in?

AD: I don't think I can make it more available, Herbie. Everyone that is at all sensitive in any way does have a feeling that there is a secret or a mystery about life--unless he's a real dodo bird; there's enough of them around! But I don't see how you can be a sensitive person and not feel that mystery of life, or that life has a secret for you. I think everyone that has any sensitivity is aware that so it is.

HS: Is this like "wonder"?

AD: Yes, wonder. "Who am I?" "What's it all about?" It's a little different than the way Tim put it. Tim says you get up in the morning and the first exercise you do is "Why bother?" (laughter)

TS: And then the "Where am I?"

AD: So I can't simplify it: you're either aware of it or you're not. And most people are aware that there is something of significance in their life--if only they knew what it was.

HS: Does that demand for meaning belong to the World-Idea? Does it belong to you?

AD: I'd rather it belonged to you personally.

HS: But is that what you were saying about the World-Idea working itself out in you or as you?

AD: Yes.

HS: Before when you were speaking of "in the depths of your being the World-Idea enters and you have to understand it there"--are both those part of the essence of mind?

AD: Sorry, Herbie, I don't understand you.

HS: You said before, in relation, to the last quote.

AD: That was a long time ago. (pause) So what did I say?

HS: It was too long ago. I forgot. (laughter) You made a statement about in the depth of your being the World-Idea is--the question, or the reality of the World-Idea is there?

AD: If it's not now, it's a long time ago. I'm sorry, Herbie. Let's try another one.

A QUIET MIND IS NECESSARY FOR OBSERVATION

LR: Your choice of the word 'observation' implies several things. One of the things that comes out is that it IS the Witness position. Another thing it seems to point out is that in order to simply observe you must have--

AD: A quiet mind.

LR: --and contents--

AD: Yes, true, but it's a mind that has answered all its questions. Otherwise you don't observe, but what you do observe will be selected by the unanswered questions. You remember, there's a quote from PB--I don't remember--where he points out that a Chinese artist tries to put himself in a state of absolute stillness so that the object is painted on his mind. And until that happens, he doesn't paint, but once that happens, then he paints. The thing first has to be observed by the mind. The mind has to take the form of that thing; now you could go ahead and paint it. Now, that means that your mind is in a state of stillness. You remember Wang Yang Ming sitting down, looking at a bamboo for a whole month. He didn't come up with any answer, but it's an interesting experiment. A quiet mind is necessary in order for observation.

LR: I think I follow, but I was going to question the contents of that observation. The quote is about having to FULLY employ reason before the mind can give it up. So when you said 'observation,' one of the things it meant to me was that real contents have been actually brought to the point of (inaudible), the observation and the real principles that are brought out rather than a collection of half-baked traces. That (when) the reason is fulfilled, has been fully employed, the observation is OF those reason-principles which have been employed.

AD: I understand it differently.

LR: It seems that one could pass (to/through) the Witness point of view without having necessarily employed the reason. It seems that people are catapulted into that position at odd moments of their life. The Witness position is not necessarily the result of reasoning, there are many different (inaudible) that would put one in that position. It appears he's speaking of stilling the mind as the RESULT of the maturation of reasoning.

RC: But I think part of what I'm hearing Anthony say when he says (that) otherwise you can't observe because instead you're selecting, the unanswered questions are selected. It's kind of like in the scientific method, they generally say the first thing you do is you start out with a hypothesis and then you observe the data. I think Anthony would say that if that hypothesis is there dominating your mind, you can't really observe because you're inclined to be selecting those things that are going to corroborate what you're thinking. Whereas if your mind is completely still, then the object sort of explains itself.

JB: I think it's just looking for corroboration because you might need to get hit over the head. It's a matter that there is still this need for experiences, isn't it more likely? They could be corroborative or they could be deflating you or any number of things. There's something very pure about this idea of observing, where it is you don't need anything. I mean if all the thinking is all done, and it's all digested, then it's like

there's no more karma to burn away and there's nothing else to DO with thinking any more. It isn't just that you were biased in favor of your ideas but that the world in some way gave you the experiences that you need. You don't need anything anymore, then you can observe.

KD: What is it that you observe when you are finally capable of observing? Is that what you've spoken of as the wisdom of the cosmic circuit? (Inaudible) spontaneous (inaudible) of ideas (inaudible).

AD: Well, whatever the situation calls for. If you're sitting in a forest, you'll observe a bamboo shoot. You'll observe a bamboo shoot.

KD: In other words, the attention isn't tied to the biases-- (Q: re-check audio for 'not')

AD: Yes. Let me put it this way--

KD: --thoughts, and all that.

AD: Sit down and look at something. Or like sometimes here, we listen to music, and experiment with yourself. As the music is going on, try to notice how often you're interrupted by extraneous thoughts. Are you listening to the music?

KD: No.

AD: So you're looking at a bamboo shoot. Are you looking at the bamboo shoot or at every vagrant thought that comes into your (mind)? Now it can go deeper than that, of course, as you observe just the bamboo shoot, you might be able to see the reason-principles that went into making that bamboo shoot. But you first have to see the bamboo shoot.

It's the same with people. You see people, and if your mind is observant, very quiet, your heart's filled, there's no craving, no clinging, anticipation, expectation--you know, run the gamut--you'll immediately know the foremost features of that person. Intuitively, immediately. That would be observing the person. (pause) Let's try another one.

THE MYSTIC GETS A GLIMPSE OF THE ARCHETYPAL WORLD (INTELLECTION); NIRVIKALPA SAMADHI

PB: "The highest contribution which mysticism can make is to afford its votaries glimpses of that grand substratum of the universe which we may call the Overself. These glimpses reveal It in the pure unmanifest non-physical essence that It ultimately is. They detach It from the things, creatures, and thoughts which make up this world of ours, and show It as It is in the beginning, before the world-dream made its appearance. Thus mysticism at its farthest stretch, which is Nirvikalpa samadhi, enables man to bring about the temporary disappearance of the world-dream and come into comprehension of the Mind within which, and from which, the dream emerges. The mystic in very truth conducts the funeral service of the physical world as he has hitherto known it, which includes his own ego. But this is as far as mysticism can take him. It is an illuminative and rare experience, but it is not the end. For the next task which he must undertake if he is to advance is to relate his experience of this world as real with his experience of the Overself as real. And this he can do only by studying the world's own nature, laying bare its mentalistic character and thus bringing it within the same circle as its source, the Mind. If he succeeds in doing this and in establishing this relation correctly, he will have finished his apprenticeship,

ascended to the ultimate truth, and become a philosopher. Thenceforward he will not deny the world but accept it . . .” (Q: This quote continues below. Also note this quote was discussed again 8/2/84 & 8/22/84) (Perspectives pp. 263-264 and 20.4.115)

(Para reread to “. . . before the world-dream made its appearance.”)

AD: Stop there. Stop there and discuss it. (pause)

JB: It’s a very hard idea that the mystic can see the Overself before it was manifested. Is that right?

TS: Before it was manifest?

JB: As it is before manifestation?

TS: Yes.

JB: Before the dream, before it was attached to things.

AB: I thought it was--it can see the world as it is in the Overself, before it is manifest.

JB: Oh, before IT’s manifest.

TS: No, he’s saying the ‘it’ here is the Overself. He says, “The highest contribution which mysticism can make is to afford its votaries glimpses of that grand substratum of the universe which we may call the Overself.” So the glimpse is of the Overself, not of the world. In this first stage he’s speaking of here is of knowing of the Overself as unmanifest, as non-physical essence, as non-physical being.

AH: Would that be the same thing as the essence of Mind?

TS: If I remember that was mentioned as being the apprehension of the uncharacterizable nature of the mind, was still a relative position, a position within relativity. And when he speaks here of this highest contribution of mysticism, is to know the Overself before the world dream appears, as Nirvikalpa samadhi, I think would be prior or a priori to the mind. (inaudible) I don’t think it would be relative. I don’t think there would be an apprehender.

PC: Wouldn’t the experience of the Overself be the apprehension of mind as essence? (= paraphrase)

AH: Is the mystic experience of mind as essence without content? (= paraphrase)

PC: Wouldn’t that be the same as the Overself, before the world-dream?

BS: The World-Idea would have to be within the Overself in some unique way, but in this stage of mysticism unknown to the mystic. How could you deny the World-Idea is within the Overself? (= paraphrase)

AD: You’re not denying the World-Idea in the Overself. In the mystic glimpse, it isn’t that the World-Idea is negated; what is negated is the sensible appearance of the World-Idea. The mystic gets a glimpse of the world in the sense of, let’s say, formless reason-principles or universal reason-principles. Plotinus would say that he has intellection going on. Intellection means, in this sense, he perceives the universal archetypes, the reason-principles that in their totality, in combination are going to become the sensible

world. So, in the mystical experience this is the thing that is given to you: a glimpse of the world in its archetypal phase. Pure liquid gold.

CdA: This is in one unific whole vision?

AD: No, it would be an understanding of universal reason-principles, and it doesn't necessarily have to be that you have the whole world; in other words, you don't have the all-time, fixed image of the world. That's not what you're grasping. It's not the cosmos in its entirety, from 25,000 B.C. to 25,000 A.D. That's not what you perceive. Intellection of the formless universal reason-principles that constitute the world is what you would perceive there. That's what the mystic gets a glimpse of. In other words, he gets a glimpse of the ARCHETYPE of everything that's here. That's what Plotinus called Intellection.

(personal aside between AD & CdA)

AD: It varies-- The scope, the amplitude, and the intensity of the Intellection that takes place: you could have a glimpse for an hour or for a day. It varies. So I can't answer your question. So now would you read that again? The first part, Tim--

(para reread, tape ends during para: "The highest contribution . . . made its appearance.")

[Audio File 1984 0125a Ends]

[Audio File 1984 0125b Begins]

AD: Here (in the Overself) there's no coming, no going, no creatures--none of that. (Q: phrase in parentheses from PC transcript)

PB: ". . . Thus mysticism at its farthest stretch, which is Nirvikalpa samadhi, enables man to bring about the temporary disappearance of the world-dream and come into comprehension of the Mind within which, and from which, the dream emerges. The mystic in very truth conducts the funeral service of the physical world as he has hitherto known it, which includes his own ego. But this is as far as mysticism can take him. . . ."

HS: Would you go so far as to say that what is called Nirvikalpa is itself just the essence of mind?

AD: I'm sorry, Herbie, I don't understand. I have to understand your question to answer it and I don't follow your question.

HS: That quote seems in part to describe what's called Nirvikalpa samadhi?

AD: Well, you remember, we spoke about that: That's a thought-free state. There are no thoughts. It doesn't mean that you're blind.

HS: But in that state--just--what's there?

AD: What's there? He just said, didn't he? A perception of the universe as it exists in its archetypal manner or form, and the mind which is the substratum of that, in other words, the Overself; these two together.

HS: (inaudible) still speak of it as a dualistic state?

AD: It's not dualistic, and there's no thoughts there. What I'm referring to is a perception of the archetypal universe or the Intellectual Cosmos, it's not a thought. You're not thinking.

HS: Is it within the essence of mind, or mind as essence?

AD: Yes. You could speak about it as mind, or mind-essence; it doesn't matter.

AH: Is it important to understand the notion of the archetypal form as not being (any kind of) content? (Q: AH repeats this sentence with 'a' substituted for 'any kind of')

AD: Well, it is a content, but I think what you mean, is you have to understand that there's no subject/object relationship here.

AH: I'm missing something that you're saying that the quote hasn't said. PB seems to describe the state as Mind, per-se, and you seem to be describing it as that--

AD: Have him repeat the quote.

PB: "The highest contribution which mysticism can make is to afford its votaries glimpses of that grand substratum of the universe which we may call the Overself. These glimpses reveal It in the pure unmanifest non-physical essence that It ultimately is. They detach It from the things, creatures, and thoughts which make up this world of ours, and show It as It is in the beginning, before the world-dream made its appearance. Thus mysticism at its farthest stretch, which is Nirvikalpa samadhi, enables man to bring about the temporary disappearance of the world-dream and come into comprehension of the Mind within which, and from which, the dream emerges. . . ."

AH: Can I repeat my question? Your description seemed to add a refinement, or a subtlety to that notion of an archetypal world, that I started to understand as some kind of content WITHIN mind. I don't know quite how to deal with that. But if it IS Nirvikalpa and it's experience of the mind-basis--

AD: No. Nirvikalpa would be the last step, but in the process of inwardizing consciousness, the intellection can take place, or let's say that the mystic perception of the intellectual cosmos takes place. If he deepens further and inwardizes his consciousness, he will reach Nirvikalpa, where there are no intellections at all.

Now, what we were discussing, at the level where the mystic perceives the intellectual cosmos, you wanted to speak about it as a content, and in a sense, of course, it is a content. It's the Overself and the World-Idea, so you can speak of the World-Idea as a content of the Overself or the Overself as manifesting the World-Idea, indifferently; I don't care which way you speak about it. But what I'm trying to point at, is that at that level, although we can speak of a content, we cannot speak of a subject/object relationship, because the consciousness of the mystic that perceives or has intellection, at that level is not different from that of which it has intellection. There, being and knowing are identical. So there's no subject/object relationship there. Would you finish?

PB: ". . . The mystic in very truth conducts the funeral service of the physical world as he has hitherto known it, which includes his own ego. But this is as far as mysticism can take him. It is an illuminative . . ."

AD: Up to that point.

TS: That seems to be a second act or effort. That is to say, is it one and the same thing for the individual to have a glimpse of the Overself as the substratum of the universe and to see the death of the physical world (and/in) the ego? (pause)

AD: I think what you're saying, is that, in a sense, the mystic experiences the inward transformation of the sensible world into an intelligible, immaterial, archetypal universe, and that is the reality of the universe. So the sensible universe which is a manifestation of that, or a pictorialization of that, receives a sort of extreme de-evaluation, and with it, of course, the ego which is included in that World-Idea is subject to the same treatment.

TS: Is that extreme devaluation of the sensible world and the ego the inevitable result of the glimpse of Nirvikalpa? Or is it the consequent act that follows, that is only possible having had a glimpse?

AD: Try again, louder.

TS: Is that extreme devaluation of the sensible world and the ego the direct and inevitable consequence of the glimpse of Nirvikalpa samadhi?

AD: Not the glimpse, Nirvikalpa, the glimpse of the archetypal world.

TS: Yes. Or is it--

AD: Yes.

TS: It is that. So that it's a guarantee that a mystic who has had that glimpse will NOT have a re-identification with the reality of the ego?

AD: Oh? (chuckles) No. He'll re-identify, don't worry.

TS: I wondered if this is not a second state--

AD: But it won't be real. He KNOWS that it's not real. It'll still have power.

TS: So when he says that he's conducting a funeral service, isn't that an indication--

AD: You're not going to bury it right then and there. (laughter)

TS: In other words, it's a whole state, a whole process--that that burial process is an effort that commences upon, can only commence upon having SEEN its unreality but that in itself doesn't blow it out. It takes a little bit of--

AD: It would be wise not to think of a TIME involved, because it would vary. In some people it's immediate; in some, it's years later. But the important thing here is to get the feeling that he's telling you that the mystic glimpse gives you a perception of the heavenly world. If you perceive the heavenly world, this one is no longer going to mean anything. It's completely de-evaluated. Everything that you thought was so important here loses its value.

RC: It seems the way he put it--if he says you conduct a funeral service that's to put it positively. It seems you could also say "he sees the writing on the wall" to put the same thing negatively.

AD: Sure.

BS: Where did Nirvikalpa come in?

AD: I pointed out to him, if you go beyond that intellection that's taken place--intellection here, of course, in Plotinus' sense--if you go beyond that, if you continue inwardizing your consciousness, you get into Nirvikalpa.

BS: This would be a stage beyond the archetypal world?

AD: To speak of beyond, I don't know what you mean.

BS: Then I don't understand what you mean by 'deepening.'

AD: What YOU mean by 'beyond.' (laughter) I DIDN'T use the word 'beyond' deliberately. If you inwardize the consciousness, you remember, like he pointed out, you go through the mentality, you go through Witness consciousness, you go through celestial reasoning and intellection, and then you go into Nirvikalpa. It doesn't have to happen that way, Bert. You could be shot, catapulted right into Nirvikalpa and miss everything in between.

See, but as soon as you say 'beyond' you get the feeling as though the I AM principle is beyond the World-Idea, and it's not. Because he points out the Overself is basically the ray of the soul and the World-Idea together. And he calls the Overself the World-Idea or the World-Mind in you, a ray of the World-Mind. Now let's read the whole quote. Did we finish it?

TS: No.

AD: Oh, I'm sorry.

TS: Finish it?

AD: Yes. Randy picked out all the easy ones for tonight.

A PHILOSOPHER ACCEPTS THE WORLD

PB: "... For the next task which he must undertake if he is to advance is to relate his experience of this world as real with his experience of the Overself as real. And this he can do only by studying the world's own nature, laying bare its mentalistic character and thus bringing it within the same circle as its source, the Mind. If he succeeds in doing this and in establishing this relation correctly, he will have finished his apprenticeship, ascended to the ultimate truth, and become a philosopher. Thenceforward he will not deny the world but accept it. . . ."

AH: Would it be correct to understand that that transition to the second stage, the mystical experience has provided the Overself as real and the world is unreal. (To say) the world is real and the Overself is also real is like a problem. It's either one or the other UNTIL he attains the philosophic stage.

(TS/AH/TS/AH/TS/AH/PB: "For the next task . . . as real."/DB/HS/LR/RC (tells Aurobindo anecdote)/PD/HS/PD/AH/DB/ PB: "And this he . . . source, the Mind."/TS/ = about 10 min.)

HS: Is he saying that the reality of yourself is mind, the reality of the world is seen to be mind, in mind, and that transcendent ground--it's all one mind. (He gives the world value by seeing it as real, as Mind. The reality of the World-Idea and the reality of the Overself are both Mind. = paraphrase)

TS: He's saying the reality of the individual is found to be mind and the reality of the world is found to have its source as mind.

AH: The mystic would say the mind is real, the world isn't. The philosopher would say both are real.

AD: Randy, give me that quote from Aurobindo again.

RC: The fellow experienced Nirvikalpa, and he was very excited about it. And so he came to Aurobindo, I guess, to notify and celebrate that now he knew that the only reality was the pure consciousness. And that he had that experience and now he knew it for sure. And Aurobindo said: "That was one experience, now you are having another experience. I want the person who has them both." (pause)

AD: Do you see why Plato in his divided line had at one end the sensible world and on the other intellectual intuition? He said, "Now, if I listen to Parmenides, there's only intellectual intuition, and if I listen to Heraclitus, there's only the snapping of dogs. What about the rest of the range of human knowledge?" And so he put in the other two pieces. And he says this whole thing is the range of human knowledge: the Nirvikalpa samadhi AND the sensible world. They're all included in reality. So the last sentence is?

PB: "Thenceforward he will not deny the world but accept it."

AD: He won't deny the world any more. He'll accept it. Alright, let's try another.

(Short RC/AD discussion on whether to read the quote below.)

MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE AND METAPHYSICAL UNDERSTANDING ARE BROUGHT TOGETHER TO PRODUCE THE PHILOSOPHER

PB: "I remember the first time I had this astonishing experience. I was fond of disappearing from London whenever the weather allowed and wandering alongside the river Thames in its more picturesque country parts. If the day was sunny I would stretch my feet out, lie down in the grass, pull out notebook and pen from my pocket--knowing that thoughts would eventually arise that would have for me an instructive or even revelatory nature, apart from those ordinary ones which were merely expressive. One day, while I was waiting for these thoughts to arise, I lost the feeling that I was there at all. I seemed to dissolve and vanish from that place, but not from consciousness. Something was there, a presence, certainly not me, but I was fully aware of it. It seemed to be something of the highest importance, the only thing that mattered. After a few minutes I came back, discovered myself in time and space again; but a great peace had touched me and a very benevolent feeling was still with me. I looked at the trees, the shrubs, the flowers, and the grass and felt a tremendous sympathy with them and then when I thought of other persons a tremendous benevolence towards them." (Perspectives p. 305 and 22.6.80)

(long pause)

AD: Let's read another one.

TS: There was a second paragraph to the one we read.

PB: (Continuation of the quote from above.) "The metaphysician may also perform this task and obtain an intellectual understanding of himself, the world, and the Overself. And he has this advantage over the

mystic, that his understanding becomes permanent whereas the mystic's rapt absorption must pass. But if he has not passed through the mystical exercises, it will remain as incomplete as a nut without a kernel. For these exercises, when led to their logical and successful issue in Nirvikalpa samadhi, provide the vivifying principle of experience which alone can make metaphysical tenets real. (Q: The quote has more, which is copied below, but this is as far as the reading went in the class.)

"From all this we may perceive why it is quite correct for the mystic to look undistractedly within for his goal, why he must shut out the distractions and attractions of earthly life in order to penetrate the sacred precinct, and why solitude, asceticism, meditation, trance, and emotion play the most important roles in his particular experience. What he is doing is right and proper at his stage but is not right and proper as the last stage. For in the end he must turn metaphysician, just as the metaphysician must turn mystic and just as both must turn philosopher--who is alone capable of infusing the thoughts of metaphysics and the feelings of mysticism into the actions of everyday practical life." (Perspectives pp. 263-264 and 20.4.115) (long pause)

TS: Is he saying here that the two stages can be reversed? That for a metaphysician the task of understanding the mentalistic character of the world can first be achieved in his mind and then the mystic experience of the Overself, if that follows upon the heels of understanding mentalism, it will bring him to the same place--where he becomes a philosopher? (pause)

HS: Do you think it could vary in an individual--like one guy gets a mystical insight--and then his karma is such that he pursues a metaphysical understanding. And another guy gets a metaphysical understanding (and then) pursues it mystically. It seems to depend on the person, as to the order.

AH: To use a little example, the mystic would have the kernel without the nut, the metaphysician would have the nut without the kernel. The object is to have both.

HS: . . .

TS: It seems like he's saying that both processes seem to have a natural potential for reaching the goal. That is, if a person begins with the metaphysical approach that it has the possibility within it of leading to philosophy, provided the metaphysical conclusions are verified by mystical exercise. And the mystic also has the same potential and in objectifying or incorporating the World-Idea through metaphysics.

HS: (inaudible) He says that the metaphysician has a permanent understanding?

TS: Yes.

HS: And yet it's the mystic who supplies the truth value. Otherwise it's a (hollow tenet).

TS: Yes.

(HS/PB/TS/HS/)

AH: (The) metaphysician's tenets are permanent but not real?

TS: No.

AH: Not real until vivified by yogic practice?

RC: Once he has the vivifying experiences then the understanding, which is the fruit of it, is permanent.

AH: It seems that making the comparison that Tim made between just the metaphysical tenets as compared to the mystic's trance--though a trance might last a few seconds your understanding of metaphysical (inaudible) will last your whole life, and then some . . .

RG: It seems you could intellectually understand the doctrine, yet not necessarily have an experience of its truth, as he was saying, yet that would be a permanent intellectual understanding, but he wouldn't have the experience of the truth of it. You would KNOW it's true but you wouldn't be it. It would be knowing without being in that case.

(TS/DB/TS/)

DB: Earlier we spoke of this process of understanding in a constant state of development until that point where it automatically cancels itself out. Here, speaking about an individual who's familiarized himself with the doctrine . . . who's completed the intellectual work, but apparently not to the point where the thought processes have stopped for him.

TS: Doesn't he say not just a mystic but a mystic who's achieved Nirvikalpa . . . ?

DB: . . . By metaphysician who is he speaking of? Kant? Hegel?

(RG/DB/)

AD: Kant would be a good example. He understood very well that the world is an idea, that it's mental, but he never had the EXPERIENCE of the mentalness of the world. So he did generate within himself that understanding (that is) thorough and grounded on reasoning. And he knew that the world was mental, was an idea. But he did not have the vivifying experience; he did not have the FELT experience that the world is an idea. On the other hand, you could have a mystic who HAS the experience that the world IS idea, because he's feeling it as such. It is an idea, and it is FELT as such. But he doesn't understand it. He can't understand it; he hasn't brought it out in the reasoning process. So I think what PB is saying is that these are two complementary things. They have to be brought together in order to produce the philosopher. To have the mystical glimpse, the recognition that intellection could take place without the sensible concomitant and to have an understanding of the sensible world, and reason your way out of it but without the intellection--these two things are separated. Here, they have to be brought together. They're complimentary. Wouldn't you think so?

AH: . . . Not only ultimately but also in terms of practice . . .

BS: Why to the metaphysician is the understanding permanent? It would seem that the understanding would be only permanent insofar as the waking stage, the physical world. It does not exclude the mystic state.

AD: If you take a person like Kant as an example, he's thought out in his understanding the categories of thought bring about the arisal or, let's say, make possible knowledge. If you asked Kant when he was 40, when he was 50, when he was 60, he would still be able to tell you, wouldn't he? The mystic who has the experience when he's 20 years old, and, at 30 years old, you ask him about it, it's only a memory, and at

40, it's only a memory. At 50, it's still only a memory. But the knowledge that, let's say, Kant had, was permanent. He didn't lose it. It's part and parcel of his being now.

LR: And you would say that it could be part and parcel of his being without being experience at all of those things?

AD: You try thinking it out.

LR: . . .

AD: Yes, yes, you try thinking--

(LR/RG/)

AS: If you fully understood the implications of the Overself, that would be different from the experience of the Overself.

LR: You wouldn't fully understand it without some experience.

AS: Overself may not be as good an example as mentalism. But there's nothing more he can add to the UNDERSTANDING; he can add experience.

(LR/RG/)

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0125b Ends; Side 2 Begins)

AD: (inaudible) It took Kant about twelve years to work out the *Critique*.

Now, if we go back to what we said before, that the intellect is a tool for survival, for biological adaptation, and that it's restricted in its operation to what is something that it can gain, and then we brought in the fact that this man had to reason, and that meant he had to use the intellect. But this reason was guiding the intellect. He worked out the problems on epistemology and metaphysics--he worked out these problems--by manipulating the intellect; that is, the reason manipulated the intellect until it brought forth the correct answers.

Now, as we said, this was a process that took a dozen years. Can you imagine--? If we look at it this way, then what we're saying in effect is that this ray of light which penetrates into the psychosomatic organism, and is that illuminating principle within the ego. What we're in effect saying is that this guiding light was directing and guiding the intellect until it reached a point where it understood these metaphysical principles, so that what we're in effect saying is that it generated in the continuum of its own consciousness this work, this understanding. Now this is permanent for that individual. He comes back again the next incarnation; he hasn't lost it. He's not going to lose that ability. Now, (he/it) could still be quite distinct from the experience, let's say, of Jacob Böhme or any mystic might have of the Overself and yet not understand any of this.

The point that he's making here is that these two things have to be brought together. One MUST try to get a glimpse of the higher Self, the Overself, to see how intellection goes on in that realm, and one must also understand at the level of the intellect, the way it could be put IN such an order that the sensible and the intellectual--in other words, the divided line--is not divided. There's no difficulty here. After all, if you work this hard for the understanding, and you're going to lose it, then why bother getting it?

LR: . . .

AD: I'm sorry? I didn't hear you.

LR: Well, you might say there's nothing hard to grasp here, but I would disagree. When the quotes that have to do with reason actually exhausting itself--

TS: It says "completing its task"; it doesn't say "wiping itself out."

AD: Yes, there's a difference here. David also used the term "it cancels itself out." No, it doesn't cancel itself out; it FULFILLS itself. That's quite different.

LR: Right. Those quotes seem analogous to what you say--I don't know--I can't speak for Kant because I haven't read the *Critique of Pure Reason* and I probably don't intend to. So I'm taking your word for it, that he came up with (the idea) of mentalism. That's what you said. But I thought he concluded that you can't know anything outside of your own mind.

AD: What's the difference?

LR: If he actually came up with the conviction of mentalism, that the world was mental, it's hard to believe that it was absolutely without any mystical experience of that idea . . .

(AS/LR/RG/LR/AS/LR/LdS/)

VM: On the other hand, what about the quote where PB spoke about Heisenberg, when thinking about physics, actually went into Nirvikalpa samadhi?

AD: Well, that's not (contrary/Kant/(hard to hear))! It happened to Heisenberg, not Kant.

(AS/RG/AS/RG/TS (reads line of PB)/AB/)

AD: Ok. (Rings bell.)

[Audio File 1984 0125b Ends]