

**CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
February 15, 1984
PB PARAS; PHILOSOPHY; INSIGHT**

TOPIC: PB Paras

SUBJECT: Philosophy

SUBSUBJECTS: Insight, Philosophic Understanding, Intuition, Soul (Double Knower)

CONTENTS:

INSIGHT IS THE FUNCTION OF LIFE ENTIRE

DISMISSING THE INNER BEING AND IDENTIFYING WITH THE LIGHT OF SOUL

THE SAGE CAN THINK AND NOT THINK; INTELLECT AND REASON (EMBODIED AND UNEMBODIED)

PHILOSOPHIC INSIGHT, ONCE ESTABLISHED, IS PERMANENT; UNIVERSALITY OF LIFE

MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE OF "CENTER OF BEING" VS. PHILOSOPHIC EXPERIENCE NOT LIMITED TO A CENTER

PHILOSOPHIC EXPERIENCE COMBINES THE I AM AND THE WITNESS-I

PURE CONSCIOUSNESS UNCOLORED BY EGO

INTUITION AND INSIGHT

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives*.
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)
- Plato, *Seventh Epistle*

NOTES:

- The first part of this transcript is a reformatting of the 1993 transcript (transcribed by HP et al.) that was used for *Living Wisdom*, which used the audio cassette tapes and the original Pat Campbell 1984 transcript as a basis. The second part of class was retranscribed by IT using the 1993 transcript and digitized audio cassette tapes located in 2000s (Audio Files c and d, corresponding to Side 1 and Side 2 of Tape 2). Tape 1 for the first part of this class is still missing as of 2020.
- Other, earlier transcript versions may also exist.
- Excerpts from this transcript appear in *Astronoesis* in "Unit Soul as Absolute Individual," p. 211 ff., and "Diagrams of Levels of Soul," p. 185.

TRANSCRIBED Verbatim by IT 2019 (second part only); the first part is “reader verbatim” as was typed from Pat Campbell 1984 transcript. Reformatted by JRM & JF from V11a version 2019-2020. Subheads and new Table of Contents added by JRM. In 2023, IT updates prefatory matter, footer, and audio file name, alters Subheads to make more accurate, completes Book List, fixes typos and errors, reformats to accord with new conventions. **Archival verbatim transcript – V14.1a.**

AUDIO FILES: 1984 0215c, 1984 0215d.

1984 02/15 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Philosophy; Insight
Archival Verbatim Transcript

INSIGHT IS THE FUNCTION OF LIFE ENTIRE

[Begin class, first part, re-typed from Pat Campbell 1984 transcript, and quotes sourced/proofread.]

PB: "Insight is the function of the entire psyche and not of any single part of it." (*Perspectives*, Ch. 20, #80, and V13, 20:4.184)

S: Insight is not like intuition, which works with parts of the psyche.

AD: But does life have parts?

S: Not to my knowledge.

AD: Then why don't you go back to his statement: Insight is the function of life entire.

S: But we've spoken of insight only becoming available after those functions have been developed.

AD: But do you think life will have to wait until all the functions of the psyche are developed for it to understand itself? Do you think that life--and we're not speaking about parts of life; we're speaking about life in its entirety--has to wait for the psychic functions to get developed for it to know what it is doing? If you stay with the quote, he says it's a function of life entire or the psyche entire.

S: By entire you mean . . .

AD: . . . undivided.

S: By part does he mean my life?

AD: My life or any functions of the life as parts. The undivided life which is the same as universal being understands or perceives or knows what it is doing. The knowing here is not something external to what it is doing.

IT's there all the time. It's not a product (of a process), no. You think life has to figure out what's the next step in the evolution of a person's growth and lay out a plan of attack and see to it that these things happen? Do you think that life entire works in the fashion of deliberation or discursive reasoning?

He says that insight is the function of the entire psyche or the entirety of life. If you follow up the thread of the thought we just spoke of--that life is undivided, an entirety--and we say that it knows what it is doing, intrinsically--then what kind of knowing could that possibly be? You see, there's your answer.

S: Well, it's not going to be an understanding that we have here. Would it be a knowing by identity?

AD: Yes, it would be a knowing by identity.

S: When PB says "of the entire psyche," that's harder to understand than when you say "of life."

AD: When we say 'life,' instead of saying 'psyche,' then it immediately takes on the characteristics that belong to it, Universality--Life is universal, universal being--and life understands itself without the use or

the need of any intermediaries; it doesn't need eyes, nose, doesn't need reason, doesn't need any of these accessories.

Now the kind of understanding (life) has of itself is what he's calling 'insight,' and this is the function of life per se.

S: Are you saying the World-Idea is self-cognitive?

AD: I'm not saying the World-Idea is self-cognitive; I'm saying LIFE is self-cognitive.

S: Could you explain the relationship between 'psyche' and 'life'?

AD: I'm using them synonymously. 'Psyche' and 'life' mean the same thing.

S: But my psyche isn't universal.

AD: I didn't say your psyche is universal. I said your psyche is life. You're speaking about your psychic functions are not universal.

S: How do I distinguish my psychic functions from my psyche?

AD: Dissolve them back into their origin.

But what do you mean, your psyche isn't universal? First of all, it's your life. All of a sudden you've become a capitalist!

I'm changing the word 'psyche' to 'life'. He's not speaking there about my life or your life, your understanding or mind; he's speaking about it in its universality, its entirety. He said that insight is the function of the entire psyche; I just changed one word, 'psyche'; I used the word 'life.'

S: Doesn't that imply that I have to universalize my psyche in order to function as insight?

AD: It doesn't imply anything of the sort. Not that one quote. There's no implication of that.

S: I thought you were saying that life is already universal.

AD: Yes, and that life already has intrinsic self-cognition, and that the way life understood itself was through insight.

What does 'psyche' mean?

S: Soul.

AD: Soul? What does 'soul' mean? Don't you mean life?

S: I thought of life as the manifestation.

AD: No, life isn't the manifestation. What you see is a manifestation of life, but life you can't see. You see its manifestations, but life itself is indivisible in its core, it's an infinite power--you don't SEE that.

You remember those quotations we ran through in Plotinus where I told people, "Memorize these. Write them out on a card, put them over your bed, and when you go to sleep at night, reread them. Keep doing that every night. Fall asleep with that." You remember those quotes about what soul is, what life is? An infinite power to the core; that it remains indivisible no matter how often it gets divided; it's

indivisible, and it has this indivisibility from its prior. You think I give you homework for no reason at all?

What happens when the individual has insight is that he's participating in the knowledge that the soul has of itself. So we could return to the quotation. Life always has insight. It's intrinsic to it.

PB: "This is the true insight, the permanent illumination that neither comes nor goes but always IS. While being serious, where the event or situation requires it, he will not be solemn. For behind this seriousness there is detachment. He cannot take the world of Appearances as being Reality's final form. If he is a sharer in this world's experiences, he is also a witness and especially a witness of his own ego--its acts and desires, its thoughts and speech. And because he sees its littleness, he keeps his sense of humour about all things concerning it, a touch of lightness, a basic humility. Others may believe he stands in the Great Light, but he himself has not particular or ponderous self-importance." (*Perspectives*, Ch. 20, #81, and V13, 20:4.205)

AD: What transcends life? If you use the word psyche, you're going to get confused. If you use the word 'life' or 'soul'--you say that soul has a basic insight into its own nature--it would be more difficult then to make this kind of an error of thinking that when you get insight you're going to transcend life or transcend the psyche. The insight is INTO the psyche and OF the psyche and BY the psyche. It's life understanding ITSELF: not something outside, but itself. So how could it transcend itself? If you use the word 'transcend,' you'll get confused. You think that you're going to go beyond life to something that's beyond life and understand by looking down at life what the life is about. But the understanding that is being offered by life is in terms of life itself and IS life itself.

That's a pretty universal concept--life--although people have the notion that it's restricted only to what they understand as life: this amoeba crawling around or this grub or this human being walking around. But life is universal in its sweep. It permeates the entire universe and makes the universe possible. It oozes out the universe from within itself. So why speak about transcending it?

S: I was speaking about transcending psychic functioning.

AD: Oh, ok. That's different, because the psychic functioning is very restricted, isn't it? It's very specialized. Let's say we could even confine it to the instincts that a person has to work with. You say, "Well, life is operating or manifesting itself through the instincts." So in that sense, immediately, the kind of understanding that the life of a person has through the instincts is going to be restricted, confined by that instinctual functioning. But when we speak about life in its entirety understanding itself, it has to transcend all of those restrictive modes or ways of being, in the same way that when he speaks about the fusion of these three--the willing, feeling, and knowing. You see he points out that knowledge utterly transcends those functions, and it is a perception--if I could use this awkward phrase--of life itself, life perceiving itself without the use of any intermediaries at all. But through its own living, life perceives itself. This, of course, transcends all psychic functions and cannot be restricted by any specialized mode of knowing.

S: And even knowing, willing, and feeling are specific and restrictive psychic functions?

AD: Yes. They're modalizations of its universality.

S: So would you also say that knowing, willing, feeling, and all other psychic functions are in some sense personal, whereas the psyche itself or life itself is totally impersonal?

AD: Well, I think what you're saying is that any modalization of universal life immediately implies a restrictive mode of being. That means it's being singularized or manifested or particularized, and therefore you're speaking about some entity.

S: If you wanted to symbolize the psyche or life, would you say that it extends to the sidereal zodiac?

AD: Well, from what you understand of life itself, where would you say the origin of life is? If we speak about an origin in our twentieth century contemporary mode, where would you say it came from?

S: The sun.

AD: I would too. We speak about the sun as that infinite light and life, and that life has its own mode of understanding which is being referred to here as insight. The Orientals would refer to it as prajna. It has its own understanding, intrinsic to itself.

DISMISSING THE INNER BEING AND IDENTIFYING WITH THE LIGHT OF SOUL

PB: "He who possesses insight does not have to use arguments and reach conclusions. The truth is there, self-evident, inside himself as himself, for his inner being has become one with it." (*Perspectives*, Ch. 20, #82, and V13, 20:4.170)

AD: The question is, how does the inner being become one with (insight). If we take for granted, or maybe we should mention, what do we mean by 'inner being'? What does PB mean when he says 'inner being'?

S: Is that inner being just the principle of consciousness?

AD: The question is precisely that: How do I become that principle, considering the way I am?

S: You can't become it.

AD: Why not?

S: Because you already are it.

AD: No. I don't feel that I am it.

S: Well, you don't know that you're it.

AD: I don't know it, either.

If I am not the truth, and don't feel that I am and I don't know that I am the truth, what can I do about it? Evidently, the inner being the way it is now is not one with the truth. So what do I do about it in order to become one with that truth?

S: I would say try to get deeper into that inner being.

AD: Try to get deeper into that inner being? That guy full of lies, fairy tales, illusions? Get rid of him! Get rid of it, that inner being, and you'll be one with him.

S: It's not that easy! You start out with little bits at a time.

AD: Yes, that's the process that is involved. You disidentify or dismiss that inner being that you think you are so that you can be one with what you really are.

PB always uses words in the sense that they mean today, not the sense that they might mean in any specialized jargon. Now when you speak to a person, and you say your 'inner being,' what do you think he's going to think of? He's going to think of that congerie of feelings, thoughts, memories; all these things that pass through your mind. This is what you refer to as your inner being.

S: He means that, rather than the evolving power of understanding?

AD: Yes, I think he means that inner being, all this stuff that's like a seething cauldron. If I think about myself as that inner being, how DO I make myself one with the truth?

S: By recognizing that the truth is within you and that you aren't all those other things that you're identified with.

AD: So what's involved?

S: Purifying yourself of those things in order to recognize the truth within you.

AD: What do you mean when you say 'purified'?

S: Recognizing your identification with . . .

AD: That's not purifying. If I recognize my soul, that's not purification of my inner being.

S: Changing your habits.

AD: Yes, and even more precisely, wouldn't you say that by dismissing all those notions about your inner being that you'll become one with your soul?

S: But it seems that you're saying the inner being can never become one with the soul.

AD: You're catching on!

S: Any experience endowed with the personal self-form is not the truth, and it has to be removed from the field of consciousness.

AD: And then that leaves you with your inner being, your true inner "I." In other words, you have to dismiss all these vagaries, fantasies, thoughts, memories, selections from your past, anticipations of your future, expectations--you want me to go down the list? You have to remove all that in order to identify with it. Or, in other words, you stop thinking. Now I'm sure you're going to see that after class you'll think much more!

When there is no more thinking, concept forming, which is concerned about creating an artificial object--whether your inner self or your outer self doesn't matter--when there isn't any of that any more around, then the inwardness or the principle that you are which is illuminating or shining in you is what you really are. That is, so to speak, there always. But you're not aware of it because you're preoccupied with the images, not with the light which is illuminating those images. If you temporarily could stop those images, then there would be just a light shining, and you would know that "this is what I am." Then the

images resume. Now it is possible for the images to go on and still hold an identity with the light which illumines the images, and then one could say, "I'm identified with that light and not with the images."

But the point is that the concept-making--the mind, always producing these concepts and images--is in a sense reifying an object constantly, and that prevents identification with what you really are. Now, the sage does not think, and that's why he's in identity with it. And when you sleep you're not thinking, and you're very happy, but you don't know it.

S: The sage doesn't think, but knows by being?

AD: Why not both? If he has to (think), he can. He knows that he's enlightened because his being and his knowing are, so to speak, identical. But suppose he has to think, and he knows now, "Well, now, I'm thinking. I'm using concepts. Can I say I'm enlightened, or this is what they mean when they say I'm enlightened?" Could he formulate it? Sure he could. Why not?

S: He could formulate something from the perspective of thought that would refer to his enlightenment, but. . .

AD: He wouldn't confuse them.

S: He could refer to it by thought negatively.

AD: Even if he says that enlightenment doesn't mean anything, he could formulate it in thought. He's not afraid of it. He knows it's just thoughts.

S: Does he see people?

AD: Yes, he sees people.

S: What principle confuses itself with the inner being the way you define it?

AD: If we speak about this life and light which is imparted by the soul for the psychosomatic organism and then identifies with that psychosomatic organism and uses a reasoning which is based on sense perception, which belongs to the organism itself, then of course confusion and misidentification will take place, and the "I" will think of itself as being these images, memories, etc.

The most direct way to get to this "I," or this life and light imparted to the psychosomatic organism, is by a process of disidentifying from the images. And this process of disidentification from the images results eventually in isolating the light from the psychosomatic organism and then recognizing that this is what it is, that this is the "I" that I'm referring to.

When you say "I," the I-ness is referring to a plane that's other than that of the psychosomatic organism but confounded with that of the psychosomatic organism. So what is required, the way it was put--is to purify our inner being. Purification here means to dismiss the thoughts--and all their cousins and nephews and everything that comes with them--to dismiss them. And this is a long process; I mean, one doesn't disidentify from his thinking over night. It's a long process that takes many years. It's gradual. But eventually there is a reduction in the amount of thinking that takes place, and the possibility of that life understanding itself to be that light which illuminates all these images becomes more available.

When--let's say even temporarily, for a moment--you throw the sense functioning out of gear so that there's only this life, you recognize that life to be "I." "That's me." The recognition here is through

identity. It's not a discursive kind. Then, again, when that is over, it reidentifies all over again with the psychosomatic organism. You can see how that purity of what you felt to be your "I" is now lost, and it again is mixed up and confused with the functioning that is going on in the psychosomatic organism.

S: So would you say that this "I" is the one that has the power to disengage itself from the psychosomatic organism as well as will itself towards it or be involved in it? So that by disengaging from the psychosomatic organism and knowing itself independent of it, it provides the conditions by which the higher self can be present to it?

AD: Actually present, yes. So if you could maintain this state of thought-free consciousness, there wouldn't be any doubt as to what you mean when you say "I." Whereas, insofar that there is a continuing stream of content in your consciousness, there is that confusion. One will always think of those contents--and of course the main content is the body-thought.

S: If fundamentally, in the total scheme of what we say is the soul, you are this life which is always insightful, then how could it be obscured by a light that it projects forth?

AD: Ah. If you bring these two quotations together, you're going to have difficulty. That quotation did not refer to individual light [Note: life?/'light' is in PC transcript]. That quotation said that the function of insight belongs to the psyche entire. Now put brackets around that and stop right there. Life entire. Did he say your life or my life or anyone's life? He just said "life entire." So, in other words, what he's saying is: One of the functions or one of the ways that this principle of life can be intrinsically recognized--or the mark of life as a universal principle--is that it has self-cognition. That's a philosophic statement. That's got nothing to do with your personality, mine, or anyone else's. It's like you're characterizing or trying to pick out the feature that belongs to a universal. Now what characterizes life? Well, Plato would say movement, motion.

S: From the things we've read in Plotinus, I'm not sure Plotinus would characterize that basic life as self-cognitive, because the Nous enlightens it. It's not intellective by its own nature.

AD: Did you ever find life without the idea present in it? Because then you're no longer speaking about this life or that life or a soul; you're speaking about Absolute Soul. When you speak about Absolute Soul, it's not the soul of anything. But as soon as you start speaking about life in the sense that it's in manifestation, then you're speaking about either the soul of the cosmos or the soul of this plant, this animal, whatever. You're speaking about a unit soul. And if you have a unit soul, the World-Idea is inevitably associated with it; it has to be. There isn't an undetermined life anywhere.

THE SAGE CAN THINK AND NOT THINK; INTELLECT AND REASON (EMBODIED AND UNEMBODIED)

S: On the one hand the sage doesn't think, because he's attained enlightenment. On the other hand, he can think if he wants to.

AD: Why would you want to think if you're in a state of prajna?

S: Is it that cut and dried that thought and consciousness are considered distinct?

AD: Yes. They belong to two different realms of existence.

S: And whatever we'd symbolize in language is pointing towards that but is certainly not ever that.

AD: Yes. If we think of the bodily senses or the senses as perpetually manifesting an appearance--in other words, insofar that they function, appearances are taking place; appearances are concomitant with what we call the world as we know it. And it is this that you manipulate. In other words, what you are manipulating are these images, whether they're very abstract images or very concrete images. Images of the light are not the light. So any formulation that is made in terms of images will always be an imitation, a semblance of that life, but never that life.

In other words, a symbolic activity that's going on tries to portray what that life is in its original, native state. It can't do so. It can only paint a picture; no one is confused that the picture is not you. That is, no one that understands.

So when a person speaks about an enlightenment, we know that he's formulating in words that which escapes all formulation. But some indication has to be given to us that these things are there.

S: Is reason segregated from that?

AD: Embodied reason, yes, is segregated. So most of us, when we reason--if we examine very carefully the reasoning process, the words that we are using or the thoughts that we are employing--we'll see that behind it there is an image. It may be a very abstract image, but there's an image there. When even that is gone, then you're reasoning, but no longer now the way we understand reasoning. That's a trance state, that's a contemplative state: no images, even the most abstract kind.

It's worth remembering this point, since you're preoccupied with it. We went through the evolution of the genetic mentality that takes place in any living creature, and if you think of the innumerable development that has gone on in the development of an animal body, and the fact that it had to learn to respond to an environment, and that the senses provide it with indications of what that environment is, and that these memory traces of what the senses have delivered is stored, registered, classified, memorized, and this is what you use when you try to communicate with someone. So they're really secondhand copies of what is already--ALREADY, try to understand--of a bodily sense.

S: But that wouldn't be reason.

AD: No, I didn't say that was reason. You manipulate these images when you reason.

S: Then that's not reason.

AD: Why isn't it reason: the manipulation of these symbols to a certain end?

S: Because I thought reason was when you stopped manipulating the traces or the symbols.

AD: Well, now this is reason unembodied.

S: We did make the distinction between reason and intellect, which is the manipulation of all those processes.

AD: Yes. In order for me to communicate some understanding of what the reasons are that I think something to be such and such, I have to manipulate these symbols or images which my intellect has stored up. And it doesn't deprive me of the use of the intellect, either.

S: When you try to communicate what your reason has brought to you, that's not the same process as the reasoning process per se that you'd use.

AD: The unembodied reason?

S: Yes.

AD: Well, they're not the same, but you remember there are passages in many of the texts where they speak about reason experiences itself differently when it gets embodied than when it was unembodied, but it's still the same reason.

S: When the sage formulates a doctrine about truth, he has to use those same vehicles.

AD: Yes.

S: He's not privy to some special vehicles?

AD: Well, he is also; that too is true. He can sometimes communicate, to a person who is sensitive enough, directly without the intermediary of these symbols. It depends on the sensitivity of the person. So you know sometimes a student will see a teacher, who will give him a smile, and that's it; he got it. The rest of us have to spend twenty years with him. I'd be careful as to what restrictions I'd place on a sage.

S: There seems to be a lot of controversy about what is scripture and what isn't.

AD: No, there's no controversy. It's only controversial for those people who don't understand. While you're in a stage of still trying to understand, there's a lot of controversy, pros and cons. When a person understands truly, there's no controversy. It's there in black and white. It's even better than black and white.

You know, like sometimes when you see a movie picture and the light gets very, very intense, and then like the picture is blurred out; then the light is retracted somewhat so that you can see the images? So with the sage: When he's not thinking, there's just that bright light. There's images there, but the light just overwhelms them. Then he has to focus back to see the images again.

S: PB used to do that.

AD: All the time.

S: It was such an effort for him to start talking and thinking again, and you got the sense that his whole being was in that consciousness and he was using language and thinking very much like a tool. So there was nothing automatic about his speech.

AD: Everything was always new for PB.

S: So when the sage is using words to convey meaning, that would be embodied reason, not intellect.

AD: Yes. I tend to use (intellect) more like the biological functioning.

S: And the biological functioning really couldn't reveal a reason-principle.

AD: Well, you remember we pointed out, the intellect keeps thinking about something, trying to figure out something, spends years on it, and then all of a sudden there's an illuminating flash of light? That's

the reasoning, putting together what the intellect can't understand. And, of course, the intellect will go on and say, "Well, look at what I've done." But it's basically the intuition coming from the reasoning that joins together certain strains of thought that seem disconnected, and you suddenly get an understanding of what that's about.

S: So with the sage, using words and concepts to convey meaning; it's the reason that's organizing those contents to reveal something, whereas the intellect can't do that.

AD: Oh yes. I don't think the intellect can be as precise.

PHILOSOPHIC INSIGHT, ONCE ESTABLISHED, IS PERMANENT; UNIVERSALITY OF LIFE

PB: "A mystic experience is simply something which comes and goes, whereas philosophic insight, once established in a man, cannot possibly leave him. He understands the Truth and cannot lose this understanding any more than an adult can lose his adulthood and become an infant." (*Perspectives*, Ch. 20, #78, and V13, 20:4.198)

AD: Notice where he says there "once established." Because you can have it and lose it. And you can have it and lose it, and you can have it and lose it. But to establish it is a whole different ball game. Basically once it is established there's no coming or going, whether you're awake or asleep or anything.

S: So what are the implications of that point where you can say it's "once established"? Is that the final disassociation from identification with the ego?

AD: Yes. That definitely would be one of the characteristics about it. You will never regard yourself as body, although you know that you have a body, that you use a body, that it's a means. But you'll never identify with it.

And even if in the following incarnation you will yourself back into embodiment, it's only a short time before the recognition dawns on you who you were or what you really are. Because in the early years, the childhood years, the soul is basically preoccupied with the building up of the animate, the ego-complex. It's only as it reaches a certain level--I would say puberty--when it can turn its attention to other things. But until then it has to be preoccupied with building up the animate.

S: It seems that in order for that to be established, that kind of balance that we were reading about would have to be attained. But he also talks about that balance as being required in order for the insight to arise in the first place.

AD: Yes. You can see that you may have to spend a number of lives evolving your cognitive understanding--thinking, basically--your feeling, and your will. You can see it would take a number of lives. And then to bring them into balance so that you could bring about their fusion. And then, the end product of that fusion, he points out, that a quality arises that is utterly different from the willing, thinking, and feeling, which he calls insight. But the arising of this quality is being conveyed to us as the result of a process in time. But, on the other hand, it is atemporal: Insight per se is atemporal and belongs to the universality of life. So that when an individual life evolves sufficiently and fuses these three elements and insight arises, insight was always there. It isn't something that you created, but that you

create the necessary equilibrium among all the psychic functions so that it could naturally arise within you. You don't create it.

So, for instance, a person could say, "Well, I had a satori, and in that moment I experienced eternity." Now eternity, of course, is an irradiation. In a sense you're right; you can say, "I experienced eternity," but it was only for that moment.

Wouldn't you say that the insight would provide you with the sense of not being separate from other persons, and that the psychic being that you are provides for the distinction from other persons? So, for instance, this is one of the things I try to do when we work on Monday night and try to read a person's chart and you try to understand the psychic components that constitute that person. Let's say you do, let's say you understand something about the way I'm psychically constituted, and I understand something about the way you're psychically constituted. And I try to work in harmony with the way you are, and you try to work in harmony with the way I am. But if either of us had insight, we would see that life is one and the same, that it is a universal life. But we would see that these psychical components of the personality is what's providing the distinctions between us. So a sage acts in harmony with a person because he knows the basic constituents that make this person to be what he is and not anyone else, and he can work in harmony with them. He can also work against them, believe me. He could confront them if he wanted to.

I don't know if this analogy might help, but we could think of the ocean up north where you have a variety of different kinds of icebergs. Each having their own shape and form, but that ultimately they're all nothing but water. So we could say that the psychic being that you are is a precipitation from that life, and each precipitation is a form that's unique. And the person established in insight can see that water underlies the icebergs, regardless of their shape, form, color, and all that. But nonetheless they are what they are in the sense that this is "A" and this is not "B," that there are differences.

S: The way I'm conceiving of this universal life is as entirely unappropriateable, that it wouldn't be proper to describe the contact with that as one's inner being.

AD: Well, theoretically, that's correct; practically and methodically, it's wrong. Think of yourself as that universal life. Now, this is very peculiar, but the Christian Scientists or the New Thought people, they imagine or they conceive of that universal life as their personal property, and they very often unconsciously want something to happen by trying to employ this substratum that's at their disposal. But philosophically they're wrong. It isn't.

[2nd part of class, verbatim transcription from IT]

[Audio File 1984 0215c Begins]

RC: --the sense of inner and outer necessarily lapse, that the language of inner and outer has to be one step lower.

[short pause]

AD: One step lower than the--

RC: Than universal life.

AD: Yeah. Of course. But I think all of us recognize this much, that below the threshold of consciousness that we function with, there is a life that is universal in its understanding. We speak about it as the subconscious. And it takes care of digestion, it takes care of breathing, takes care of everything. And that some people do employ this to bring about certain effects. And they know that by-- You remember the example that was used about these young boys who had leukemia and they imagined the red fighting the white and the good guys were beating the bad guys and that the employment of this imagey-- imagery brought about an improvement in their condition, you remember that example. [RC assents] We could refer to that as employing this knowledge that-- through concentrating on certain images we can bring about certain effects or help to bring them about. [RC assents] So when you consciously employ that image, if you think of the cells fighting the bad guys, you know, and that they're winning, [RC simultaneously: Ok.] it's like you're employing that knowledge to bring about an improved condition in [RC simultaneously: Ok.] your own physical being.

RC: Now that starts to become meaningful to me in terms of how does one bring one's inner being in alignment with this [one word inaudible] It seems that that-- that employment of the mind that we're speaking about there, when a-- when applied to these revealed teachings, that-- that that's the process of bringing one's i-- that's the process of bringing one's inner being into alignment with the truth.

AD: Yeah.

RC: That it isn't something that was before that but something that is done through the exercise of this--

AD: Yeah, to gradually bring your inner being to act in conformity with the rules or the laws that govern-- govern. But remember, when we're speaking about the ultimate path then you're speaking about even dismissing that.

RC: Yeah, ok. I think that's what we're going on to next here.

PB [V13, 20:4.136 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy, #83, RC reading]: "Whenever I have used the term..."

RC: Huh?

AP: (Uh-hm/Yeah), well I-- are you going on to the next quote?

RC: Yeah.

AP: Oh, can I ask, the-- we distinguish between the mystical glimpses and the-- and glimpses of insight, right?

AD: Uh-hm.

AP: How-- how do you-- what is the distinction?

[12 second pause]

AD: Well, insight like we said is a very peculiar and unimaginable kind of knowledge, that is that life has intrinsic self-cognition. But a glimpse, you could have a glimpse of the soul and you could be filled with rapture, alright. This isn't necessarily knowledge that life has of its own being. In other words, glimpses

could have a variety or many different statements about-- in other words a person could be listening to some beautiful music and get a glimpse of beauty, alright. Again, this is a very modalized kind of understanding in comparison to the insight that life has into its own being.

[short pause]

AP: What makes you know that you have a glimpse of insight? What makes you lose it?

AD: There could be many things Anna. But basically, basically we're not in a-- in a condition to hold it.

AP: Why, because of habits?

AD: Habits, attachments, etc, all the things that make us what we are. And that's why very often they'll go into a-- a long protracted philosophic discipline to try to be independent from a certain way of functioning. I want to be a-- let's say try to be more detailed, more practical. [short pause] If-- if we had the experience of true devotion and adoration, alright, you would always be aware of the Overself. But we're not always in that state of mind, we're more often preoccupied with adoring ourselves, alright, so if you get a glimpse it doesn't cancel out the fact of this kind of self-love that we always have and it sooner or later reasserts itself. The question is, how long can you prevent it from asserting itself. You'll find out, it's kind of limited. Alright le-- let's read some more.

RC/S(?): Yeah.

RC: We've read this one before. But I've been inclined to put it in with these quotes concerning insight just because it seems to me-- well I guess it's the most exciting image to me for this state that he's talking about.

MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE OF "CENTER OF BEING" VS. PHILOSOPHIC EXPERIENCE NOT LIMITED TO A CENTER

PB [V13, 20:4.136 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy, #83, RC reading]: "Whenever I have [RC reads: I've] used the term "[the] centre of his being," I have referred to a state of meditation, to an experience which is felt at a certain stage. [RC adds: Because] The very art of meditation is a drawing inwards and the finer, the more delicate, the subtler this indrawing becomes, the closer it is to this [RC reads: the] central point of consciousness. But from the point of view of philosophy, meditation and its experiences are not the ultimate goal--although they may help in preparing one for that goal. In that goal there is no kind of centre to be felt nor any circumference either--one is without being localized anywhere with reference to the body, one is both in the body and [in] the Overself. There is then no contradiction between the two."

[22 second pause]

HS: [one word inaudible] so with reference to the body, how-- read it.

PB [V13, 20:4.136 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy, #83, RC rereads a part of]: "[But] from the point of view of philosophy... In that goal there is no kind of centre to be felt nor any circumference either--one is without being localized anywhere with reference to the body, one is both in the body and [in] the Overself."

[short pause]

HS: You're in the body and there's no reference to the body. Is that what that says?

RC: You're in the body--

HS: And the Overself, but there's no reference to the body in that you're like a center without a circumference?

RC: No.

HS: Yeah, what's the meaning there, could you just read it.

PB [V13, 20:4.136 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy, #83, RC rereads a part of]: "In that goal there is no kind of centre to be felt nor any circumference either--one is without being localized anywhere with reference to the body, one is both in the body and [in] the Overself."

HS: Ok, so there's neither center nor circumference. You're in the body and you're in the Overself and there's no necessary-- no reference to the body.

AH: Herbie I think the notion of center was in meditation, the first part where (he) says "I use centre-- I use the term "centre of being" in-- in case of-- of meditational experience." And then he says, from a philosophical-- from a philosophical perspective there's not only the lapse of that center in reference to the body but he goes on to describe it's both in the body and in the Overself simultaneously.

S: Yeah.

AH: I think the notion of center referred to the prior intuition.

HS (simultaneously): Right so listen, a kind of mystical attempt to seek the center of your being inside your body so to say, [student assents] inside your psychosomatic entity.

AH: Yeah, I thought-- I thought that's what that was describing.

HS: Ok, but now when you say it's your-- in the body and the Overself yet there's no reference to the body.

RC: No reference to being *localized* with respect to the body. It seem--

HS (simultaneously): To being localized in the body. So the body you're in would be what?

RC: Well it seemed there are two ways that you could localize your consciousness with reference to the body. You could either say it's in it or you can say that it's everywhere but in it.

HS: Go on.

RC: And he seems to be saying that neither of those is what's happening, that simultaneously you are in the body and in the Overself--

CDA: Couldn't that be an experience of the body in the soul? I mean that it's not anywhere else and you don't-- No?

AH: But the perspec-- the perspective of the experience is not from the body. [S: Right but--] Nor is it from the Overself.

RC: Well nor is it from *not* being in the body.

S: Uh-hm.

AH: Nor [HS simultaneously: Or not being the Overself.] is it from *not* being in the Overself.

RC: Ok. (RC laughs a bit)

S: Uh-hm.

S: Uh-oh.

KD: Remember when we talked about like meditation, you cancel out the World-Idea, but in philosophic-- the highest stage of philosophic realization would be that you don't cancel out the World-Idea, so that maybe this would refer to the Sage would be identified at the highest level, like at the Solar Lo-- Solar Logos and his body would be held as a thought. He-- if he's identified with that highest consciousness his body would be a thought just like any other-- any other object. He's not-- but he's not identified, he's not localized, he's not-- his attention hasn't been restricted to the circumference of the body.

AH: The body is-- the body is a thought.

KD: Just like the world would be seen as not other than a thought, not other than-- you know, not other than consciousness.

AH: And those thoughts are--

KD: So it would be of the same nature, you know, as all the other phenomena, all the other phenomena are seen as thoughts held-- thoughts held by the mind and that thought is constituted of consciousness and-- and consciousness is not another thought that-- his body would be in the same category.

AH: The various thought-forms but the perspective is of consciousness per se. I-- I don't-- is that what you were saying?

KD: I didn't-- I'm just saying [one/two words inaudible]

AH: There's various thought-forms, one of which is the body. But-- but--

KD: Well the world is experienced as not other than thought, and that thought is of the nature of consciousness. And as such the body would also be a thought held by the-- held by the World-Mind. And if his consciousness-- you know, if he's-- if he's identified at that level, like with the Solar Logos consciousness or whatever, which a Sage would be, then his body would be seen in the same light in it, so it wouldn't be-- his-- the circumference of his being would no longer be limited to the body, to the psychosomatic organism.

AH: There wouldn't be any circumference.

KD (simultaneously): I don't know.

AH: There wouldn't be any circumference.

KD (simultaneously): Yeah, I could be--

S (very faint): Yeah.

S: Well-- (S laughs a bit)

CDA: I think that's-- I-- that sounds pretty reasonable to me, or pretty reasonable. (bit of laughter)

KD: I'm just referring it back to the other [CDA simultaneously: No I--] interpretations that we give, [AH simultaneously: I--] like the World-- you know, the World-Idea in philosophic realization isn't denied like it is in mys-- you know, like in the stages of mediation you deny it.

HS: So in that the body is part of the World-Idea is-- you don't localize within the body--

KD (simultaneously): Well yeah, your body is part of the World-Idea.

S: Yeah.

KD: And our problem is, you know, we're just stuck to this one body. Right? (KD laughs a bit)

S (faint, possibly part of background): I don't follow.

KD: So a Sage, you know, has to-- [S simultaneously: Has to what?] maybe sees his body-- If he's identified with the-- with the consciousness of the Logos--

HS (simultaneously): With-- with a particular body--

KD: Well then his body becomes an object held by-- hel-- becomes another thought held by the World-Mind. Instead of *my* body, *my* ego and my thoughts, you know, it's-- it's-- he-- his attention is no longer reduced down to this one little tiny point. Maybe, I don't know.

AH: Would you mind reading (it/this) again please?

KD (simultaneously): But I don't believe. (KD laughing)

S: Yeah.

RC: The whole thing or just the second half?

AH/S(?) (simultaneously): The whole thing please.

HS: Ok.

PB [V13, 20:4.136 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy, #83, RC rereads]: "Whenever I have [RC reads: I've] used the term "[the] centre of his being," I have referred to a state of meditation, to an experience which is felt at a certain stage. [RC adds: Because] The very art of meditation is a drawing inwards and the finer, the more delicate, the subtler this indrawing becomes, the closer it is to the central point of consciousness. But from the point of view of philosophy, meditation and its experiences are not the ultimate goal--although they may help in preparing one for that goal. In that goal there is no kind of

centre to be felt nor any circumference either--one is without being localized anywhere with reference to the body, one is both in the body and [in] the Overself. There is then no contradiction between the two.”

KD: Yeah, consciousness is both, you know, the Overself and the body, it's-- you know, the body-- body is a thought and a thought is of the nature of consciousness.

AH: I think, I think, I think--

KD (simultaneously): It's not-- you know, it's no longer localized, there's no longer that separation between, you know, consciousness and the-- and the body or between con-- you know, me and the world and--

AH: As in the first case there's an experience of consciousness in meditation. That's from the point of view of the body. But the philosophic perspective is described as where consciousness and all possible phenomenon, all thought-forms are somehow a result of this [KD simultaneously: Yeah, the world-- yeah the--] bene-- benefic-- It's like, it's a much higher state of attainment [three/few words inaudible]

KD: 'Cause the World-Idea isn't shut out, [students assent] it's--

AH: Is that right Anthony? Are we on the right track?

PHILOSOPHIC EXPERIENCE COMBINES THE I AM AND THE WITNESS-I

AD (simultaneously): Well-- I think what you're saying is, well, (banned). I would try to interpret it a little-- use a little different terminology maybe to help. You know, when we sit to meditate and the person succeeds in intensifying his attention, it seems as though the concentration is like going to his center. You could think of all the radii of a circle converging to a point. And he says this is the experience that comes from meditation, alright. And, I would say that basically there what's happening is that the attention is being restricted or contracted or-- yeah, (contracting/contracted) to that point which we refer to as the-- that part of the soul which has been projected, in other words, the re-embodying soul. And that's one type of experience. There's another type of experience which goes further than that. And that takes you to the experience of your I AM, alright, which is beyond it. So we could say something like this, that when you constrict your attention to a point and you experience the re-embodying s-- the re-embodying soul is like the mystical experience, and we could call that consciousness just for the sake of discussion, alright? And then there's something beyond that which let's call the Mind, the individual I AM, alright. And if one goes beyond that and reaches that individual I AM, alright, there is no reference to any center. One doesn't experience the gathering of all his forces and plunging to a central point in his being. That's not the experience of the I AM. The I AM is an experience which is quite different. Now, the combination of these two, the experience of one's center of being and the experience of one as just being is what Plotinus referred to as the "We". And that's the philosophic experience, the experience of the I AM, which includes that part-- includes that part of the I AM, that power that the I AM has to project forth, alright. So when we say that the I AM projects forth a part of itself or a power from itself and this is the consciousness which gets embodied, that's one experience. The experience of the I AM independent of that is another. The two of them together is the experience of the soul as the "We" which contains both of them and that's the philosophic experience.

KD: Is the philosophic experience that you just described as-- another state of meditation or was that a state [S: Yeah.] of realization--

S: Uh-hm.

AD: That's more than meditation, that's meditation and philosophic understanding.

KD: Does it describe the state of the Sage?

S: Yeah.

AP: Well, that's what--

KD (simultaneously): When you said that there's both the I AM alone and the I AM that projects forth the world you mean, the--

AD (simultaneously): The Witness-I. Alright, [KD simultaneously: The--] if you-- if you want to use that term. The I AM, pure Mind, the individual unit Mind, alright, which projects forth from itself the Witness-I, alright. Now, the experience in meditation takes you into the center of your being, that's the Witness-I. The experience of what's beyond it is the I AM. The two of them together is the "We". The experience of the "We" is the philosophic understanding of both in the sense that on the one hand [S: Oh.] you could think of yourself as this body and on the other hand you could think of yourself as egoless being.

LR: So Anthony that would be this state he refers to when he says the attention is to the temp-- you have-- is to the temporal moment in the foreground and the permanent "I" in the background?

AD (simultaneously): Yes, yes, you could use that. [short pause] I'm s-- I had to bring in the way Plotinus would describe it because maybe that would clear up what he means by when he says "And the 'We'?" What are 'We'?" 'Cause that's a [KD simultaneously: I--] very difficult phrase in Plotinus to understand what is the nature of the "We". It's the I AM and the Witness-I together. It's the Witness-I that has the experience of the world and the World-Idea, alright. The I AM doesn't. The two of them together gives you the full (understanding).

S: Oh boy.

AD: I could have said it more precisely but, I haven't got the words right now.

KD (simultaneously): So, are-- are you saying that that was-- that that hold as a description not of the state of knowledge of a Sa-- of a Sage, not-- but that-- that that would be how-- what describes the-- the I-ness that he operates with? It's both the Overself and the Witness as projecting a-- a world?

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, the Overself would refer to the la-- the last part of the sentence. Would you read that [RG simultaneously: (Right/Yeah).] phrase again?

PB [V13, 20:4.136 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy, #83, RG rereads a part of]: "In that goal there is no kind of centre to be felt nor any circumference either--one is without being localized anywhere with reference to the body, one is both in the body and [in] the Overself. There is then no contradiction between the two."

AD: See there-- there's a simultaneously-- for the Sage there's the simultaneous functioning of being the Witness-I, alright, and of also being that undifferentiated consciousness.

KD: So it doesn't have anything to do with a World-Idea reception, it refers to the experience--

AD (simultaneously): Per se, per se. But you have to hold the two of them together to grasp what he's talking about. [student assents] That the Sage operates in this way, the two of them are together. The functioning of the Witness-I which can only be in relation to a World-Idea and the I AM which is not.

HS: Is this another descri-- is this a description of insight now?

S: Uh-hm.

S: What'd he say?

HS: Is it-- can you make a distinction between them?

AD: No, this-- this is more like an attempt to understand the way the-- the way he speaks about philosophic understanding, that it has to include both. Philosophic understanding is understanding of the-- let's say the functioning of insight which the Sage operates with and also the understanding, the-- the unders-- the understanding of the Witness-I and its role in the world, that these two(--/.) It is a way of speaking about the double knower.

HS: Go on.

AD: The soul as being the double knower, retaining intrinsic self-cognition and also discursive reasoning and sense-perception.

MB: Anthony, this is-- I don't know if you want to get into this but one thing that I noticed that is sort of a little bit paradoxical to me is that when he talks about the center of consciousness in this quote, or the center of the being, and you relate that to the Witness-I, it seems to me that as far as mysticism goes, that that experience has to do with the denial of the world or the World-Idea and yet you just said that the Witness-I only exists in relation to a World-Idea.

LR: Yeah that's the only way it can know.

MB: That's the only way it could deny it is because it's in relation to it? It just seemed somewhat paradoxical to me.

LR: But he's always separating himself from the world so it *is* in relation to the world, it's just he's emphasizing--

MB: Uh-huh. Yeah, so, in other words by--

LR: It's still an issue in other words.

MB: By trying to escape it, it just points out that it is still-- it's enmeshed in that world.

LR: Yeah.

BS: Does philosophic realization deny the World-Idea?

LR/S(?): (No/Yeah).

S: [couple words inaudible]

LR/S(?): Yes. What he was saying--

MB: No. I mean I don't think--

BS: Huh.

MB: That's not what I-- what-- what I was saying although Anthony did say that the I AM which relates to philosophic meditation is not directly related to the World-Idea. Is that right Anthony?

BS: Yeah but then he said the Witness-I is together.

AD (simultaneously): Yes. It is the Witness-I which has the experience of the World-Idea.

MB: But it's not that the I AM experience *denies* the World-Idea.

AD: No, we didn't say that.

MB: Ok.

AD: We just said that that-- that the soul in order to have experience of the-- of a world must project forth from itself a power which he r-- refer to as its projective power or the embodying soul. And it is that which has the-- the experience of-- of the world. Now, in order-- in order for you to get to the center of your being, to use his term, alright, one sits down and meditates and withdraws with-- let's say draws his consciousness within, inwardizes it and deepens it, alright, and it's in the very nature of the mystical experience to be a passing thing. It passes and the World-Idea resumes and comes back. [MB assents] And it'll keep coming back. [MB assents] And you can't stop it from coming back as long as you consider yourself to be a Witness-I and identified with that. So, it's paradoxical but that's-- that's the statement of the truth even for Plotinus. But the experience of the I AM, alright, shows it to be a egoless being, a being that, so to speak, is and could be without reference to an ego. [MB assents] And it is the combination of these two which will give us true philosophic perspective and understanding. There's no real contradiction here. Maybe paradoxical, yes.

JfL: When the mystic has-- well [one/two words inaudible] not that he can hold that nature of that position but, I had the impression that the mystic has as his goal the experience which I believe was sort of an inside contact of I think like with his own divine principle, with the soul per se.

AD: Yeah.

JfL: 'Cause it sounded as though-- I thought you were taking the mystic path as being what he finally gets to as his Witness. But he-- Ok, doesn't look like [one/two words inaudible]

AD: No, it's just that the mystic has to go further. Most of them stop there. And that's why their efforts are frustrated. Because how-- you can have a glimpse for an hour, a day, a month. I knew someone to have it for six months but it went. And then he was forced to recognize that the world *was* part of that functioning and he couldn't get rid of it that way. And again and again PB brings out that the only way to really transcend the World-Idea is by absorbing it, and you absorb it through philosophic understanding.

But philosophic understanding would require that you understand the soul in this peculiar way. On the one hand, that it is egoless being and on the other hand, [HS: Yeah.] this egoless being can restrict itself or employ one of its powers to have experience of a world. If you-- if you remember all those passages in Plotinus about the "We", if you read them in the light of what I just said you would see that they're very-- they will clear up automatically.

[short pause]

S: Yeah.

AD: Let's read another, (Dick/Vic).

PURE CONSCIOUSNESS UNCOLORED BY EGO

PB [V13, 20:4.188 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy?, #90, RG reading]: "Where we speak either metaphysically or meditatively of the experience of pure consciousness, we mean consciousness uncoloured by the ego."

KD: Could you just read that again?

PB [V13, 20:4.188 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy?, #90, RG rereads]: "Where we speak either metaphysically or meditatively of the experience of pure consciousness, we mean consciousness uncoloured by the ego."

[28¼ second pause]

HS: That's like-- When you speak-- when he says something like that, pure consciousness there, is that-- is that what you were calling before the one life? Is this the same phrase now? The sa-- is this meaning-- trying to mean the same thing now?

AD: I don't think so, uh--

[short pause]

S: Uh-hm.

AD: I think the thrust is in another direction now. [student assents] [short pause] If I were to speak to you and say that this person had such and such an experience where he managed to dismiss all thought of every kind and experience himself as consciousness, that is, it would be a kind of self-recognition, alright, [HS: Right.] he's saying well, you're coming from the point of view of actual meditational experience, alright. Now, let's forget the mystic and let's say I just explain this to you. Ok? I'm coming from the point of view of metaphysics.

[short pause]

LR: Would you repeat that Anthony, I didn't follow.

AD: Someone say something?

LR: Yes, could you repeat please?

[short pause]

AD: This is just a story, a fairytale, to use Tim's expression. I just come out of a deep meditation and I experience myself to be pure consciousness, I had dismissed all thought, and in the dismissal of all thought what remains is this immaterial unobjectifiable consciousness that I am. And I talk to you and I tell you about it, alright. Now, I'm coming to you from a direct experience of it and I'm explaining it to you or trying to explain it to you. And, you would say well, you got that from meditation. Now, another person comes along and repeats identically what I have said but he hasn't had the experience. But he knows theoretically what it should be all about. He's coming from a metaphysical point of view. In other words, he's coming from the point of view of a theoretical understanding of what it should be like and the other person is coming from a practical experience of what it should be like. But, they should both be accurate in the sense that this is what you really are like, this pure consciousness.

LR: Now that pure consciousness, could that refer to either of the two--

AD: No, it would generally refer to your Witness-I.

LR: It refers to the Witness.

AD: Yeah, generally refers to Witness.

LR: Ok.

S (faint, possibly part of background): Right.

[short pause]

AD: You remember the sentence where PB says there's awareness of awareness and then there's pure awareness? [Note: See PB, *Notebooks*, V4, Part 1, 4:1.128 & *Persp.*, Ch. 4, #8.]

LR: Yes.

AD: Well when you have the experience of the Witness-I you won't be able to distinguish that it's an awareness of awareness. At-- at the time that you're having it you're going to think that it's just pure consciousness. It's going to take the experience of the I AM to recognize that it wasn't that pure, that it was an awareness *of* awareness. It's only when you're in the I AM that you are just the awareness. [short pause] Pat I gotta apologize, I'll leave. (laughter)

S: Don't leave.

AD (simultaneously): Stop writing.

RG: Could you go over that idea again Anthony?

AD: Again?

RG: I--

AD: What do you think I am, a parrot? (bit of laughter, student words) One is basically coming from a point of view of the practioneer-- prac-- practitioner. And the other's coming from the point of view of the theoretician. And you [RG simultaneously: But--] remember the-- like the Buddha pointed out, he

said, the-- the combination of these two is ideal--the man who understands this and the man who experiences it. But anyway, read it again Dickie. I might've--

RG: Good.

PB [V13, 20:4.188 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy?, #90, RG rereads]: "Where we speak either metaphysically or meditatively of the experience of pure consciousness, we mean consciousness uncoloured by the ego."

[short pause]

AD: Yeah, I think we got off the point, didn't we?

S: It's alright.

[short pause]

AD: You remember we spoke about the psychosomatic organism and we said it was constituted of many different psychic functions--the intellect or communicator and evaluation function, etc, this that and the other thing. And one thing that we left out which we should have also heavily stressed was that it also has an emotive content which is very very powerful. Now--

HS: Emotive or motive, what?

AD: E-motive. E-motional. You know what that is Herbie?

S: Yeah. (laughter, student words)

AD: That'll override the intellect almost any time. At any rate, the experience of yourself as pure consciousness has to be completely removed or let's say that in no way is the functioning of the emotive elements in the psyche or the psychic functions themselves operative at the time that you experience the glimpse. If they are in any way operative, no matter how slight they are, they will immediately obscure the glimpse to some extent. So, if there's an element of emotion involved while you're having the glimpse, alright, you're not going to have it in its purity, it's going to be colored. It's going to be contaminated, polluted, alright, this emotional element. If there are any lingering, let's say, thoughts, and there really can't be any but, if let's say you've entered into the glimpse and there was a very strong thought that you were holding at that time, that too might color the glimpse. So, that's what the quote is really and not what we went in.

MB: So he uses the term ego here to cover any trace of the psychosomatic organism.

AD (simultaneously): Functioning, yeah. But don't [MB simultaneously: That's a--] forget the emotive because that's really more often the intruder, [student assents] you know, the emotive is more often an intruder than even the psychic functions. Because it's much more primitive. To still that you really have to go down into your old-- into the depths of the psyche to still that. In comparison it's much easier to still the intellectual functioning.

[students assents]

S: Anthony, are you speaking of the higher feelings are absent then or was--

AD: I can't hear you.

S: The higher feelings, what we usually think of in terms of the glimpses, emotional feelings or the ecstasy that-- you're speaking of that being absent in this case of experiencing pure consciousness?

AD: The higher feelings do not come from that realm.

S: So when you say emotive you're talking about the lower [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): The basic, yeah, the basic emotivity [one/two inaudible student words simultaneous with AD] that's involved in all protoplasmic functioning. You want to keep it right in the psychosomatic because that's what e-mote means, it's dealing with the psychosomatic. Whereas the higher feelings could be functioning without the psychosomatic.

RC: Just to elaborate then, you'd be saying that the presence of those higher feelings in no way gives a color to consciousness that's other than pure.

AD: Yeah, very often they'll even invade the psychosomatic, the higher feelings, they'll come down *into* the psychosomatic. And then you'll feel like you're exalted above all beings, etc etc. (bit of laughter)

DR: Yeah. That's the way it goes.

AD: Let's try another one Dickie.

INTUITION AND INSIGHT

PB [V13, 20:4.150 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy?, #84, RG reading]: "Philosophy seeks not only to know what is best in life but also to love it. It wants to feel as well as think. The truth, being above the common forms of these functions, can be grasped only by a higher function that includes, fuses, and transcends them at one and the same time--insight. In human life at its present stage of development, the nearest activity to this one is the activity of intuition. From its uncommon and infrequent visitations, we may gather some faint echo of what this wonderful insight is."

[18 second pause]

KD: Could you read it again a little slower?

PB [V13, 20:4.150 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy?, #84, RG rereads]: "Philosophy seeks not only to know what is best in life but also to love it. It wants to feel as well as think. The truth, being above the common forms of these functions, can be grasped only by a higher function that includes, fuses, and transcends them at one and the same time--insight. In human life at its present stage of development, the nearest activity to this one is the activity of intuition. From its uncommon and infrequent visitations, we may gather some faint echo of what this wonderful insight is."

ME: Would you like to comment on the difference between intuition and insight?

[short pause]

RG: No not really.

[12¼ second pause]

RC: We had a quote on that.

KD: Yeah.

PB [V13, 20:4.152 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What Is Philosophy?, #79, RC reading]: ““Intuition” [RC: In quotes.] had come to lose its pristine value for me. I cast about for a better one and found it in “insight.” This term I assigned to the highest knowing-faculty of sages and was thus able to treat the term “intuition” [RC aside: Is that page 30? Oh. “...was thus able to treat the term “intuition”] as something inferior which was sometimes amazingly correct but not infrequently hopelessly wrong in its guidance, reports, or premonition. I further endeavoured to state what the old Asiatic sages had long ago stated, that it was possible to unfold a faculty of direct insight into the nature of the Overself, into the supreme reality of the universe, [RC adds: and] that this was the highest kind of intuition possible to man, and that it did not concern itself with lesser revelations, such as giving the name of a horse likely to win tomorrow’s race, a revelation which the kind of intuition we hear so much about is sometimes able to do.”

[short pause]

ME: Yeah, yeah, when you read this last week that-- it was (“I’ll settle”). It seems-- would you say then that the individual mind, let’s say, the lower insight, the insight not on the highest, individual mind would be functioning, I mean is that what makes it different, is it the object of the intuition or-- Yeah, I guess that would be, is it the object that the-- it sort of seems like what he was saying. Or it’s actually the-- I mean [one/two words inaudible] about it, the knowing, willing, and feeling, right, and you have this other one, intuition. [RC assents] Would you still say that the individual mind would be functioning when you get even lower intuition?

[short pause]

RC: I would. I guess I’d speculate that the individual mind would have to be involved in both cases. But that in the case of what he’s speaking of as the insight of-- all specific content would be embraced and permeated by--

[Audio File 1984 0215c Ends]

[Audio File 1984 0215d Begins]

RC: --all its potential, that he could come to know the whole of heaven. And the other one corrected him or at least qualified that remark by saying that-- that that was true but that he would first have to make contact with the original Mind. And it seems that he’s using the-- the intuition for more reference to a specific content of knowledge. Whereas the insight seems to provide the-- [short pause] the illuminative nature of the Mind itself as also being revealed.

[15¼ second pause]

AH: I don’t-- I don’t know how or the reasoning for positing the individual mind in both cases. It seems more clearly intuition somehow invo-- involves the psychic functions. But, insight is described as a consequence of the fusion of that and I-- in what sense are you using individual mind as the receptacle for insight?

RC: In that a-- a balance, a unique balance of this individual mind is required in order for it to arise in this life stream. Granted that in the-- in the universal life it's always present. Nonetheless if you speak of it as the culmination of some being's development, then it-- I can't conceive it as a cancellation of that individuality.

AH: Would you-- would you speak of it as the-- a requirement would be that those psychic functions would be still? They would be fused? But, you still would have to speak of a particular Sage's insight.

[short pause]

HS: Let me go back. When you speak of intuition, what-- what do you mean? Like what-- intuition is a kind of-- like what's intuition? How about that? When you say intuition, what do-- what do you indi-- what are you trying to indicate?

S: Exaltation.

HS: Something like that.

JfL: Well, I would say that in intuition the light comes in but what it's going to light up is the ideas that you have in your psyche. And the best you can get is, whether correct or not, a formulation *of* that, whereas in insight--

HS: Wait, wait, wait. Oh you mean some-- something enters your think-- your conscious-- so-called conscious mind from-- from inside your psyche? And-- is that what you said?

JfL: No, I don't think the-- I think in an intuition-- remember we used that idea of the circle of who you are and then you get the light that passes through, using that idea. And then in an intuition it would seem that-- that what you're presented with is another formulation or-- illuminating the contents of your-- of your psyche, of your-- of your experiences. You know it's kind of like has a content to it that insight-- that I don't think of when I think of insight.

HS: Well, I'm confused as to what intuition is now, you know, it's kind of like you keep repeating a word and--

PD: Well it seems to be some specific [one/two inaudible HS words simultaneous with PD] bit of knowledge, from what was said so far, specific answer to a problem or question.

HS: But-- but it's morphed by what, by coming from inside your mind, so to say?

PD: Well it seems to have-- I mean, maybe it can come from perceptions or, you know, internal feelings, so-- *Where* it comes from may not be that important, but it seems to be a specific bit of knowledge that is--

HS: That appears in your mind that you don't know how it got there? I-- is that what--

AB: What if we said [one/two words inaudible]

PD (simultaneously): Well, most people don't know how anything got there.

HS: Yeah, yeah, I know. (laughter) So what's the special mark of intuition?

PD (simultaneously): [couple words inaudible] the intuition.

HS: Yeah so what? [S simultaneously: What you said (couple/three words inaudible)] What marks intuition from perception say?

AB: What if you said it was a revelation of something inside or in relationship to the mind but which was from outside the mind? Like Jeff was saying, something comes in and lights up.

S: I don't know.

HS: It's from outside the mind.

CDA: Well--

AB: And therefore it's incomplete or it's not always reliable.

HS: So it's something that appears in the mind from outside the mind.

AB: Something from outside the mind lights up something within the mind.

[student assents]

CDA: It's not that--

KD (simultaneously): [few words inaudible]

PD (simultaneously): But why take that approach? In-- an intuition [S simultaneously: It's insight.] seems to be a specific piece of information given to me, given [AB assents] to consciousness. [AB(?) assents] And it seems to have a pertinence, a specific pertinence to a specific state of questioning or s-- or problem that you as an individual person it exists in relation to.

HS: Ok and when it-- intuition is-- when it's right it could-- it's-- it's right, it's just you don't know what it's right about, I mean--

PD: Well it seems to be right with respect to the problem, it'll give you some guidance to a specific problem or an answer to a specific question.

AH: Or it seems to be wrong about a specific--

PD: Yeah. But a-- when it's wrong we generally say it wasn't an intuition, that's the problem.

RG: Go ahead.

JfL: Yeah, uh-hm.

PD (simultaneously): But, you know-- [couple inaudible student words simultaneous with PD] Whereas insight doesn't seem to have a reference (to/or) any specific experience, specific problem, specific content of knowledge.

HS: Ok, yeah, you do point out it's intuition which is the-- the closest thing to insight or the one thing perhaps you can get a [RC assents] taste or a smell of it, I mean--

RC: Yeah. He even called [HS simultaneously: Yeah.] insight the highest form of intuition.

HS: Oh ok, yeah.

LR: Yeah.

RC (simultaneously): Right.

LR: You know--

BS (simultaneously): So we--

LR: It's alright.

S (simultaneously): Go ahead.

LR: (That's/This is) just a thought, I don't know what intuition is either Herbert, but you know when Anthony was talking about the fusion of knowing, willing, and feeling delivering insight? Well it seems like intuition could be like a deliverance *from* knowing, willing or feeling, not as they are fused but couldn't intuition be--

RC (almost to himself): That's interesting.

LR: I mean it seems like you can have an intuition in the felt mode, in the [RG assents] willed mode, [HS: A knowing mode.] and it would be specifically modalized like that. [RG assents] I mean that's-- that's usually what I think of when I think of intuition. But, then he says it-- you know, insight has to be-- arrives only out of the fusion of those, the triple mode.

HS: Could--

LR: So in one sense one's coming from a definitely modalized awareness in our other terminology.

TS: (Go on) experience.

AH: Herb, [couple inaudible HS words simultaneous with AH] are you-- were you asking more for like-- like a technical description of what-- what's going on? I would be interested in that 'cause I've never understood the-- they talk about a light coming in and it bounces around and-- (laughter)

HS: Inside the-- inside the mind you mean, picks up a content and then you-- then you have an intuition, yeah.

AH (simultaneously): Something from-- something from outside the mind comes inside the mind, I thought everything was inside the mind. I'm really confused, I-- I had never understood it either. But maybe now is not the time to--

HS: Well-- well just-- I mean just in terms of the common-- like you have an intuition, what does that mean? You know, you're walking around, you have an intuition, go here, you know, [couple inaudible student words simultaneous with HS] some guy has an intuition about numbers. (students assent, bit of laughter)

AH: It's like a hunch, right?

HS: Yeah, a hunch. I mean what does that mean now, I mean--

CDA: Does it mean that-- I mean as long as we're speculating. Well it means that--

BS (simultaneously): Well it's a certain aspect-- Is someone still talking? (laughter) I really can't hear Carol, if you're gonna talk I need (to hear you).

CDA (simultaneously): Well I haven't said anything yet!! (laughter)

S (amidst laughter): If you have an intuition [one word inaudible] in his (faith/face).

BS: Didn't you say something?

CDA: I was about to.

CDA/S(?): Yeah so [BS simultaneously: See?] then intuition (is) about [S simultaneously: There it is.] something. (laughter)

BS (amidst laughter): Well I was about to also.

S: You should've just started talking.

BS: When you get [half/one word inaudible]

CDA (simultaneously): I was just going to respond to Herbie, [BS: Ok, right after the class.] saying [one/two words inaudible] (laughter) intuition, you know. [BS simultaneously: (On Friday) I thought he said some--] That's what he said, what does that mean. Um--

S: Oh. (bit of laughter)

S: What?

CDA: I-- (laughter, student words) Never mind, never mind, it's obviously not, you know, so, [S simultaneously: Each student--] I couldn't take your--

RG: Bert has to talk, go ahead.

CDA (simultaneously): This is a sign.

S: He'll deny that you--

BS (simultaneously): What? No I don't have--

RG: No say s-- [CDA simultaneously: Go ahead Bert.] go ahead, you got the floor. Didn't you also Bert--

S (simultaneously): Oh yeah, he'll talk.

RG: Go ahead Bert.

BS (simultaneously): Oh.

S: Stand up.

S: (Well) [possibly: I--] (laughter, student words)

BS: Gee, what was I going to say?

S: Time's up.

S: That would be--

RG (simultaneously): Time's up. (bit of laughter)

BS: I'm getting the impression that some-- [S: Apparently.] some aspect of intuition anyway is similar to the notion we once spoke of of the intellect gathering up a certain amount of facts. And that would be within the ego structure itself. So, intuition could be right or wrong but it could only deal with the facts that the ego has gathered up for itself. Is that what's--

S: [couple/three words inaudible]

AH (simultaneously): But how can it pick-- [S simultaneously: Then it's not intuition.] how can it pick the right horse?

BS: What?

AH: How can it pick the right horse? [RG simultaneously: That's right.] That's not part of the ego.

AB: Yeah because it knows which horses are running.

CDA: We're degenerating.

S: Absolutely.

HS: No.

BS: I thought it's already amassed that.

HS: But a certain kind-- a specific knowledge could come into the-- what, into the intellection of the ego, you know, the low-- what you speak of the lower? It's a specific knowledge from some place in the psyche that appears into the conscious ego?

BS (simultaneously): You just might not have all the facts.

RG: But you know, isn't the reason that intuition is closest is because it does seem functionally to deliver something outside of the ego's ken. And that's why you call it intuition, that the e--

PD (simultaneously): So it's a clear spot in the psyche which the ego hasn't grabbed hold of yet.

S: Yeah.

RG: Yeah.

AH: I'm sorry?

RG (simultaneously): But it that-- it seems functionally different from other-- other psychic functions [BS assents] in that there's seems to be a controlled ego function in them. But intuition can work through as Linda said any of them it seems, but by itself doesn't seem to have a conscious functioning that the other functions have. Seems to be given.

AB (simultaneously): It's more revelatory.

RG: Yeah, it seems revelatory.

AB: The others have a process.

BS: Then what does it mean it's more revelatory and how could we speak of it sometimes being correct and sometimes incorrect and it has to be-- intuition has to be checked out by reason, we've heard these kind of quotes, right, I mean--

LR (simultaneously): Well, it's the content that has to be checked [RG simultaneously: Checked out.] out, if it's revelatory of some content--

BS: Then it is connected to--

LR: --the content has-- rea-- it seems like reason has to be applied to whatever that content is to see if that's true.

BS: Then intuition is always conjoined to a content.

LR: [couple/few words inaudible]

KD (simultaneously): Now I thought that-- I thought [RG simultaneously: Yeah.] the experience of intuition was outside the--

BS (simultaneously): And if it isn't conjoined to a content--

KD: Go ahead. Go ahead.

BS (simultaneously): --then he's calling it something else?

KD: I thought the experience of [LR simultaneously: What do you mean Bert?] intuition itself was outside the psyche, [BS simultaneously: Well isn't it the soul (one/two words inaudible)] was outside the psychos-- I thought the *experience* of intuition itself was outside the psychosomatic organism. But then what happens is you're immediately back in it, within all the--

RG (simultaneously): Where did you get that from Kathleen?

KD: I'm just repeating a class we-- that we had ages ago on intuition.

BS: Too late.

KD: So that once you're back in the psyche, then you-- there's the possibility of misinterpretation. Just a repeat.

BS (simultaneously): [couple words inaudible]

S: I remember.

KD (simultaneously): [one word inaudible]

BS: But if it's outside--

KD (simultaneously): Yeah, you remember-- [S simultaneously: I do.] she remembers it too. (some laughter)

S: Just remember it.

KD (simultaneously): (I don't.) I'm just recalling a [one/two words inaudible] (some laughter)

LR (simultaneously): Where are you when you're not in the psyche?

AD: It's not [KD simultaneously: That would be--] outside the psyche, it's outside your psychosomatic organism.

KD: Right, [CDA simultaneously: Well that's what she meant, you know (couple/three words inaudible)] outside-- well-- that's what I meant, outside that box. (laughter) Outside that box that we drew that-- that contained all-- all the facts that-- there was a line coming in off the left and it said "light of reasoning" (laughter) and the experience of intuition was the experience of that light of reasoning and at that moment you were not in that box. (laughter) And that-- and that after the experience you're back in the box.

LR: Now you know Herbert what it means. (laughter, student words)

AD: The way Bert stated it was the right way Andrew. The way you stated it was wrong. (laughter) Because the intu--

AH (amidst laughter): I can't dial into [possibly another student: an intuition].

HS: Ok, ok.

S (simultaneously): You're right.

RG: You're right Bert.

KD: See I wouldn't really know.

AD (simultaneously): It is the intellect that was manipulating the modifications, the memorized modifications of bodily functioning, alright, not the mind coming into the mind. I'm using language as precisely as I can. If we speak about the intellect as that biological communication that can take place within the psychosomatic organism, and which has a propensity to retain its experiences, organize them, classify them, etc, alright, that's intellect. That's intellect the way, you know, it is used in contemporary language. And that the intellect could be preoccupied with a certain problem which it cannot under-- let's say resolve. And then we speak about some intuition arising within and pointing out to the intellect to combine things in such and such a way and a discovery is made, or some invention comes forth, alright. But, we could say this much. We can say that intuition deals with and is within the domain of relativities. I think we feel pretty sure about that, ok? [student assents] It's always *of* something. I get an intuition to do something or I get an intuition of an idea, alright, or an intuition (of/is) the proper feeling that should be the underlie of a certain experience. The intuitions *are of some thing*. So they're within [student assents] the domain of relativity. Let's see, if we go a little further then. It seems that the intuition has to do with the coordination between the cosmic circuit or the World-Idea and the psyche's-- the individual psyche's response to it. Whether it is correct or incorrect is only something that reason will be able to demonstrate. You see what I'm saying?

S: Yeah.

S: Yeah.

AD: You have the World-Idea with all its-- with the entire potential of all circumstances, situation, events, bits and pieces of knowledge that can be brought together or not. And, you have a *reasoning about* that World-Idea on the part of an individual. And intuition very often attempts to coordinate the state of knowledge within the individual and the so-called World-Idea. It tries to coordinate them. And this coordination-- now notice the distinction, there's like two different levels or frames of work-- framework being used. On the one hand, the cosmic Idea. On the other hand, the individual's relationship to that Idea and how he understands it. And up to a certain point the intellect is adequate but then after that point intuition has to be brought in to get deeper and deeper into this understanding of the World-Idea. So intuition will always be about relative-- about relativities, something in the domain of the relative, alright, the coordination of the knowledge that the individual soul or the Witness-I has concerning something in the World-Idea. But insight is *not* that kind of a knowledge, a knowledge of relativity. Insight would be the soul understanding *itself*. It's not something outside and-- or external to itself like the World-Idea, which is imposed upon it, but soul understanding its own nature. That will be insight, so you can see that they're qualitatively *different*, alright. Insight is reality understanding itself. And if we say it's reality, it's axiomatic to say that it would understand itself--in a way that's peculiar to itself and we can't imagine. But it would, being of a kn-- a knowing-- or being a reality it would also have to include *knowing* itself. So, that's where I use the phrase "knowing [S: Right.] knows itself", and then I restrict it, "knowing knowing", alright. But intuition, as you can see, it's like the soul now externalizing, alright, trying to understand something which is *not* itself, the World-Idea. And the correlation and coordination, alright, between these two is where intuitive-- intuition is functioning.

ME: The-- this-- the power of the-- let's say the faculty of intuition, would you use that kind of terminology-- I mean it seems to be-- is it a-- let's say, a faculty found within the ego or would you say it's particularly different?

AD (simultaneously): I think it works both ways, Michael. On the one hand it's a faculty we develop of learning after we have exhausted all our efforts to understand something to be able to keep still so that the World-Idea *itself* could try to influence us or *suggest* something. So that given the appropriate opportunity for instance when we-- you know, like in the study of some of these charts where a person has exhausted every possible resource to understand something and then he tries to give up the problem and an auspicious occasion, a good aspect shows up and it's like the universe is trying to inform its-- *him*. Those aspects are of the world, I mean they're planets aspecting each other, they're trying to inform that person. So you can see that this would be in the domain of relativity, (alright/right), alright, whereas the other is not at all. So, in the case like for instance, we speak about Einstein had the septile going to his Saturn Mercury and the intuition came in of relativity, alright. It was like the World-Idea was trying to inform the soul something about the way *it works*. And that receptivity, alright, to *receive* it and then to work it out, you know, with his-- with the equipment that his ego had.

ME: The-- and-- and reason let's say that PB and you say is that-- you know, they'll say insight is the highest form of intuition, is that--

AD: I don't think it's intuition.

ME (simultaneously): You're going to say it's different, ok.

AD: I don't think it's intuition at all. I think that in the very-- in our language, in English, the highest form of knowledge was always considered by philosophers to be intuition, alright. And so even when Plato speaks about intuiting the Ideas, it-- you think that he's referring to intuition. But like in the *Seventh Epistle* he says very clearly, he says this flame that-- this spark that bursts into a flame and consumes itself, alright, he's speaking there about insight, not intuition. And he even makes the remark "I have never written about it, nor will I ever write about it." Alright. Because it's a faculty that's almost impossible to understand, this-- the nature of insight. But you see the distinction here? Insight is like reality understanding itself, and when I say reality here I mean your soul understanding itself. It-- it is a knowing knowing, alright. But then when we speak about intuition we're speaking about how the soul is relating to the World-Idea and trying to understand it. So that there would be sense-intuition, alright, and then there would be intuition of one's own self or knowing that I am, the way the Buddhists speak about it. And then they speak about intuitive knowing, which means a direct access or a kind of intuition is given to the individual to know what the nature of that object is. So you can see intuition will always be about the domain of relativity. And if you go through all the philosophers, Hegel, Aristotle or whoever, the higher form of knowing, insight, outside of Plotinus and Plato I don't think you're going to find indications that there is such a thing. But even when Hegel uses intuition it's still in the domain of relativity.

KD: Is intuition really a faculty?

AD (simultaneously): Goodie, goodie.

[someone rings bell]

AS: Ah. (laughter, student words)

S: [one word inaudible] ring the bell?

AS: Yes.

[few seconds of faint background student talking]

AD: Time's up. Goodnight.

[students getting up to leave, faint background student talking]

AP: Goodnight.

[Audio File 1984 0215d Ends]