

CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
June 20, 1984
PB PARAS; PHILOSOPHY; SAGE

TOPIC: PB Paras

SUBJECT: Philosophy

SUBSUBJECTS: Sage, Nirvikalpa vs. Sahaja, Serpent's Path, Mentalism, Soul

CONTENTS:

DISTINGUISHING EGO, WORLD, AND CONSCIOUSNESS

NIRVIKALPA VS. SAHAJA

NIRVIKALPA IS NOT THE ULTIMATE TRUTH, REASONING UPON THE WORLD-IDEA HAS TO BE BROUGHT IN

SERPENT'S PATH; PHILOSOPHIC YOGA LEADS TO SAHAJA; MORE ON NIRVIKALPA AND SAHAJA

GETTING ESTABLISHED IN SAHAJA; PB'S ABILITY TO KNOW THE KEY POINTS OF AN ARTICLE WITHOUT HAVING TO READ IT

THREE DEGREES OF UNDERSTANDING MENTALISM

SOUL'S DUAL NATURE

BOOKS / JOURNALS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives* [Persp.].
- Paul Brunton, *The Hidden Teaching Beyond Yoga*
- Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*
- Swami Vidyanarany, *The Jivanmukti-Viveka: Or the Path to Liberation in This Life*
- Sir Edwin Arnold, *The Light of Asia*
- "Philosophy East and West: A Quarterly of Comparative Philosophy"
- Bertrand Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy*
- Maharishi Valmiki, *Yoga Vasistha*
- Gaudapada, *Gaudapada Karika*

NOTES:

- Anecdotes about PB highlighted in yellow.
- This class is related thematically to WG Classes 1984 0802, 0808, 0822, and 0919.
- Earlier transcript versions exist.

TRANSCRIBED from Audio Cassette Tapes 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, alters Subheads to make more accurate, fixes/completes Book List, corrects typos/errors, adds new notes within transcript, reformats to accord with new conventions. **Readable edited transcript – V14.1r.**

AUDIO FILES: 1984 0620a, 1984 0620b. [Note: “Tape” and “Side” refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

1984 06/20 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Philosophy; Sage
Readable Edited Transcript

DISTINGUISHING EGO, WORLD, AND CONSCIOUSNESS

[Audio File 1984 0620a Begins]

RC: . . . From last week, basically three questions: what's the ego, what do you mean by the world, and what do you mean by consciousness? How do you distinguish those three? I was not able to find any quotes in PB that deal with all three of them at once . . . There are three things that we assume to be distinct: the ego, the world and consciousness . . . I'll read a few things from other sections that we haven't dealt with for awhile to see if we can get a discussion going. So in terms of the world: . . .

(RC reading PB.)

PB: "It is not possible for sincere, scrupulous thinking to admit, and never possible to prove, the existence of a world outside of, and separate from, its consciousness. The faith by which we all conventionally grant such existence is mere superstition." (21.2.104 & Persp. p. 287)

(Student clarification and quote reread.)

RC: Part of the problem I've had in going through these quotes, is it seems hard to compare two things that I don't think very many of us actually believe. On the one hand we've talked about the ego being an idea, and I don't think very many people believe that, and now we're going to try to talk about the world as an idea, and I think maybe even fewer people are going to believe that.

LDm: What do you mean by believe--feel?

RC: By belief, I mean have some kind of internal meaning or relationship to conceiving of it that way--to say that on the one hand the ego is an idea and on the other hand the world is an idea, then they don't differ by being ideas, but what is it about one idea that makes it so different than the other idea?

AH: I think it's an interesting play on the notion of belief, because the quote seems to suggest that there's a compulsion to believe otherwise, almost as if the contrary belief, the belief that it's a cause of error, is compulsive and innate. It's not belief that will change belief, but reason.

RC: That's a good point.

DB: In the previous discussion the notion of the world, this whole world, in the way it's used means something that stands outside and apart. That's how it's differentiated in thought from ourselves, "Well, we have ourself here, and then there's the world." The world that stands apart from myself, my ego, and that's what we mean when we differentiate the two, and in the quote he says 'scrupulous' thinking . . . But yet the very fact of the world being differentiated and called something . . . that it's out there independent from my own self-being and whatever . . .

AD: Is it independent of your knowing?!

DB: Oh no!

AD: Well, then how could you speak of it as being “out there”?

(Student discussion follows about subject/object split and the PB para. The most pertinent of the student comments follow.)

(VM/DB/VM/AB/VM/AH/RC/AB/= 4 min.)

RC: He kept saying in those ego quotes, that the fundamental and root thing that he was trying to hit at was that notion of separateness. But would you say that same act by which my ego establishes its separateness, is the same act that creates the world?

VM: Yes, the body and the world arise together, and I want to use the word body in a very wide sense--subtle body, physical body--and say that the body and the world or the ego and the world arise together as the same functions of the mind.

RC: I could go along with the ego and its world.

VM: But what other world is there? I thought that was part of that quote, not to assume that there's some world outside of the one known in thought.

(RC/BS/)

VM: I don't see why you can't say that the ego and the world arise together under any circumstances. Try to conceive of a world independent of some form of embodied subjectivity. How can you do that? . . . Does the embodied subjectivity or sense of egoity or personality somehow arise simultaneously with the world? I'm trying to say that it does.

(AH/RC/VM/LdS/RC/Quote reread/AH/LdS/JG/LdS/RC/JG/= approx. 4 min.)

VM: There's no doubt that you don't know anything outside of your consciousness, but does the world exist independent of consciousness and somehow work its way into the consciousness and account for the nature of the world?

JG: That would be another step from the quote.

VM: By definition, you can't know anything outside of consciousness, because if you were going to KNOW it, then it would have to be within consciousness . . . Nonetheless, a lot of us have a kind of gut feeling, that independent of my knowing, an object exists in space-time, and somehow it gets into my mind, or impinges on my senses, and gives rise to the world I know.

(JG/LdS/LR/LdS/VM/PC/VM/AH/RC/JnL/VM/JnL/RC/JnL/RC/AH/RC/= approx. 8 min.)

VM: . . . I think this quote is directed to the issue that it's improper to believe in objects independent of thought, that you cannot legitimately BELIEVE in objects that exist independent of your knowing or your consciousness of them. There are not things out in the world which, when you turn, and they impinge on you, give rise to your world--that seems to be the issue.

RC: That feeling, that presupposition that you're trying to contradict.

VM: That belief, is what's called animal faith.

(RC/JG/)

AD: Then, Vic, the ego and the world are both ideas.

VM: I would definitely say that.

AD: And the consciousness is distinct from them.

VM: The consciousness is something which reveals them or underlies them.

AD: So we have a division here. On the one hand we have consciousness, and on the other side of the mind, we put ego, and the world.

VM: I would also add, that even though you can oppose the ego and the world, you can't form the same relationship between either of those two types of thought and the consciousness itself.

AD: I'm sorry, I don't follow, I don't understand.

VM: Although we can make a reasonably clear distinction between what we normally call the ego and what we normally call the world, we can see those in opposition, a relatively clear subject-object dichotomy. You can't now form the same relationship between this principle of mind or consciousness that we're discussing and either of those two contents--ego or world . . .

AH: I think that's correct . . .

VM: Let me say it again. We've got three principles: we've got mind--I don't want to use the word consciousness--this principle of mind, the ego, and the world, two relatively distinct types of contents, which arise within mind. You usually see the world and the ego in opposition to each other. Now when you try and say what's the relationship between mind on the one hand and either the world or ego. You can't make the same kind of relationship or consider them to be the same type of relationship . . .

NIRVIKALPA VS. SAHAJA

AD: Why don't we do this then? Why don't we do this: why don't we try to trace, trace back to its origin, the ego and the world? And trace back to its origin what we're calling consciousness? And if I introverted, or you introverted, intensely, inwardly, and you end up with Nirvikalpa Samadhi--or there's the other alternative, of ending up with Sahaja--what would be the difference?

VM: I thought Nirvikalpa's a thought-free state, absolutely thought-free.

AD: For who? What's excluded? What's excluded?

VM: Certainly any notion of world and ego.

AD: World and ego? For who?

VM: Well, I guess the ego.

AD: But MIND, no? For mind? It's mind that's excluding the world and the ego, and it becomes free of that. But what about Sahaja, where the person is experiencing the peaceful consciousness despite the existence of the World-Idea?

Now if you tackle it this way--I think you'll have a more-- you'll be able to grasp better the distinction I'm trying to bring about between what they call the ego and the world, and the consciousness. What would you trace the origin of the ego and the world to?

VM: Well, I would have to trace them back to this principle of mind.

AD: You'd say the World-Idea and the World-Mind, wouldn't you?

VM: Ok, both of them, you could say, are contained within their unfolding of the World-Idea by the principle of mind.

AD: And so in some of the terminology that we use, we said there's this mind, this Intellectual-Principle that is our being, you know, the verdant one, the green one. And we're saying that this is a principle in itself. It's a consciousness, it's an intellectual authentic. And that if we introspect very intensely we can get to that, and we would appreciate or we would experience the thought-free peaceful state which we are calling consciousness or mind. On the other hand, we also know that this mind manifests the World-Idea, which means the World-Mind too, World-Mind and World-Idea are both being manifested through this reality. And in manifesting the World-Idea, included in it would have to be a body which is going to assume--which you're going to assume is yours, and that you're going to work through. So that this body is going to be the ego, and that the consciousness illuminates that ego or shines through that body, a world is going to arise. If it withdraws, there's no world and no ego. It enters--both arise concomitantly.

So now if we try to understand these three things--the ego, the world, and consciousness, we'll have to, I think, make this division. It's a distinction. It's not a real separation, it's a distinction. And I would grant you now that if you reach Nirvikalpa Samadhi or if you had Sahaja, you would be talking about the same reality. But it would seem that one is like psychological, when we speak about Nirvikalpa or introversion into our own being, it seems to be psychological. Whereas when we speak about entering into, or trying to understand, the nature of the Intellectual-Principle which is supporting the World-Idea, that seems to be more metaphysical. In other words, insofar that this being that I am penetrates and understands the nature of the ego and the world, not conceptually, not in a two-fold (Q: or 'three-fold') way, but by experiencing the consciousness, the World-Mind's consciousness and by experiencing that, then we could speak about that entity, that I AM, is associated with, or is experiencing, the consciousness of the Intellectual-Principle, it is enjoying Sahaja. In other words, the World-Idea unrolls, but it doesn't disturb that consciousness.

So can you see like the distinction that is being pulled out little by little? On the one hand, Nirvikalpa--we're speaking about a kind of psychological introversion and the Sahaja--you're speaking about a kind of penetration into the metaphysical reality. But reality, the ultimate reality, is the same in both. But we're bringing about this clarification in order to help us understand why you could use a quote like the one you got--could you read that quote?

(CdA reading.)

PB: "That which is aware of the world is not the world. That which is aware of the ego is not the ego. When this awareness is isolated, the man "experiences" the Overself." (22.5.5) (para reread)

AB: Anthony, from what you were saying about the distinction between Sahaja and Nirvikalpa, it seems in Nirvikalpa there's an assumption that the consciousness can be separated or is different from the world

and the ego. Because it is pushed out or the World-Idea, and in the Sahaja, you realize that they're really not different, they both have a higher . . .

AD: What's really not different?

AB: That the World-Idea isn't in opposition to the Overself?

AD: That may be. Is there any other way of looking at it? The Overself is not in opposition, we said, to the World-Idea?

AB: Because in Nirvikalpa it seems there's the experience that the World-Idea has to be blotted out in order to experience the Overself awareness, and in Sahaja . . .

AD: In Sahaja?

AB: The World-Idea is present IN the Overself awareness; it's not incompatible. It seems that there's a lack of understanding of the fine point of this mentalistic doctrine in Nirvikalpa, if I could put it that way.

(RC/AB/VM/JfL/VM/RC/approx 4 min. = discussion of Nirvikalpa and Sahaja.)

VM: Do you think that Sahaja is more inclusive than Nirvikalpa?

AB: The way we put it was that Nirvikalpa was more psychological and Sahaja more metaphysical.

TS: I thought that the idea there was that in the mode of Nirvikalpa Samadhi the individual mind is returning into its own source of the Overself, the I AM principle. And in Sahaja it's returning into the Intellectual-Principle within it, that the World-Idea is contained in the Intellectual-Principle, and the World-Idea is known for what it is by the Intellectual-Principle interior to the Overself. And it's that knowing of the Intellectual-Principle's consciousness of the World-Idea that is what is contacted in the Sahaja consciousness--It's the knowing of the Overself's being which is what is contacted in Nirvikalpa.

JfL: Could you clarify what you understand to be the Intellectual-Principle there?

EM: Within the I AM?

JfL: Yes.

AD: There's a quote from PB, where he speaks about the Overself receiving the aura or the emanation which will be translated by the Overself consciousness, or this Intellectual-Principle in us, it will be translated into the World-Idea, with the World-Mind immanent IN that. You remember that quote? (Q: Probably a reference to 28.2.79 & Persp. pp. 384-385.)

RC: Yes.

JfL: Is the world presented in that experience?

AD: I don't understand the question.

JfL: I thought Tim was making the connection between Sahaja and the individual making contact with the Intellectual-Principle by withdrawing his consciousness deeper. And I thought Sahaja would actually present the world concomitantly rather than this other experience which I . . .

AD: Present the world concomitant?

JfL: Concomitantly with the stillness, sort of at the same time. So that the world can still be presented and thought can be there and seen as real, as real as the Overself consciousness. Whereas I thought what Tim was describing was the sage who has insight at his disposal is able to penetrate deeper into the Void itself.

TS: No.

(JfL & TS = 2-3 min.)

AH: There seems to be a much simpler way of describing Sahaja--it's just exactly like the experience we're having right now except the ego is absent.

LDm: Anthony, couldn't--?

AD: Do you have any idea what that means?

AH: Nirvikalpa is described in a way that it is unlike anything else because it's thought-free, but then when you describe Sahaja as the presence of the reality and the mind's contents and the only thing that's missing is the ego.

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0620a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

(More discussion = AH/LDm/LdS/DB&VM/= approx. 2 min.)

LDm: Couldn't we see if maybe Nirvikalpa as more of a static or homogeneous view of Overself, and by definition static or homogeneous would not include manifestation, but on the other hand Sahaja would include a static and DYNAMIC view of Overself, or homogenous and multiple levels within the Overself and so it would be more inclusive a state of reality.

AD: Why would Sahaja, Louis, by definition, include Nirvikalpa?

LDm: Because it has this static aspect; it would be awareness of awareness which is what Nirvikalpa is, but it would be awareness of awareness with content arising also.

VM: Wouldn't Nirvikalpa be just one more state, one more possibility of Sahaja?

AD: You know, the interesting thing is the story runs nice (Q: what the last word sounds like)--when you read the *Hidden Teaching*, and you get to the third chapter, you get to the situation where you begin to understand that PB had achieved Nirvikalpa Samadhi, but was still very unhappy about the whole situation. (laughter)

JG: That's where he also says that it is a psychological achievement.

AD: Yes, it was a great psychological achievement, but he still went around very discontented and people were telling him, "Well, you achieved the best that could be done, why aren't you happy?" And why wasn't he happy?

JG: Because he had to repeat it all the time.

AD: He had to repeat it, yes, and what else?

VM: It was an impermanent state.

AD: YES. It was an impermanent state, we know that. Or you know, you could try to stay in it for 40 days or something, but what else?

JG: He didn't know what the world meant, it eludes you.

LDm: There was still a duality.

AD: The meaning of the world still escaped him. You remember that?

VM: Right.

AD: So how do you get about solving that?

JG: He applied reason, didn't he?

AD: Yes, he applied reason, but what did that lead to?

VM: The assimilation of the world.

AD: Didn't that lead to the fact or the recognition that the World-Idea was spawned by the World-Mind? And that the World-Mind, insofar that his Overself was part of the World-Mind, that the reality he was seeking was the reality of his own being. And that he'd have to see both of them in the light that they were all part of the World-Mind.

LR: Would another way of saying that be that he had found the Who but not the What?

AD: Well, sure, you could say that's another way of saying it.

LR: What I mean is, to get to the subjective principle without actually understanding the contents which it manifests.

AD: I'm sorry. Louder?

LR: Would it be appropriate to describe the 'What' as all the intelligence of the World-Idea in that case? And that Nirvikalpa Samadhi would not be concerned with the What at all, but only the SUBJECTIVE principle, and that's why it's not the ultimate state?

AD: Yes, I think that's what we've been saying. But I think what we're also trying to do is to amplify these meanings so that at the ground level when we start talking about the ego and the world and the consciousness, that we know what we're speaking about, because we could trace them to their ultimate principles. And rather than use the Who-What terminology right now, I'd rather try to explain these things.

LR: But in this context, Anthony, I can't understand the claim that there ISN'T a world outside of my knowing, because I would strongly assert that there IS.

MB: Don't use the word 'knowledge,' use the word 'consciousness.'

AD: Could we try to do one question at a time? We could handle that later. If you want to insist on bringing in the--something ontic, we could handle that later. Right now let's handle this notion of what

does the ego, world, and consciousness mean. And what do we have to do to find out what they mean? Do we have to trace them back to their origin, or don't we?

NIRVIKALPA IS NOT THE ULTIMATE TRUTH, REASONING UPON THE WORLD-IDEA HAS TO BE BROUGHT IN

RC: Did I hear right? Did PB realize that his Overself was part of the World-Mind and that that included the world?

AD: And that included the world?

RC: Yes.

AD: And that world--that his Overself was--manifesting within the World-Mind, yes?

RC: The Overself included the world? I'm just trying to follow.

AD: That's why we have to go slow, a step at a time. We're saying that each individual's Overself, or the Overself, is the means by which the World-Idea is being translated (Q: sounds like "transpolated," a combination of "transposes" and "translates"), or the ego and world arise together. It's within YOUR mind that these two things arise, alright? We agreed on that? So, then we have our consciousness, our Overself consciousness, our mind, and then we have the World-Mind's Idea, or what he called the emanation of that mysterious aura which OUR mind transposes or translates into the World-Idea. And when it does that, that means that my body is part of that World-Idea. I didn't say my consciousness, I said my BODY is part of that World-Idea. So that the ego, when the consciousness, let's say, is associated with that body, that ego is on the one hand part of the World-Idea, and on the other hand, the consciousness can withdraw from that body and be independent, or let's say, free of the World-Idea. So we have this paradoxical thing that we're talking about: the Soul, so to speak, as self-concerned in Nirvikalpa, absolutely self-concerned, it rejects everything else and stays in its own identity. On the other hand, we know that this isn't the ultimate; this isn't the ultimate truth because it excludes the truth of the world. So he had to come out of that situation, and he kept on wandering around trying to find out what was the truth. Because he refused to accept that Nirvikalpa was the truth--it wasn't. So what did he do? You said he went through a process of reasoning. What else do you remember about what he did with this reasoning? (pause)

He came to certain conclusions, right, regarding--you remember what the conclusions were?

JG: I remember one particular (point) . . . and that was "From Thing to Thought". And that towards the end, where he prepared for the *Wisdom* that the, uh (inaudible) at which he arrived in the *Hidden Teaching* is really fed by the World-Mind. That there is the World-Mind's (inaudible) the world. (Q: hard to follow)

AD: Why don't you try to join in, try to elaborate what you're saying? What would be the consequence of reasoning upon the World-Idea, having assumed now that he understood the nature of his own being, you know reaching Nirvikalpa, what would be further reasoning on that? Now he comes back, he's achieved Nirvikalpa, looks at the world, and he refuses to accept the fact or the notion that the world is an illusion, or that it doesn't exist, he just refuses--he throws that out, he throws that out with the rope trick. But then what kind of reasoning follows? Go ahead.

(DB/MB/= approx. 2 min.)

LdS: Part of the reasoning that brought him to mentalism had to do with the fact that in order for there to be any kind of real relationship between a knower and his world, PB had to see the need to establish a common substance between those two factors or those two elements. So the mentalism or the notion of mind or whatever had to have been in terms of the very dynamism of the reasoning process. There couldn't be two dissimilar factors or poles that--

SERPENT'S PATH; PHILOSOPHIC YOGA LEADS TO SAHAJA; MORE ON NIRVIKALPA AND SAHAJA

AD: Could you substantiate that from a quote or from a passage from PB? How about using the exercise, the Serpent's Path? [Note: See Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Yoga of the Discerning Mind," Exercise 7.]

TS: Yes.

AD: Yes? Go ahead.

TS: It seems that besides the reasoning process, that the other technique that would be most direct would be that which would try to penetrate between the thought process as the activity--

AD: Between two thoughts.

TS: In between two thoughts, and try to catapult the mind into an identification with that production of thought which would be the act of the World-Mind . . .

AD: No, Tim, if I could stop you for just a minute. I think we're on the right track, but let's go slow.

We're saying that on the one hand, the world is a series of thoughts, one thought following upon the other. And that the purpose of that exercise is to INSERT the attention between two thoughts so that you could contact Void Mind, or Mind. Now, WHO is it that inserts his attention between two thoughts? Is it the same nature as mind?

TS: Yes.

CdA: Is the insertion different than the isolation of the awareness?

AD: It's really very straightforward: my attention is riveted on the flow of thoughts. My attention is equivalent to my consciousness? And it's riveted between these two thoughts--and we're beyond the realm of sensation and all that. So my mind is riveted and it's waiting to break through two thoughts, so that it could reach mind, what mind could it reach?

TS: Its source as in the World-Mind.

AD: It would reach the World-Mind, yes, between two thoughts. The World-Mind is producing these thoughts of the world, so World-Mind would be behind that. But what about MY mind?

TS: It would be producing one's own mind, together with those thoughts.

AD: I'm sorry?

TS: It would be producing the Undivided Mind, the Overself Mind, together with those thoughts.

AD: But if my attention, like he says, is alert, dynamic, stripped of any preoccupation with anything else, so it's almost like pure attention, it would be equivalent to consciousness. And it is THAT which inserts itself between two thoughts and reaches the World-Mind, then what happened there?

AH: Whose mind was it?

AD: Oh come on--it's YOUR mind, Andrew. How do you think--I'd be wasting the time doing the exercise, if it wasn't.

JG: You mean Sahaja is coming about?

AD: No, no! I'm just asking, what happens there? You have the World-Mind producing the world, right, thought after thought. The exercise says now you focus your attention. And this is an extreme kind of attention, alert, dynamic, concentrated, alright, and it's really focused, it's trying to get in between two thoughts. Let's say it succeeds--it gets in between two thoughts--what's behind the thought? We said the World-Mind is producing it. And who's trying to get into it?

AH: (aside) That's my line--

AD: My mind, my mind--I'm trying to get enlightened. I would assume that if a person could do that, he's achieved Nirvikalpa at least.

AS: Not necessarily . . .

AD: You don't think so?

AS: I'm saying that would he necessarily achieve Sahaja?

AD: No. A person would have to develop to a point where he could do Nirvikalpa, that is, reach such an intense focus point, that he can use that now, alright, to get into the thought that the World-Mind is producing.

AS: When you asked the question originally, PB went through this process of attaining Nirvikalpa where, in a sense, he cut off the world and the ego. But now it seems like the next process he has to go through somehow is to absorb. He speaks of the difference between cutting off the world and the ego and now ABSORBING the thought into himself. In other words, tracing the reasoning process tracing the origin of that world. If he traced the origin of his own consciousness to the World-Mind (inaudible) thought-producing activity now it seems he has to trace the origin of his thoughts to that very same mind to which he traced the origin of his consciousness. And that seems to me not so much cutting off the thoughts, but reabsorbing them, tracing them back to their source . . .

JfL: What do you mean, Avery?

AD: The question here that's coming up is what he means by the philosophic yogi has to absorb the World-Idea. The way I understand the absorption of the World-Idea is that when the philosophic yogi penetrates into the World-Mind between two thoughts, at that instant he has absorbed the World-Idea. It's

become part of him, he KNOWS that the world IS consciousness transforming itself into Idea. Now he has Sahaja. Why does he have Sahaja NOW?

AS: The reason he has Sahaja now, is because no matter what happens, he's always established in Mind.

AD: He knows THAT WHATEVER IS, IS MIND.

AS: That's why, in the Nirvikalpa he doesn't have an ego, and in fact, in some sense, there can't be an experiencer of the Nirvikalpa because by definition, he has to cut off the ego and world. Whereas in Sahaja the ego COULD subsist.

AD: The two-and-a-half percent.

AS: That two-and-a-half percent. But that seems to be an important distinction. There's not a need in the Sahaja to cut off the ego and world, because it isn't something other than the manifestation of mind, or maybe we could use the quote where he says the Real is now continuous with its appearance. [Note: See Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*, p. 207, Rider 1943 edition.]

CdA: Could we back up?

AD: Yes, you're going to have to back up.

CdA: I didn't follow it at all. How you got to the penetration between two thoughts . . .

AD: Well, if you read the exercise very carefully, he tells you how to do it.

CdA: But I don't--he doesn't speak about it as being absorbed--that that's what it means to absorb the World-Idea.

AD: What do you think it means to absorb the World-Idea?

CdA: I would imagine it to be--

JG: Could you speak louder please?

AD: You'd better face them.

CdA: That it's the realization of the divine source that is our being, our thought . . .

AD: I'm sorry. You've got to explain yourself, the realization of the divine source? I'm just asking you to explain yourself.

CdA: What I understand of what it would be to absorb the World-Idea, to no longer see it as other, to see it as non-dual--

AD: Yes, that's the absorption of the World-Idea. But then what are you talking about?

CdA: What I was asking was, the process of getting there that I thought you were describing, which I didn't understand.

AD: The process of getting there?

CdA: You spoke of that process of the Serpent's Path exercise--

AD: The thing about the Serpent's Path exercise, like we can see it's very complex, because he speaks about achieving enlightenment, full enlightenment. And if you assume that a man who's capable of doing Nirvikalpa, is NOT an enlightened man, then you see what he's leading you to. He's saying now this person has to be enlightened or penetrate into the World-Mind in order to become enlightened. You do NOT become enlightened because you achieve Nirvikalpa Samadhi. And he shows that in the first few chapters, his discontent and the consequence of that.

Now in this exercise, he speaks about the yogi who has developed the ability to be able to concentrate, alright, to a point where he can penetrate in between two ideas, two flashes of the World-Idea, and grasp the innermost World-Mind's consciousness that's producing, or let's say, is the substratum of that World-Idea. Now there's two kinds of consciousness involved here. On the one hand, you have the consciousness of the individual practitioner, who's going to try the exercise. It is HIS attention that is being brought to bear within his own consciousness of the affiliation or filiation of the World-Idea. And he has to penetrate that World-Idea, Ok? Now it is--the way we understand is that the mind of the individual, insofar that it produces the world, does so in this way, this fluctuating way, because that's the way the Intellectual-Principle produces the world, instant after instant.

Alright, now, you could take the position of the Buddhist and say that the consciousness is always fleeting. You could take the position, that would be the World-Idea. You could take the position of the Hindu, that consciousness is always self-identical with itself, and never changing. And you could combine these two positions by understanding this exercise. The yogi attempts, by a consciousness that he has brought to an act where it can be focused, and to such a minute point that the flashing World-Idea can be penetrated. With that consciousness he penetrates into the MIND that is producing the World-Idea. At that instant he has ABSORBED the World-Idea. Why has he absorbed the World-Idea? How else could you absorb something?--if you want to absorb a piece of cake, you gotta bring it into yourself. You gotta EAT it. And if you want to absorb the World-Mind, you got to take it into yourself--of course in this case, the recognition would be that your Overself, which is a particle of the World-Mind, is part of the World-Mind.

So at one and the same time, you have this dualistic way that you have to approach, that also to see that ultimately you're speaking about the same reality, the reality of the Overself and the reality of the World-Mind which underlies the World-Idea. It's one and the same reality.

So a simple question, like what is the ego, what is the world, what is consciousness, shows immediately how much of these principles of PB you've picked up--or if you picked up any.

TS: There's this amazing quote he has on that--I think that--

AD: Would you give it to us, Tim?

TS: It summarizes what you've said. It summarizes something of which you've been speaking.

PB: "The ego to which he is so attached turns out on enquiry to be none other than the presence of World-Mind within his own heart. If identification is then shifted by constant practice from one to the other, he has achieved the purpose of life." (8.1.127)

AD: Would you repeat that again? Would you repeat it in red, I mean, say it out loud?

RC: Where is the quote, Tim?

TS: It's in his orange book with a little 4 under it. (Q: = AD's notebook of ego quotes typed out by residents of the Center.)

(Quote reread, then PC/TS short student discussion and questions = 1 min. or less)

VM: I wasn't interpreting it that way. I have a different way.

AD: That's interesting. Go ahead. Start in. (laughter)

St: Could you read it one more time?

(Quote reread a third time, followed by more discussion.)

AH?: From ego to World-Mind.

JG: In the heart.

AD: So it's not enough that you can criticize Guenon. That's not enough. You got to know the doctrine, too. It's not enough to be able to see how THEY'RE wrong, you got to understand why you're RIGHT. (laughter)

AS: We may be right, but they're always wrong.

AD: Exactly. (inaudible)

(PC and VM/AH/VM/AH/DB/= 3 min.)

(TS re-reads part of quote.)

PB: "... If identification is then shifted by constant practice from one to the other . . ."

AD: Well, what would that mean?

LR: Constant practice?

JG: Constant absorption, right, Anthony? That's what inquiry's all about, isn't it?

AD: That's not a very specific answer; what would that mean, what would you do?

VM: Withdraw that attention from this thing, the ego, and continuously try and turn it in upon itself, until it gets to the root of your being, which is NOT the ego.

AD: Wouldn't that be what we were just talking about--the exercise? Instead of paying attention to the thought that would be a change or a shift in identification, because we tend to identify with the World-Idea, because our ego is included as part of that World-Idea. Whereas what is required of us is to assert the attention or insert it in between two ideas, which would mean the negation of the ego.

JG: There's something about self-inquiry that's very mysterious and has its own dynamism, something that's very catching. When you described now the Serpent's Path, and Tim said what he just read is a summation of what you said, or corroborates what you said, would that not be this self-inquiry that is laid on us by PB? . . .

AD: That's probably what Ramana meant when he said "self-inquiry," to go through all this. But you see there's something more important at stake here--and I tried to mention it before--I don't want to condense the explanations, I want to amplify them; I want them to be made available to our understanding, and that's very important because if we don't, then these little sayings trip us up very easily. Like this one that she just read to you--it just won't make sense.

PC: Could you reread it?

(PC/TS rereads quote/AS/)

JfL: If in the initial experience of the mystic, the Nirvikalpa state, if it's a thought-free state, because he isn't prepared to experience it in its fullness, why did PB--?

AD: I don't know what you mean--"he isn't prepared to experience it in its fullness"?

JfL: I thought that the Nirvikalpa is initially experienced as a thought-free state--

AD: That's so, yes. That's so, it's a thought-free state, but that's all.

JfL: But if it's thought-free, why did PB come out of it thinking "What's wrong here with this world?"

AD: No, he doesn't come out of it thinking. It's after a period of time, after maybe a couple days, when the same old problems come up, when the world raises its head and shows how unsatisfying it can be, regardless of your Nirvikalpa.

JfL: This absorbing of the World-Idea, I don't understand what . . . Here by the Serpent's Path, it sounds like you're absorbing the World-Idea through meditation, and I imagine absorbing the World-Idea is sort of developing the ego and that is being done through world experience.

AS: In finding, in that exercise finding the source of the World-Idea. In the Nirvikalpa, as he says, there's no-thought, you might say after a few days, after you come back, he might have thought "That must have been the ultimate reality, that there's no thought, that thought is excluded. But then here I am again, and the world is appearing again, and I have a problem, because if ultimate reality is that there's no thought, and yet now the world is appearing, then the world should be an illusion, and yet it persists, and it's still a problem that I have to deal with. So what I concluded from my experience of Nirvikalpa must not have been quite correct, that ultimate reality EXCLUDED the world appearance. It couldn't quite have been like that." So, now, I guess PB finds he has to go and seek further, and find out why the source, why the reality does NOT exclude the world appearance, as the original experience might have led him to believe.

JfL: So he goes back, let's say he does the Serpent's Path, and now in between those moments . . .

AD: He goes forward now; after Nirvikalpa he goes forward--he doesn't go BACK; that's just a prerequisite in order to achieve Sahaja. In order to understand that the nature of the World-Idea is not an illusion, but consciousness transforming itself or mind transforming itself. And that has to be understood as an actual experience, and not a conceptual understanding. The way he points out that mentalism has to be understood the same way that you understand bodily pain.

AP: The person who meditates in the ordinary mystic way, when he introverts the consciousness and drops it into the heart, doesn't that person also come to that point where the pulsating thoughts come in

also. And what is the difference? Don't you have to come to that point even to reach the thought-free state?

AD: No, you EXCLUDE that to come to the thought-free state. You exclude it. Consciousness introverting upon itself does not have any room for the World-Idea. Listen to what I said. Consciousness introverting into itself has no room for the World-Idea. By definition. How could it? Then you're not talking about consciousness introverting into itself, you're speaking about the EGO introverting into itself, which is part of the World-Idea. Consciousness, Mind, introverting into itself, has no room for the World-Idea. (Q: last sentence spoken softly)

It's a whole different ballgame, when you want to become a philosophic mystic, then you have to take that consciousness that is capable of introverting into itself, and use it for the Serpent's Path exercise, so that you can achieve the Sahaja which is the understanding that the World-Idea is MIND MANIFESTING ITSELF and that the appearance and the reality are coterminous or the same thing.

LR: I don't understand either.

AD: Well, why don't we do this? Why don't we read a few more quotes so that I can catch my breath and I can yell a little louder?

LR: When you're doing the Serpent's Path you're also disregarding the thoughts.

AD: What?

JG: Disregarding the thoughts.

AD: But that's a whole 'nother ball game--of course you're disregarding the thought, because you're trying to get to the World-Mind!

AS: The clue I think is in what Anthony said in the Nirvikalpa--it's consciousness introverting INTO ITSELF, whereas to get the Sahaja it would have to be consciousness, meaning the Soul-consciousness, getting into the World-Mind--

AD: --Mind's consciousness.

AS: And that's, we would put it--

LR: You can say that--

AS: I thought you--

(Q: The question is when, within, where the thought, where the pulsating thought comes in also?)

LR: I just want to understand what it means.

AD: Of course we can't understand what it means. It transcends all meaning.

AS: (explanation) . . .

AD: Vic, how long ago was it that you asked me this question? You remember?

VM: I don't know.

AD: You see why I didn't want to answer? We'll read a little bit more, a few more quotations, and we'll go back to it again. Because I'm sure it will come up; it'll keep coming up until it's understood.

RC: It summarizes a lot of what's been said too.

JG: Could you--

AD: Does it show how faulty your understanding of the *Hidden Teaching* is?

JG: Of course.

AD: You see why he was in such pain and agony and all that?

JG: Why PB was? Frankly I don't. No . . .

[Audio File 1984 0620a Ends]

[Audio File 1984 0620b Begins]

AD: They're different, the truth is one thing, our personal comfort is something else. Our pleasure, the fact that we're comfortable, is something else.

EM: . . . If a person is in a state where they're able to experience Nirvikalpa, when they come out of Nirvikalpa, wouldn't they still have this stinky ego, as stinky as ever?

AD: Well, no, it's not as bad.

EM: Or would it be a very refined ego?

AD: No, you're on your way to self-development. I mean, the recognition that there are supreme values is not something that you put off lightly.

EM: Would there still be that push to rid oneself of these, the lower, or some lower aspect of the ego?

AD: You begin to recognize the need to burn out the samskaras, the vasanas, that they have to be transformed. And so you take a text like the *Jivanmukti*, you know, *The Path of Liberation*, where they prescribe a whole course of how to go about reducing those vasanas to a minimum. [Note: See Swami Vidyanaraya, *The Jivanmukti-Viveka: Or the Path to Liberation in This Life*.] We're not talking about something that gets accomplished in a short time; it's a long-drawn-out affair. And these vasanas, the way they speak about them in these texts, is that they have to be burnt, scorched. And they say that the only way that they can be scorched is knowledge. So I would assume that that would mean one has to recognize that ultimately these vasanas also are of this mental substance. They also are part of the World-Idea, and consequently that is the way to go about getting rid of them or overcoming them.

You see, the big issue here, in terms of what we've been doing, is to understand this double nature of the Soul and the peculiar infiltration of the World-Idea in it, and that there's these two ways of trying to understand it. And that it has these alternatives; it can get into a Samadhi state or a thought-free state, or it can get into a Sahaja state. And PB tries to make clear that the Sahaja state is a superior state because there you reach the point where you recognize that reality and appearance are really only a distinction that the ego makes, not that the insight permits. And your understanding then becomes more

accurate. But the discussion about--what does it mean to absorb the World-Idea when you're concentrating and trying to get in between two thoughts--I don't want to bother with that kind of question.

You know the story about how Arnold (Q: Sir Edwin Arnold, *The Light of Asia*) tried to describe it? He says, well you know they speak about the dew drop slips into the sea? He says, "No, it feels like the other way around; it's like the ocean is slipping into the dewdrop!" And that would be a way of trying to understand the way the individual Soul absorbs the World-Idea. But these are metaphors--they're all bunk. They're junk! If you ever get enlightened, you're going to come and shoot me! --For lying.

JG: No.

AD: You'll shoot me! For lying! You'll say everything I said was a lie. And I'd have to shoot myself . . . (laughter)

VM: I don't think there's much danger here.

GETTING ESTABLISHED IN SAHAJA; PB'S ABILITY TO KNOW THE KEY POINTS OF AN ARTICLE WITHOUT HAVING TO READ IT

PB: "Too often we say that we are what we are by nature and heredity, but too often we leave out the more important ingredient of selfhood, the one most hidden and most elusive yet the very source of the personal life. That this omission is caused by ignorance, or by lack of any enlightening experience, is true, but does not pardon our inertia and apathy. For Consciousness gives us the "I," gives us the world, gives us wakefulness and sleep. It is the stuff of what we really are. Yet all we can say about it is to confuse it with a *thing*, the fleshly brain, and let it go at that dismissal." (8.1.63)

PB: "His first mental act is to think himself into being. He is the maker of his own "I." This does not mean that the ego is his own personal invention alone. The whole world-process brings everything about, including the ego and the ego's own self-making." (8.2.15 & Persp. p. 104) (para reread)

PB: "There are three stages on the path of world enquiry. The first yields as its fruit that the world is but an idea, and this stage has been reached from the metaphysical end by thinkers such as Bishop Berkeley, and nearly reached from the scientific end by such a man as Eddington. The second stage involves the study of the three states, waking, dreaming, and deep sleep, and yields as its fruit the truth that ideas are transitory emanations out of their permanent cause, consciousness. The third stage is the most difficult, for it requires analysis of the nature of time, space, and causation, plus successful practice of yoga. It yields as its fruit the sense of Reality as something eternally abiding with one." (Cat. 19-intro, p. 2, (19a.g)) (para reread)

PB: "*Sahaja* is the final phase and, in striking contrast to the first phase, the Glimpse, lasts as long as corporeal life lasts. In this he brings the light into every day's thought, speech, and behaviour. It is the phase of Application. So, little by little, disjointedly and at intervals, he gets established in a calm awareness of his connection with, and relation to, the Overself." (24.3.317) (para reread)

VM: I find that a little unsettling, because I thought the state of Sahaja Samadhi WAS the state when you DID have calm abiding in the Overself and simultaneously the World-Idea was continuously--

AD: Yes, that was true. But it's a continuous process.

VM: You grow into it?

AD: You grow into it deeper and deeper.

VM: I thought it was like--you get there and that's it, but you're saying that it's a deepening.

AD: It's always deepening, so that ultimately it's the Soul that is living--you know, through that ego, the Soul is determining and dictating EVERY phase of your existence. The ego has nothing any more to say, and that's the establishment of the Soul in the corporeal life. And there's no limit to that. Don't think of it as a one-shot thing. The spiritual is never a one-shot.

JG: Does that mean that there is still effort?

AD: No. No effort.

HS: Would you--

AD: The variety of situations that arise are occasions for the sage to employ, or use, the wisdom of the Soul, as to how to live. So we can look at it that way. I'm sorry. I interrupted someone. You wanted to hear it again?

HS: (I'd like to hear) what you said again, because that was really nice. That the unfolding . . .

AD: Well, there's another quote where he speaks about in Sahaja also there's a relationship, so to speak, with the World-Idea--one knows more what the role of his ego is, what the role of his personality, if I could use that, is in the world, and that too is established gradually, or more and more firmly. It's in both directions--in relation to his own Soul and in relation to the World-Idea that's being worked out.

JG: So you would know what you had to do?

AD: Yes. Not perfectly all the time, but he knows what he has to do.

JG: But he wouldn't know that after Nirvikalpa?

AD: No.

HS: Wouldn't you say that there's the establishment of a kind of certitude first, of the truth of this self-

AD: Yes, yes, you're established in that recognition that everything is mind. But then it's another thing--now, how do I live in this new situation?--that's what they were talking about--the establishment of Sahaja. And it's something you could see take place, at least I think I saw it, getting deeper and deeper and more beneficent and more encompassing, as he went along.

HS: Could you say there's a process that begins in thinking about the world?

AD: I'm sorry?

HS: Wouldn't the process begin with thinking about the world?

AD: What process?

HS: The process of a deepening . . .

AD: No, he doesn't think about the world. He doesn't say, "Well, what should I do under the situation," and starts thinking about it. That doesn't exist for him.

HS: And is there any stage where--let's say, there is certitude of the truth of the world, and--

AD: The truth of the MIND.

HS: The truth of the mind?

AD: The truth of the consciousness, the truth of the mind.

HS: Is it the certitude that the truth of the mind is the truth of the world?

AD: Well, whatever truth you want to give the world, yes. But that's what we're talking about--for you to suddenly realize and recognize that the world is mind--not words, Herbie, I mean something that is known, the way he expresses it, the same way that you know of the existence of pain. You notice how pain makes mentalists of everybody? That's the kind of knowing we're talking about.

So when the sage knows that everything is mind, we're not speaking about knowing in the sense of the triple relationship or any of that, and he doesn't think about what he has to do.

HS: There's no enquiry into the nature of the world like Bishop Berkeley.

AD: Let me give you an example. Could you tell him about the way he would pick out paragraphs from an essay and then go back and would you--? I don't know who it was, was it you, Randy or Tim? The way he'd take an article from "East & West," make dots, these are the important parts. Ok, then go and read the whole article and it was still so. Who told me that? I don't want to say that I know that; it's better you say you know it, because they'll think I'm prejudiced. (laughter)

TS: You're referring to this practice he (Q: PB) would have of picking up an article and reading the salient points in the article first. That is, only reading the important sentences, and then afterwards, just for completeness, he'd read the rest of it.

AD: And say, "Gee, I wasted all that time," right?

TS: Yes, but he would bribe himself and say "Well. . ." and he'd go through just dot out, intuitively or you could say with that insight, that there would be a direct contact with the salient points in the article, and he'd only read those passages. He wouldn't read up to them and mark them out. He'd just read those passages first.

AD: You follow that, Herbie? You follow that?

TS: Then he'd say, "I'll make myself a cup of tea with a little more tea in it today," and then for a reward, for reading all the parts where the author wasn't getting to the point, he'd make himself read the rest of it, and that would be his discipline.

AD: You see what he does--I give you a ten-page article and I'd say, without you reading it, "Alright, mention the five most important points," and so you turn to the page, and you say "this one, this one. . ." Ok? Then I read it, and I say, "Gee, he's right." You never thought about it; you never read it or anything. Let's not try to conceive how the sage thinks (laughter). It's hopeless.

RC: The thing that most fascinated me even more than that was--he'd pick something from the journals in the library. (Q: This comment, next student comment, and beginning of AD following are all spoken at once.)

HS: That's what you do.

AD: I don't do that. I've read all these books. I'm sorry, Randy, he's trying to say I do that, and I'm telling him, I've read these things, and I don't do that, I know I don't do that, I know PB does though; I've seen him do it.

RC: It fascinated me even more that he'd pick up journals in the library, not his library, but the state library or whatever--he'd pick up books in languages he couldn't read and pick out a few things and say, "Would you get that translated? I think it might be interesting." (laughter)

AD: Some of those magazines we have of his, in foreign languages, which have parentheses in certain parts, I know he can't read it, and he's got parentheses. Alright, Herbie, let's go on to some more quotes.

THREE DEGREES OF UNDERSTANDING MENTALISM

HS: Could we go back to the one where he mentions Bishop Berkeley? . . .

PB: ". . . three stages on the path of world enquiry. . . ."

HS: Is this subsequent to knowing the ego's truth which is--?

AD: No, this is the first stage in your development of understanding philosophy. Bishop Berkeley insists that you cannot know anything outside of knowing, that you cannot posit the existence of matter. That's the first elementary introduction into mentalism.

HS: That gives you a conceptual understanding that the world is mind.

AD: Or that the world is within your thought.

HS: Within your thought.

AH: It's not the realization of mentalism.

AD: No, but it's a good beginning. As a matter of fact, if you read Bertrand Russell, in *Problems of Philosophy*, he says "You know, this position is impregnable. You cannot refute it, but we won't pay attention to it." (laughter). Yes, Bertrand Russell. So that's the first thing you have to recognize, that that position is impregnable, and not say "Well, I'm going to ignore it and just go on." The understanding conceptually of mentalism is a good beginning.

LR: But then what do you do?

AD: Well, after you do that a few years, you go on to the next step. But by that time you've read Berkeley, David Hume, you know, Schopenhauer, all these people are going up and down the ladder. Then you read the next series.

PB: ". . . The second stage involves the study of the three states . . . transitory emanations out of their permanent cause, consciousness. . . ." (19-intro)

AH: That seems to be the realization that the principle of one's own being is mind. That's different than the first stage in that it's a non-conceptual realization, a natural one.

HS: But how do you get that ideas are nothing but your own consciousness then?

AH: Did I say that or did the quote say that?

PB: "... yields as its fruit the truth that ideas are transitory emanations out of their permanent cause, consciousness."

DB: That comes about as a result of studying three states of consciousness.

AD: I hope you don't think study here is the way you understand it--study here means that you're willing to try making little experiments now and then, like when you go to sleep, you're going to dream about something, and you (dream?) (Q: last word hard to hear) for a couple of months, to try to determine what kind of dream you have, how you want the plot to unfold, and what you expect to get out of this. Or, to make available to yourself the fact that if nightmares occur, or any images occur, you will instantaneously awaken yourself. What we're talking about here is the willingness to practice and play around a little bit with the different kinds of states of consciousness you have. And sleep and dream are among those states which you simply take for granted.

RC: It's interesting, there's a section, Volume 15 in the library, all the 15's. He's got one section called "The Mysticism of Dream," "The Mysticism of Sleep." He's got another section called "The Metaphysics of Dream," "The Metaphysics of Sleep." They're very interesting sections.

AH: Anthony, it seems understandable to talk about understanding waking consciousness from the point of view of waking consciousness. And it is even remotely possible to understand the dream states. But to speak about having access to the sleep state where there are no images, no contents, that presents me with a problem. I don't know what to understand from this quote. (pause)

CdA: Isn't that Nirvikalpa?

St: (inaudible)

AD: Yes, now we're speaking about practicing mystics, you know, and not the reading kind.

AS: That's another one of the exercises in the back of the *Wisdom*, the meditation on sleep, where he describes . . . [Note: See Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Yoga of the Discerning Mind," Exercise 6.]

AH: There are images in waking consciousness, we won't deny that, and there are also images in dream consciousness. But what is it that's examined in the sleep state?

AD: Again, this is a theoretical question for us, Andrew, because it requires that you are a working mystic. By a working mystic, I mean precisely a person who is capable of introverting into his consciousness, experiencing in meditation various states of consciousness. Included would be what we call dream consciousness and sleep consciousness. There's no sense trying to discuss these things theoretically.

(Q: discussion follows, mostly about the three states of consciousness, AD assents but doesn't speak in the first couple of minutes.) = AS/JG/AS/RC/AS(below)/AD(below)/HS/AH/AS/RC/HS/RC/PB: "The third state . . ." LR/RC/LR&JfL/AH (below) = approx. 10 minutes. Some of discussion excerpted below.)

AS: I was saying these three are all leading towards the investigation of the World-Idea, all leading towards philosophic inquiry rather than JUST the mystical inquiry.

AD: That's right.

AH: I think the third stage in this quote--in the same way that in the first two stages the basis of reality is discovered to be mind: in the first case conceptually and in the second stage found a way to the states of waking dream and sleep. In the third case the notions of time, space, and causality are found to have as their basis, Mind. In other words, the world is not caused by something other than mind. There is not a space independent of the tissue of mind, nor is there a flow of events other than the one that occurs within the mind.

AD: He's just speaking about three levels or degrees of understanding mentalism. And you start with the easiest, you know, whether it's Berkeley in the West, or someone in the East like the *Yoga Vasistha*, but then you try, and you attempt to get deeper into the study of mentalism by experimenting with your own states of mind. Or you could read about them, for instance, you know--Christian Science and New Thought and hypnotism and things like that, to experience the mind's ability to function in a variety of ways, enough to stagger the imagination. And then when you're acquainted and understand and are equipped to deal with that, so to speak, in a way that you can manipulate it, then you go into a deeper study of the meaning of space, time and causality, such as are undertaken by people like Eddington and Jeans and etc, OK, or the commentaries, like Gaudapada on the meaning of causality. [Note: See Gaudapada, *Gaudapada Karika*.] And if you understand that, then your deepened understanding, that has deepened your understanding of mentalism. That's all he's talking about. And you've been doing that.

LR: No, I haven't.

AD: That's what you think!

LR: No, I haven't.

AD: I'm not asking you what you did, that's what you went through. I didn't expect you to go out and pick up Berkeley. I did it FOR you in classes. We went through a kind of schematization of the various levels of mentalism. In order to understand it, you gotta start off with a simple level, such as a conceptual understanding, and work your way all the way down until you can understand what your friend has begun to understand. (laughter). What modern 20th century quantum mechanics has begun to understand.

LR: Things are actually getting normal. (Q: this is in response to Anthony's participation in the class.)

AD: Things are actually getting normal?

LR: I find it miraculous that I can sit here and argue with you. Excuse my wonder.

AD: You can argue with what?

JG: She likes to argue with you.

AD: Oh, I know she likes to argue with me.

LR: I find this awesome and miraculous that I'm sitting here arguing with you. Anyway, you prefaced your explanation of this by saying what PB means by study here is not what we think of as the intellectual, as an intellectual pursuit, but it's an actual practice with the mind--experimentation of the mind. Now I was trying to see these three levels in that context of your prefatory statement, and in that context I was wondering what kind of experimentation was involved in this last analysis, namely the analysis of time, space, and causality. Because he does have quotes where he says things like the Overself can reveal itself through any vehicle, but it has to do so in accordance with karma, and in certain places, and not others--

AD: No, what that is saying simply is--to understand, and we've been trying to understand in our own way, the ultimate meaning of things like space, time, causality--and we worked on that problem over and over again. Just because you could discuss jnana, doesn't make you a sage. And the fact that you worked through these three levels of mentalism doesn't make you a sage.

LR: I agree.

AD: Ok. That's fine, you don't have to argue then. (pause) I have a quote from PB, but I got it in the cottage, where he speaks about how much work you're gonna do before you become a sage, and that you're going to die a hundred deaths and suffer a thousand sufferings. So don't worry about being a sage, but you have to understand the ultimate nature of space, time and causality with the little brain that we have. It'll be adequate, believe me--if it's used!

SOUL'S DUAL NATURE

KD: Could I ask?

AD: Alright, class over. (rings bell.) (laughter)

KD: One more question?

AD: You're just in time. (Q: not necessarily to KD)

KD: The whole purpose of going over these quotes is to bring out--

AD: You've got to understand the teach(ing), the doctrine. Or, you mean this particular quote.

KD: No, no . . . I'm really confused about the purpose of life. We did this.

AD: Did what?

KD: We were trying to bring out the quotes pertaining to the ego, the world, and consciousness.

AD: Oh you mean, why we dwelt on these particular things: the nature of the ego, the world, and consciousness. And I said that you have to trace these back to their origin. And when we do, we see that we have to bring out our whole understanding of metaphysics, and that's why it's necessary to try to understand these very simple questions at their fundamental level. Why, for instance, the ego and the world must arise together, your whole metaphysics has to be brought into operation. If you can't do that, then you don't understand the teaching.

KD: . . . Lots of comments that you made and a lot of quotes that he read had to do with consciousness. I don't understand what that means--you equated the word consciousness with Mind or Intellectual-Principle . . .

AD: Well, you have to be specific--

KD: Is consciousness equatable with the Overself, is that an equatable term? We said before that Soul is a life principle, and it's also a logos, and that it has this dual nature, and that the Soul isn't necessarily gnostic, but it's the Intellectual-Principle WITHIN the Soul that is gnostic.

AD: You're coming from Plotinus.

KD: Could you say that the Soul has this dual nature, and that the ego or the series of thoughts might be the relationship between the Soul as life-principle and its relationship with the Nous within it. And when we talked about Nirvikalpa and Sahaja that Nirvikalpa would be the penetration into the Soul as life-principle, and that Sahaja would be more fully the experience of the whole Soul, Soul plus the Intellectual-Principle within it. And that's why we speak always about this duality when we talk about the Soul. And we have got Nirvikalpa and we got Sahaja, and that's because of this dual nature of the Soul as life-principle plus the Intellectual-Principle within it?

AD: What? Go ahead.

KD: And the reason's Sahaja more complete is because the Soul doesn't come to self-knowledge without bringing in this gnostic principle which is the Intellectual-Principle within it. So the discussion about the World-Idea, the World-Idea is the emanation from that Nous within the Soul, and that's why that has to be brought into actualization, or that has to be penetrated before there's full experience of the Soul or before it's actualized. Does that make any sense?

AD: Yes, yes, I think you said it. That's the entire difficulty that we're always confronting, and it's been going on for a long time. This dual nature of the Soul: one, so to speak, insofar that we speak of it as concerned with itself, and introspecting into itself. The other we speak about as the Soul, with the Nous IN the Soul, now the Soul, so to speak, as inhabiting or presiding over a part of the World-Idea, that is a particular body which that World-Idea has created. So you have on the one hand, and this is the strange paradox, that for the Soul to gain ultimate enlightenment, it must do so through a vehicle, or vehicles, which are provided by the Intellectual-Principle within the Soul, through which it can reach that Intellectual-Principle. Yes, so this is what we've been discussing most of the night.

KD: That's why in the quote of PB where the presence of the World-Mind, that ego, turns out to be nothing other than the presence of the World-Mind in his own heart. It's almost as if the natal chart, these series of thoughts, is that point of contact--that's why it's such a mystery--between that life-principle and the World-Idea--

AD: No wait, no wait, you brought in the chart. I'm sorry--from there?

KD: That quote of PB's "The ego to which he is so attached turns out on enquiry to be none other than the presence of the World-Mind within his heart"--would refer to what you said that, that body is

produced by the World-Mind, and that that is why that's necessary, that's the Soul's contact with the World-Mind is through that body.

AD: Yes.

KD: I stuck in the natal chart, because that would be concomitant, that seems to be the result of the association of that light with the body . . .

AD: Also, the association of the Soul with a particular body is the entrance into the unlimitedness of the World-Mind.

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0620b Ends; Side 2 Begins)

AD: The actualities may be quite different. The Soul has identified with a body which is part of the Intellectual-Principle, can experience, or let's say, have experience of, the unlimited nature of the intellectual idea, and the mind. In other words, the mind and the World-Idea can experience its unlimitedness or at least become aware of it. And then to speak about, you know, three states of consciousness, would be in here, say-- Because it's actually unlimited, the extent of the World-Idea is something we can't grasp, we can't conceive. And it's through the fact that the soul can associate with part of the World-Idea that this becomes feasible or possible.

KD: It's still within the Soul, it's still within the mind.

AD: Well, of course it's within the Soul.

CdA: But that says that the body is part of the World-Idea. You're saying that because the Soul can have this association, that it's through this association that the Soul is able to experience then the unlimitedness of the Intellectual-Principle.

AD: Yes, so you could have a body, for instance, in the celestial realms--and then you could have a body that belongs to one of the higher spheres or stars. But without the body, you're not going to have the experience of the unlimitedness of the World-Mind and the World-Mind's Idea. And that's why these things have to be understood. You know, in Islam, they have this notion about Kabir, they speak about the I AM principle as "Kabir," the green one, the verdant one. You ever read about it? Well, go home then. (laughter)

You see, that's what I figured Linda would be doing when we were reading the *Hidden Teaching*, she'd run to the library and get Berkeley out and read him, and then when we were reading about different states of consciousness, she'd run to the library and get out books by Soberer and--you know, who's this modern--the existentialist--what's his name (and inaudible). But anyway, there's a lot of books in the library about different states of consciousness you can experience and you could work with. I figure you people run to the library, and look these things up, then come back, and go on to space, time and causality. That philosophically they don't mean anything, and that you run to the library and you'd read Eddington, and you'd read Einstein, and all these people on relativity. Go home.

St: Thank you, Anthony. Got to go to the library now.

[Audio File 1984 0620b Ends]