

CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
February 1, 1984
PB PARAS; PHILOSOPHY; BALANCE

TOPIC: PB Paras

SUBJECT: Philosophy

SUBSUBJECTS: Insight, Balance

CONTENTS:

PHILOSOPHERS AND MYSTICS; MYSTICS FIND SATISFACTION TOO EARLY

INSIGHT

PHILOSOPHIC EXPERIENCE INCLUDES THE I AM AND THE WORLD-IDEA

PB PARAS ON BALANCE IN PHILOSOPHY

BALANCE AS THE ABILITY TO MANIPULATE 360 DEGREES INDEPENDENTLY OR
COORDINATELY WITH THE PSYCHIC FUNCTIONS

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives* [*Persp.*], published 1984-1988. Some Paul Brunton Notebook paras are, as of 2018, unpublished, and are noted as such.

NOTES:

- Unpublished PB paras, even if sourced, should be proofread.
- 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, expands Subsubjects, alters most Subheads to make more accurate, corrects typos/errors, adds new note within transcript, reformats to accord with new conventions.
Readable edited transcript – V14.1r.

AUDIO FILES: 1984 0201a, 1984 0201b. [Note: “Tape” and “Side” refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

1984 02/01 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Philosophy; Balance
Readable Edited Transcript

PHILOSOPHERS AND MYSTICS; MYSTICS FIND SATISFACTION TOO EARLY

[Audio File 1984 0201a Begins]

RC: The title of this section is a question, "What is Philosophy?" Anthony, do you want to go over anything we did from last week or just continue?

AD: Huh? We'll continue [RC: Ok.] from last week.

PB: "The crucial point . . ." (long para) (Persp. pp. 264-265 & 20.4.24)

(Student discussion = 10 min.)

PB: "The philosopher is satisfied with a noble peace and does not run after mystical ecstasies. Whereas other paths often depend upon an emotionalism that perishes with the disappearance of the primal momentum that inspired it, or which dissolves with the dissolution of the first enthusiastic ecstasies themselves, here there is a deeper and more dependable process. What must be emphasized is that most mystical aspirants have an initial or occasional ecstasy, and they are so stirred by the event that they naturally want to enjoy it permanently. This is because they live under the common error that a successful and perfect mystic is one who has succeeded in stabilizing ecstasy. That the mystic is content to rest on the level of feeling alone, without making his feeling self-reflective as well, partly accounts for such an error. It also arises because of incompetent teachers or shallow teaching, leading them to strive to perform what is impracticable and to yearn to attain what is impossible. Our warning is that this is not possible, and that however long a mystic may enjoy these "spiritual sweets," they will assuredly come to an end one day. The stern logic of facts calls for stress on this point. Too often he believes that this is the goal, and that he has nothing more about which to trouble himself. Indeed, he would regard any further exertions as a sacrilegious denial of the peace, as a degrading descent from the exaltation of this divine union. He longs for nothing more than the good fortune of being undisturbed by the world and of being able to spend the rest of his life in solitary devotion to his inward ecstasy. For the philosophic mystic, however, this is not the terminus but only the starting point of a further path. What philosophy says is that this is only a preliminary mystical state, however remarkable and blissful it be. There is a more matured state--that of gnosis--beyond it. If the student experiences paroxysms of ecstasy at a certain stage of his inner course, he may enjoy them for a time, but let him not look forward to enjoying them for all time. The true goal lies beyond them, and he should not forget that all-important fact. He will not find final salvation in the mystical experience of ecstasy, but he will find an excellent and essential step towards salvation therein. He who would regard rapturous mystical emotion as being the same as absolute transcendental insight is mistaken. Such a mistake is pardonable. So abrupt and striking is the contrast with his ordinary state that he concludes that this condition of hyper-emotional bliss is the condition in which he is able to experience reality. He surrenders himself to the bliss, the emotional joy which he experiences, well satisfied that he has found God or his soul. But his excited feelings about reality are not the same as the serene experience of reality itself. This is what a mystic finds difficult to comprehend.

Yet, until he does comprehend it, he will not make any genuine progress beyond this stage.” (Persp. pp. 265-266 and 20.4.125)

INSIGHT

(Student discussion about the difference between mystical feelings and this “noble peace.” 20 minutes of discussion before Anthony speaks.)

RC: The stability that’s being sought is beyond the reach of any kind of personal feeling . . .

DR: But there is some kind of implication of a higher feeling. He does seem to speak about a serenity and a peace that the philosophic mystic does achieve and you would have to refer to that as some type of feeling even though you might want to exalt that. But it . . . this distinction between a misconception of that heightened feeling or what the achieved philosophic mystic DOES experience, (it seems) a higher feeling isn’t unknown to that state.

(MB/RC/)

AH: I think you could say its the absence of PERSONAL feeling, but I don’t think you could say it’s the absence of FEELING.

DR: That seems a good way to say it, because suppose you don’t want to say that peace is a feeling, I would understand that in the way that Andrew’s saying--that feeling is usually a reference to oneself, and it’s characterized in a way by what one’s psychosomatic organism’s state is. And this idea of using feeling to judge the character of the subject--that’s the way we have information of how the subject is. But in a way--there wouldn’t be that dichotomy. If the man was involved in transcendental insight then there is no separated object . . . I clearly am lost. (laughter)

MB: . . . In this quote he doesn’t call peace a feeling . . .

DR: I wanted to put in some possibility of something called higher feeling. It might not be feeling in the way you might describe it, and I would agree.

MB: Not the highest . . .

DR: Even the highest. He does speak about a serenity and a peace. Why does he even use that description?

(More student discussion)

LR: I think he’s speaking of an actual point . . .

LdS: It seems the ego is capable of all kinds of tricks. It’s not hard for me to understand that it’s the ego having bliss.

AD: David, is feeling a psychic function? David Ruth, is feeling a psychic function? Is knowing a psychic function? Is willing a psychic function? They’re all functions of the psyche, aren’t they?

DR: Yes.

AD: So you can have a feeling about reality. And if you remember, he speaks about these three as they have to be fused. And in the fusion of these three psychic functions, a new function arises which is different from everything that ever preceded it. And he called that insight. Do you remember that?

DR: Yes.

AD: So then each one of these is a psychic function, and it is specified insofar as to how it works. That is, it has certain specifications. But insight which, by the way, is inconceivable--keep that in mind--it's inconceivable. Don't try to have any ideas as to what it is, except in the language you use now. If insight is life having direct apprehension of itself, whereas feeling would take a certain aspect of life, willing would take another aspect of life, knowing would deal with another aspect of life. But when we speak about insight, we're saying life knowing itself totally and integrally. So that if you say that there's a higher type of feeling that the philosopher experiences when he has insight, and, if you say that there is a higher type of feeling, we're going to get confused. Because on the one hand we said that we have these psychic functions, and feeling is one of them, and it CAN experience something about reality; and on the other hand we're saying that insight is the direct apprehension of reality. We'll get confused if we say that in insight there will be a higher type of feeling. You follow?

DR: Yes, yes.

AD: So he gives it the term 'peace,' a 'noble peace,' a 'serenity,' which is different from the feeling and knowing and willing, but I'm not saying it's dead or inanimate.

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0201a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

AD: Something about it makes it a living thing. So we have to keep the distinction clear between psychic functions and insight. (from Pat C. transcript, not on this version of the tape)

AD: . . . (inaudible) we have to distinguish between insight (inaudible) . . . (from another version of the tapes)

AD: . . . life apprehending itself, and the psychic functions, which are specifications of the psyche and are assigned a very specific task. We have to make that distinction.

DR: If you do try to speak of the higher feeling, or a higher knowing, you are just importing the ways of the psyche into--

AD: That insight.

DR: An insight.

AD: So if we distinguish these two things that insight is, as we said, knowing knowing, and this goes on whether there IS an object or there ISN'T an object. Insight is eternal. I mean, it has no beginning in time. It always is what it is. And whether the insight takes place--let's say insight into what the nature of reality is or what an object, this object or that object, is, is insight, and also it remains insight even if there is no object. So that means that even if there is no feeling, insight still remains. You follow that?

St's: No.

AD: Isn't feeling a content? Isn't it something known? But in insight, there is nothing "other" that is being known.

DR: That I can follow. But now you say at the same time that insight does not change whether there was or was not a object. But logically I'm losing it.

AD: Well, if we use an analogy: (if) you have the lights on, you see the pole. I shut the lights off, you say you see nothing. Seeing goes on in both cases. In one case you saw nothing; in the other case you saw the pole. But seeing itself, in the analogy I'm using, seeing corresponds to transcendental insight. Reality can't disappear just because appearances disappear. So insight always remains. It's always there.

DR: And on the other side, just because there would be an apparent world is no reason for the sage that his insight would disappear. So clearly he can use his insight upon an object.

RG: Insofar that when the sage elaborates the insight, and he elaborates it through these functions, what is the relationship between that elaboration, through those functions and the experience of that insight? Is there any relation, or is it purely just because those are the psychic functions that are available? Is there some relationship between the elaboration of the insight through knowing, willing, and feeling, or is it random that knowing, willing, and feeling are the psychic functions through which the sage elaborates the world, to himself, the insight?

AD: I don't know if I understand you, but there's no possibility of elaborating insight. But these are the faculties that, as human souls, we possess, these three modes of cognition. I would suspect that there is some pre-ordained relationship between these two, that willing, feeling, and knowing can corroborate with insight. But ultimately I would say that they are contingent.

RG: I would agree that THEY are contingent as functions. But when, in this quote for example the insight is spoken of through the idea of peace or serenity, or in another quote it's spoken of as gnosis or the true object of knowledge.

AD: He tries to avoid the use of 'higher feeling,' 'higher knowing,' any of that.

RG: But you seem to get the flavor that the ultimates of those three are somehow fused in insight. And somehow, their ultimate realization grants you some experience in their purest possible state.

AD: That last sentence again, Dickie.

RG: That through this insight the ultimate possibilities of knowing, willing, and feeling are somehow fused and experienced in that insight. You may not call it feeling anymore, but it doesn't seem you could speak of it without feeling. You may not call it knowing, but you wouldn't call it unknown in the ultimate sense of knowing.

AD: I think I follow what you're getting at. And he also makes the remark that, on the one hand, the balance of these three brings about the possibility of insight which seems to be a fusion of these three functions, but then he also goes on to say that it is qualitatively different than the three. So it's really a very different answer. So I don't think I could answer that. But I do want to make this one remark: don't try to conceive insight. It's better to leave your mind blank (there). And I would make one more remark: it's better, I think, to use the terms he uses for insight, things like 'peace,' 'serenity,' and 'gnosis,' rather

than to use any one of the three functions or all three. Because it's misleading. Insight is not a higher knowing, not a higher feeling, not a higher willing. It's not that. So if we leave ourselves open that way, we're better off; we might get some intuitions about it. But it is totally inconceivable. Alright, we'll grant Kathleen her request and read another one.

PHILOSOPHIC EXPERIENCE INCLUDES THE I AM AND THE WORLD-IDEA

PB: "What science calls the "critical temperature," that is, the temperature when a substance shares both the liquid and gaseous states, is symbolic of what philosophical mysticism calls the "philosophic experience," that is, when a man's consciousness shares both the external world of the five senses and the internal world of the empty soul. The ordinary mystic or yogi is unable to hold the two states simultaneously and, quite often, even unwilling to do so, because of the false opposition he has been taught to set up between them." (Persp. p. 266 and 20.4.122)

AH: Do you think there are three terms in that description or two? Is it consciousness, empty soul, and the five senses, or are empty soul and consciousness equatable?

AD: Do you think there are three states or one state?

AH: I wonder if there are three terms, the consciousness is witnessing empty soul and five senses. Or should you think of empty soul and consciousness as the same principle?

KD: I think it would be one state, that that is the critical point at which the world is seen as not other than mind . . .

DR: That actually does justice to the analogy of the critical temperature. I think that's the point of the critical temperature-- At that temperature the substance is in both those states, you can't really distinguish--

AD: He says the philosophic experience is like that, doesn't he? Where you hold the apparent world and the emptiness of soul together.

KD: And you haven't canceled either one.

AD: Yes.

(5 minutes of student discussion including KD's remark below. RC & AH & KD & RG & JnL)

KD: It's not that it underlies both but it is both. It's not that there is a thought of the world imposed on consciousness, but that this is no longer any division or separation. There are not two things, consciousness and the world.

AD: Are you trying to say, Kathleen, that the philosophic experience includes the I AM and the World-Idea?

KD: Yes, and that neither one is denied . . .

RC: There is something missing in this quote. It seems that the psychology is gone. It seems to be part of what's indicated by the 'empty soul'. You've got the world of the five senses--that's it for the object side.

JA: What about the psychology in the World-Idea?

AD: What was that?

(JA repeats question)

AD: In other words you're saying that it's included in the World-Idea. It didn't go away; it's still there. As soon as you come back you'll find it waiting for you.

RC: Would you say that's part of the world of the five senses, that psychology? Or would you say it's part of the empty soul?

AD: No, I would say all that is part of the World-Idea: the ego complex, the five senses, tendencies, thoughts, desires. All that's part of the World-Idea. And then the I AM is the substratum within which is manifested the World-Idea. And the philosophic experience is to see both of them together.

RC: In the quote about "the mind of a perfect man is like a mirror," is there psychology there?

AD: No, there wouldn't be psychology there. But isn't that exactly what is being referred to here as the philosophic experience? It includes both.

TS: So the psychology is taken as the psychology which defines the individuality of the embodied person. His experience is part of the given World-Idea.

(TS/AD question clarification)

TS: That is, the psychology which defines the individuality of the embodied person--

AD: What? (TS/AD question clarification)

TS: That which is part of the mind/body complex is experienced as part of the World-Idea, not part of the I AM. So the I AM which is that genuine individual being is experienced as empty of any content, but that psychosomatic structure which is its outer actualization is seen as part of the World-Idea. And the consciousness of the philosopher stands poised between both. So that it is neither--

AD: Well, not poised, but includes both; not in between both, but includes both.

LR: What's the difference between the consciousness of the philosopher and the I AM?

AD: Again?

LR: I'm getting confused.

AD: Well, the quote-- We're referring to the quote--it's explaining what the philosophic experience IS. Now, what is the philosophic experience?

LR: Well, you said it's the experience of both the I AM and the World-Idea.

RG: The mystic could have the experience of the I AM and not have the experience of the World-Idea. That would be the difference.

LR: But somebody was saying consciousness, and then the I AM, as if those were two separate terms.

AD: But we're not interested in that. We're interested in the quote, right? Reread the quote again, Randy.
(part of the quote reread: ". . . 'philosophic experience,' that is, when a man's consciousness shares both the external world of the five senses and the internal world of the empty soul. . . .")

RG: Do you take the "internal world of the empty soul" there to be the experience of the I AM?

AD: Yes. [Tape transcriber #1 indicates that Anthony answers yes to his question, but it is not audible on the tape. Pat's class notes also confirm that he answered yes to this question, so he probably did.]

PB: ". . . when a man's consciousness shares both the external world of the five senses and the internal world of the empty soul. . . ." (repeat)

DB: Are there three things there? . . .

AH: . . . How do we describe experience in any other way besides (inaudible)?

RG: We may describe it that way but we sure don't experience it that way.

AH: What's different about the experience that we're having in the state of ignorance than that one?

RG: Because your internal world isn't empty, for one thing. (laughter)

AH: If we look, as we try to do in meditation, there's always a subjective principle that can't be discovered . . .

RG: I don't believe in that.

AH: I wonder how to describe the state of ignorance.

AB: It's the solid state. (laughter)

AH: It struck me as remarkable the description of experience in this quote as PHILOSOPHIC experience seems the only way to describe experience at all.

AD: Andrew, do you experience emptiness and phenomena at the same time? (pause) If you do, then it's a good description of your experience.

AH: So I experience phenomena and what?

JG: And emptiness.

JB: And we talk about emptiness.

(student discussion, about 15-20 min.)

RC: Would there be insight if there weren't people to have it? Are we talking about the peak of human development or are we talking about the Solar Logos's consciousness? . . .

JG: Anthony, would you care to help us?

AD: Well, I said it all--insight includes recognition of the soul and its manifestation as non-different.

JG: As non-different.

AD: I said all that I intended to say.

S: I didn't hear you.

AD: Philosophic experience is the same as having insight. Insight is the same as being the double knower. That means that the soul and its manifestation are non-different.

(pause)

PB PARAS ON BALANCE IN PHILOSOPHY

PB: "The basis of the universe . . ." (Persp. p. 269 & 20.3.279)

PB: "When this proper balance is lacking . . ." (unpublished, 5v/27/47)

PB: "The required condition of balance as the price of illumination refers also to correcting the lopsidedness of letting the conscious ego direct the whole man while resisting the super-conscious spiritual forces. In other words, balance is demanded between the intellect which seeks deliberate control of the psyche and the intuition which must be invited by passivity and allowed to manifest in spontaneity. When a man has trained himself to turn equally from the desire to possess to the aspiration to being possessed, when he can pass from the solely personal attitude to the one beyond it, when the will to manage his being and his life for himself and by himself is compensated by the willingness to let himself and his life be quiescent, then his being and his life are worked upon by higher forces. This is the kind of balance and completeness which the philosophic discipline must lead to so that the philosophic illumination may give him his second birth." (Persp. p. 269 and 20.3.278)

(5 min. student discussion)

[Audio File 1984 0201a Ends]

[Audio File 1984 0201b Begins]

PB: "The required condition . . ." (reread) (8 min. student discussion)

PB: "The danger of a lopsided . . ." (Persp. p. 271 & 20.3.386)

PB: "But it is of the highest importance . . ." (Persp. p. 269 only (also in 2/8/84))

PB: "The balance needed by faith . . ." (Persp. p. 271 & 20.3.410)

PB: "Inner balance . . ." (Persp. p. 271 & 20.3.412)

PB: "The proportion (Note: 'ratio' in original) of development . . . all the parts." (20.3.353 (2/8/84 also))

PB: "The balanced life . . ." (20.3.364)

PB: "It is most important . . ." (Persp. p. 270 & 20.3.280)

("The basis," "When this basis," & "The required" reread, 5-10 min. student discussion)

PB: "The required condition of balance . . ." (reread)

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0201b Ends; Side 2 Begins)

(10-15 min. student discussion on balance)

**# BALANCE AS THE ABILITY TO MANIPULATE 360 DEGREES INDEPENDENTLY
OR COORDINATELY WITH THE PSYCHIC FUNCTIONS**

AP: He talks about how you have to practice what you have learned . . . Keep one eye directed toward the World-Mind. It doesn't mean to stop acting or thinking but to think with an eye directed inward . . .

KD: It sounds like one quality is not given weight over another . . . With a sage, with a person on a philosophic path, no quality can be over-weighted . . . sometimes the World-Mind might call for you go be angry, sometimes to act with caution, and the person who's in balance will be capable of doing that, following the instructions of the World-Mind . . .

AH: . . .

KD: It sounds like the harmony doesn't come from the intellect and from the ego . . . The harmony comes from NOT letting that ego and lower intellect determine how we're going to act, but from letting the higher instruct us. Some situations may call for not doing anything, some for acting--and if you're stuck on one--"I've got to be a superior person" and "I've got to be brave" or "I've got to be this way or the other way." Like PB, he was totally able to do may things--whatever the situation called for. Everything was so spontaneous--you could never predict--a person like that is unpredictable, they're not repetitious. They're able to act according to the demands of the situation and not according to the repetitious predetermination of that ego.

AH: . . . harmony in the ego has to be relative . . .

KD: I don't know what you mean by harmony in the ego . . .

(DR/AH/)

AD: Kathleen, you were saying that the World-Idea could present you with a variety of situations or circumstances, and that the response to those situations would require a person, if he was balanced, to respond either according to the structure of his ego or for the ego to be silent and be guided, or-- (pause) Would you read the quote again?

(quote reread)

KD: Sounds great to me. Isn't that what we all want?

(LdS/HS/)

AD: Can we rephrase that a little differently so it's more simple? Is he saying something like this? The philosophic discipline demands that the whole soul, all the parts of the soul, are readily available to respond to the variety of situations that could be presented by the World-Idea. Could we make it very brief and terse? So that would mean that at one time the soul would insist that the ego do its own thing. Another time the soul would insist that the ego keep quiet and listen to what's to be done. At other times, it may be required that the complexity of the whole of the psychic organism be reorganized or be

temporarily disowned for the purposes of acting from different presuppositions than the ones it inherits. Is this in brief what he's trying to say?

KD: . . .

AD: It's like looking at it this way. It's like looking at the two charts together: the natal chart and the transits going on. There are times when you must act from within the center of your own ego; your ego has to decide what to do. There are times when you shouldn't let the ego decide but let the transits or the higher mind tell you what to do. There are times when certain functions have to be negated or denied so OTHER ideas can come to operate. So balance would be to bring all of these into some sort of coordination into a philosophic ideal.

KD: Implied in what you're saying is the inner poise of the being, that it's not stuck on any one of those qualities or conditions?

AD: Well, yes, but that too is required: that the ego sometimes operates and acts from its own needs. That TOO has to be included, because there is need for the ego to evolve along with the World-Idea. And that development that it needs also has to be included in the soul's repose, as you call it. Try to put it this way: it's the ability to apply any of the 360 degrees at any time to any given situation. If you can't, it's because there's something stuck.

So sometimes an idea is required in order for me to understand a phenomena or to operate with a phenomena or to act in a situation. And the idea that's required--I don't have no planets on it. I don't operate that way. But that's the idea that's required of me in order for me to respond adequately to the situation. But because of my predisposition to operate only in terms of where my planets are sitting on, I'm going to ignore the ones that my planets are not sitting on. So what balance means here, I think, is that ability to be able to manipulate any of those ideas, independently or coordinately WITH the psychic function(s/ing). (PC version = 'functioning,' later transcribers go with 'functions.')

LdS: What does it mean to do it without the psychic function(s)? In other words, if you don't have a planet on a degree, how would you have access to that degree?

AD: Aren't they all included within you?

LdS: Well, yes, I guess, on a certain level.

AD: If we say that the World-Idea is given to the Witness-I, then all those ideas are within you. But why is it you prefer some over the others? Why do you insist on using the same ones, over and over again? Why do you respond, in other words, to a situation in a set pattern, where it might not be called for?

LdS: So you're saying what's required is you have to be able to have this access to the Witness point of view, as well as the obvious one you always have, to the ego.

AD: I didn't say that.

LdS: Isn't that implied in what you're saying? If I'm going to be able to manipulate or have access to any of the 360--

AD: You say it's an implication, and I said I didn't imply that. It's no implication.

LdS: Ok.

AD: What did you say was an implication?

LdS: What I'm saying is an implication and what you were saying is that if I can manipulate, if I have to achieve the ability to manipulate any of the 360 degrees, that would mean or entail my ability to take the Witness perspective or point of view.

AD: Don't you see you say that's implied? I didn't imply it, I stated it! Why do you try to rephrase me? I don't have any doubt that you are the Witness-I. I never think you to be your little toe. And I have no reason to think that you're the body that's presented to me. You ARE that "I."

LdS: I just wanted to be sure (inaudible).

AD: Yes, I want you to be sure (inaudible).

CS: Anthony, it's implied the sage has risen above his chart?

AD: Well, he has risen above his chart and he is also in the chart. He is the ego and also beyond the ego. He uses the ego, and at times he feels the ego needs a certain development and he'll develop it. This is balance: the ability to manipulate the entirety of the psychic structure or any of the functions, and also any of the ideas, to respond adequately to any situation that the World-Idea presents you with.

CS: Because they are all in him?

AD: But of course, where else are they? Do you get a chart with only twelve degrees? Twenty? Twenty-five? You get the 360, or you don't get any.

CS: But they aren't all (available).

AD: Yes, I know, we'll go over that all over again now--they're not all available.

CS: But they aren't all available.

AD: They ARE all available! Otherwise, how could we communicate with one another?

LR?: We don't! (laughter)

CS: I'm confused.

AD: Confusion's alright.

CS: I thought you said when you are on one of the degrees it's not available to you.

AD: When a planet in your chart is sitting on a degree, you respond according to that degree. But you know, if you make out in your chart all the parts, or, better still, what's simpler, if for instance you're not sure if your sun or your moon is on 23 or 24 and you could keep saying to yourself, "But it could be this, or it could be that. It could be either one. I see both." Right there, there's an indication that all these ideas are within you. They're not foreign to you. Also, these ideas are the very means, and the very method, or the very medium by which communication takes place. Now if I only had 12 ideas and you only had 13--that means 25--we couldn't discuss the other 335. --It's overtime.--

AP: I had a notion that if the attachment to the ego is relaxed, that the ego (inaudible), its attachment is broken that the ego is a part of the World-Idea, that it would sort of go along doing the right thing, without being directed, because it's part of the World-Idea and the identification wouldn't be (continuous?) but it would be flowing along in a balanced way with the cosmos. (inaudible)

AD: I'm sorry. I don't get the drift of your point. You have to remember what I'm saying is the soul includes the ego, which is part of the World-Idea, as part of itself.

AP: My question was that if the attachment of the ego is relaxed, if the ego doesn't do the right thing, in harmony with the cosmos, without the ego, having to ATTEND to it--because I thought, the way you describe it, it seems so highly advanced. But it seems to me that different kinds of people even (inaudible) ability could achieve a kind of harmony where they could be used in a little way, in harmony with the higher.

AD: (softly) I'm sorry. If someone follows, let me (know).

AP: If you say, the ego with all its particular degrees and the chart as the picture of what the ego is, look at it that way and those degrees when they're working through or working their way through the ego.

Say that the person disidentifies with the ego, if it's left then to accept--not completely to accept, surely some part of the consciousness must beside of it but--I mean if it's relaxed the effort of real--

I thought that that person and that body would go about its business in harmony with the cosmos because it's part of the World Image--if you don't interfere, if through attachment to the ego, that then it would be harmonized again.

CdA: At the level of the sage?

AP: No, I don't think it's at the level of the SAGE. I mean, EACH person whether (yogi) or small talented--if they achieve this inner attitude they would be in harmony with the rest of the cosmos.

AP: The ego is part of the World-Idea. If you don't interfere through attachments to the ego then it would be harmonized. (= paraphrased summary of above AP remarks for ED1)

AD: If I follow, I think what you're saying is that the animal is in harmony with nature. I think that's what you're saying.

AP: Well, I don't mean that we should return to the animal stage but I mean--you said once--that you have to give back the body to nature and society--

AD: I didn't say that.

AP: Yes, you did.

AD: It's a fact.

AP: And if you do that, doesn't it act of its own accord in harmony?

AD: But that's what you're saying. The animal is in harmony with nature. But we're not talking about that. Aren't we talking about the balance that has to be brought about in the animal psyche in order to achieve some philosophical status? (pause)

The psyche as it is in any one of us is unbalanced. And I don't have to tell you that. You look at your chart; you can see that right away. That's what we mean when we say 'unbalanced,' right? There's a stress here and an underpinning here. So how could you bring it into balance? Well, there's some things YOU have to do to bring it into balance. There's some things that you DON'T do, but you listen for guidance. But I find that way of understanding the problem very difficult and complicated, the way he stated it. I'm just trying to rephrase it in my own terminology so that I could deal with it more easily. And that was, that in order for me to be able to respond to the variety of situations and circumstances or any combination thereof, which arises with the World-Idea, then I and I as a WHOLE--not just the ego, but "I" which includes the ego, intellection, intuition, and all that--have to be capable of responding to any situation that arises. But if there are grooves or fixed patterns of operating, ipso facto I can't respond adequately or spontaneously to any situation. So that would be one way of looking at it. Another way would be to look at the fact that the ego, because of certain shortcomings, has to develop itself; this has to be included in the program of bringing balance about. That has to be included, so I'm coming at it from that direction. I'm not coming at it from his direction because I don't follow his. It's confusing to me.

Alright, we can continue next week. We can stay on this quotation.

[Audio File 1984 0201b Ends]