

**CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
September 2, 1984
PB BOOKS; WISDOM OF THE OVERSELF;
"BIRTH OF THE UNIVERSE"**

TOPIC: PB Books

SUBJECT: Wisdom of the Overself

SUBSUBJECTS: "The Birth of the Universe," Cosmology, Epistemology, Solar Logos, Causality

CONTENTS:

THE STUFF OF THE UNIVERSE IS TRACED BACK TO THE ETERNAL LIFE OF THE SOLAR LOGOS

HISTORICITY IS AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL PROBLEM

CAUSALITY, TIME, ETC., IS MEANINGLESS TO THE WORLD-MIND, REQUIRES THE INTRODUCTION OF AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL SUBJECT

THE SOLAR LOGOS DOESN'T EXPERIENCE MOMENT-TO-MOMENT MANIFESTATION AS TIME

THE SOUL OPERATING THROUGH A BODY GIVES RISE TO NOTIONS OF SPACE, TIME, CAUSALITY; SAUTRANTIKA SCHOOL

ARE THERE ONTIC CAUSES?; PHILOSOPHY INCLUDES BOTH THE DUAL AND NON-DUAL POINTS OF VIEW

THERE IS NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN LATENT AND ACTIVE MANIFESTATION FOR THE SOLAR LOGOS, IT DOESN'T COGNIZE SENSIBLY

MIND IS NOT THE CAUSE OF ANYTHING

THE NOTION OF A BEGINNING ARISES WITH THE INSERTION OF A SUBJECT INTO THE COSMIC CIRCUIT

ORDER; HOW DOES THE SUN WORK?; MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE LIGHT

KARMA DETERMINES THE GROWTH OF THE KNOWER; BECOMING AS A RECORD OF THE INDIVIDUAL SOUL'S DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERSTANDING

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)

PLOTINUS QUOTES READ OR REFERENCED: IV.4.10-12

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

NOTES:

- Partial transcript (Scan File 1984 0902 PB Wisdom Birth causality 11p.PDF) exists. Other, earlier partial transcripts may also exist.
- This class was held on Sunday.

TRANSCRIBED Verbatim by IT 2018. Reformatted from V11a version by JRM & JF 2019-2020, with Subheads and Table of Contents added by JRM. In 2023, IT updates prefatory matter, footer, and audio file name, expands Subsubjects, alters Subheads to make more accurate, completes Book List, adds Plotinus quotes section, adds new note within transcript, fixes typos and minor errors, reformats to accord with new conventions. **Archival verbatim transcript – V14.1a.**

AUDIO FILES: 1984 0902a, 1984 0902b. [Note 1: “Tape” and “Side” refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files. Note 2: Talking on the first side of the first .MP3 audio file ends at 8 minutes 8¾ seconds and then switches to the second side. It’s possible the first part of this class did not get recorded.]

1984 09/02 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Books; Wisdom of the Overself; "Birth of the Universe"
Archival verbatim transcript

**# THE STUFF OF THE UNIVERSE IS TRACED BACK TO THE ETERNAL LIFE OF
THE SOLAR LOGOS**

[Audio File 1984 0902a Begins]

AS: Um--

LR: Play it right.

DR (in background): Linda, I was going to ask you about that [one/two words inaudible]

[baby noises]

AH (simultaneously): Avery, I-- you-- this passage, I thought I had understood it over the last twelve years in some respect, [MW, whispering in background: He's not ready.] so, [S, in background: Right.] and I guess I just didn't understand what the discussion was. [AS simultaneously, in background: That's because he's not ready.] Could you review it now?

AS: Did you-- were you here the beginning of the--

S (possibly part of background): If I reach--

AH: Would you review the discussion that happened the last five minutes, I-- I really missed what the discussion was, whether it's a substance or whether it's [AS: Ok.] principle.

AS: Well, we discu-- we had a little picture in which this World-Mind, the Solar Logos, [AH simultaneously: Yes (one/two words inaudible)] is manifesting. And the background for that let's say is this universal intelligence which is unchanging also [diagram]. Now, the World-- this in-- with this as its-- as its ideal background, this World-Mind, this Solar Logos is manifesting something of its own life, its own self in the cosmos. Now its own self being the pure soul, what it manifests is this emanating life, ok, and within that life is the whole of the cosmos or Solar system. Now it's inevitable that because the Sun Soul itself is eternal that what it manifests will be eternally being manifest, and on the other hand, these Ideas that have arisen within it [diagram], the Ideas themselves are also unchanging, eternal, universal intelligence. They don't really belong to it, they can't belong to it, they are like the Nous or [AH/S(?): Yes, pure.] pure Intellect, universal Intellect. Ok now, then I thought Louis was saying that, I think that sounded right that, when you trace back the stuff of this universe, ok, if you trace back what the stuff of this universe is, it means you're tracing back that very life within which the universe is being manifested, the life of the Sun Soul, if you trace that back, even though it seems to be continuously changing, its own essence is really the pure unchanging awareness or life or Being of the Sun, of the Sun Soul, [AH simultaneously: Which is meant by Mind.] which is Mind, which could be taken as Mind's stillness.

AH: Yes, that's the way I understood it but there was the discussion about--

AS: No, well the only thing is that-- no. No, no, no.

DB (simultaneously): Is that-- is that that phase, I think we're calling Mind in this particular paragraph, is that phase a taijasic power that the Solar Logos has or is it another--

AS: I thought it was the selfhood of that Sun, not its taijasa emanation, but the very-- but the very I AM principle itself or the-- the-- the eternalist soul which is a-- which is authentic existent. [student assents] If we go back to those things in Plotinus, the nature of the Sun, if you really trace it back, if you trace back that life consciousness that's manifesting this universe, that's defined as authentic existence, the nature of our-- of that-- If the nature of our soul is authentic existence, then the nature of the Sun Soul must certainly be authentic existence and that authentic existence is nothing else than Mind, as PB calls it. For him Mind is authentic existence. [DB simultaneously: Yeah, could I try--] What else could you say about (it)? [DB simultaneously: Could I try--] Now I'm-- Yeah.

DB: You find it all through here, just to see if I'm following what you're saying. Uh-- [few inaudible student words, possibly part of background] Let's say-- let's say that the-- let's say there's an individual person, so each day, ok, 3 o'clock he thinks about his garden, ok. Each day he has a different flower on that garden, ok, ok, but it's not the same garden but it's all the different flow-- one minute you go in it's like [one word inaudible] raspberry bushes or whatever, I don't know, but he's always thinking this thought each-- each day. No, it's not gonna work, it's not gonna work. What I'm trying to get at is, if there's a Solar Logos and the Solar Logos manifests the universe--

S: Right.

AS: Yeah.

DB: Right.

AS: Out of its own self.

DB (simultaneously): Out of-- out of its own self. Alright now, after a while that Solar Logos goes into its inactive phase and the universe is withdrawing.

AS: Right, exactly, withdrawn back into itself.

DB (simultaneously): All its-- all that's gone-- all that stuff is back in itself.

AS: (Goes/Puts) back in pure Mind, as he says [DB simultaneously: Goes back.] unborn, uncreated, unoriginated.

LR: Yeah.

[student assents, faint]

DB: Ok.

AS (simultaneously): If-- if your I AM is unborn, uncreate, unoriginated, the Sun Soul's should also be unborn, uncreate, unoriginated. And no matter what goes on in its manifestation doesn't affect that unborn, uncreate, unoriginated nature of itself. [student assents, faint] I don't-- that's the way I-- [S simultaneously: (But I--)] how I interpreted it. Ok?

S: Repeat that.

DB: Well, I guess what I'm-- I guess what I'm trying to get at is that you've got one cosmos, it's withdrawn, ok, then it's brought forth, there's another cosmos, then it goes on for an interminably long period of time, then it's withdrawn, cosmos after cosmos after cosmos. [student assents, faint] Ok. I [student assents] just don't understand within this context the fact that-- [short pause] I keep wanting to trace the fact that that-- that it is going to be continually manifesting cosmoses not to its undying nature but to something that transcends it, you know, to-- to its relation to the Intellectual-Principle. I don't see how, I mean, that this is a function that it is performing. I mean it's an agency in terms of unfolding this cosmos, ok, it does so in relation to its Intellectual-Principle. And the particular contents that it has manifest are specifically in relation to the Intellectual-Principle, its own particular vision of life.

S (simultaneously): Exactly.

AS: You know-- Yeah.

DB: Ok. And, I mean substantially, substantially, all of these universes that the Solar Logos has manifested are traced back to its own unique or its own life, ok. [student(s) assenting] But what's really eternal is the fact that it will continue to go on producing these universe(s). You s-- you see what I'm trying to get at?

AS: No.

DB: I mean I don't see how-- when you speak of the universe it's manifested and it's there for however long it's there and it returns, ok, now how, if something has arisen, you know, unfolded and then withdrawn, how is that eternal and undying? The only thing that's eternal and undying is the fact that there's a continual process going on, there's always different forms being manifested. I mean that-- that process itself seems to be eternal and undying but none of the contents within it seem to be, they're always in a pro-- in a constant state of transformation and development.

S: You know, even-- go on.

AS (simultaneously): Yeah, I think Tim--

HISTORICITY IS AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL PROBLEM

TS: I have the same question. Let's see if I can ask it another way and make it more complicated, that-- [short pause] he-- when he says here, he starts out, he says--

[Transcriber note: I am using *The Wisdom of the Overself* by Paul Brunton, Rider and Company, London, 1943.]

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe," p. 27, TS reading]: "[Thus] there is no particular moment in the universe's long history when it could be said to have been first created."

TS: Well, that--

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0902a Ends; Side 2 begins)

AD: --turn away.

TS: That's--

S: [few words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): This mystery is really [LR simultaneously: Some sort of bliss.] an epistemological problem.

VM: Right, right. And you appreciate that.

AS (simultaneously): [one/two words inaudible] that(./?)

AH: I didn't hear (epistemological).

KD (simultaneously): Epistemological.

LR: Epis--

AS: Epistemological problem?

S: Uh-hm.

AD: Yeah.

AS: Historicity.

TS (simultaneously): (It's) real hard.

LR: Yeah.

AD: When he says over here--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe," p. 27, AD reading]: "This tenet is usually illustrated in the hidden teaching [TS simultaneously: Yeah.] by asking the student to draw a circle."

AD: I mean, what is he trying to do in that paragraph, what is he trying to show? He says it's only a type.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe," p. 27, AD reading]: "He must think of this circle as a *type*, standing for all..."

AD: Because we do have to think, or I-- at least I think this way, is that the entirety of universal manifestation is something which is forever in the World-Mind. I mean it's not that the World-Mind is changing it as we go along and saying, "Let me alter this here, I don't like this the way [VM simultaneously, laughing: It's made a mistake the first time.] it's coming out." So the Idea of the universe is an eternally fixed Idea, alright. So that's not going to be altered in any way. But then there's going to arise within that Idea creatures that are going to perceive certain sections of it, certain bits [VM assents] of it.

AS: Right.

AD: This is where historicity is going to be spoken of. Go ahead.

AS (simultaneously): Well-- well then in that case, we'd have to ask this question, maybe we don't but, how-- in a sense how-- how far up do we speak about? Even the appearance of a Sun is a-- is a historical event insofar as its appearance within universal manifestation. And in that sense the only-- even that is an

epistemological event insofar it's-- it is that-- that Sun too is a particular entity knowing a certain portion or aspect of this universal Idea in a particular time sequence for itself. So, perhaps even from that point of view, there's-- there's a-- I don't know.

VM: But perhaps you could think of the Solar Logos as a type of individual, certainly not like we would be considered individuals, so in that sense it doesn't have quite the universality of the Nous. And so perhaps it is appropriate to think of-- think of it in that sense.

[student assents, faint]

AS: Well, I just--

LR (simultaneously): Which is sort of when it takes on the sense-organs and-- and retracts, when the World-Idea retract(s)?

VM (simultaneously): Well, I mean there are historical events in the ma-- in the Manvantaras and so on, so in that way-- maybe that's--

AS (simultaneously): Well maybe that's a-- yeah.

VM: On the other hand though when you think of the Solar Logos in its totality, both its inward and outward aspect, it also has no beginning and no end. Granted its outward manifestations may have beginnings and ends.

AS: But-- but the point--

LR (simultaneously): Yeah, but what does that mean?

AS: But-- but Anthony was making a particular point about the univer-- not going back the-- I thought the point was not to go back to some other eternality but just to think about the universe itself. Now, maybe I'm-- maybe I'm mistaken.

LR: He said any notion of historicity is an epistemological question.

DB: Which means-- doesn't-- doesn't that mean that then if the World-Mind's understanding of the-- of its universe is an eternally accomplished fact, that all process, all historicity and so on and so forth, is something that's taking place within that, [AS simultaneously: Well--] ok? I mean let me just-- is yes or no.

HS: Whatever you say.

DB: I'm asking.

AH: Yes, for the sake of discussion. Yes, the answer is yes.

DB: Ok. (bit of laughter) So if-- if that follows, then what-- what is the difference between the soul-- the World-Mind's vision of the universal Ideas and their manifestation? If they're both still totally inco--

CAUSALITY, TIME, ETC., IS MEANINGLESS TO THE WORLD-MIND, REQUIRES THE INTRODUCTION OF AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL SUBJECT

AD (simultaneously): To the World-Mind, latent or active manifestation is meaningless.

DB: Right, ok, alright, that's what I-- that's what I wanted to know, ok. So it's within that, it's within that that one would speak of-- of manifestation. It's within the vision of the Solar Logos' [half word inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): No, it's within the vision of the epis-- epistemological subject.

AS: Right.

AD: From the point of view of the Solar Logos, Ishvara, [DB: Yes.] to say latent manifestation or active manifestation is meaningless.

DB: Ok, alright. I'm just--

AD (simultaneously): To God, in other words, to say this is a concrete manifestation or this is an abstract manifestation, you're not making any sense.

DB: Yes, ok. So--

AD (simultaneously): Alright, you understand that, you follow that.

DB: I think so.

AH (simultaneously): I don't.

VM (simultaneously): I don't understand at all.

AD (simultaneously with AH and VM): Then you would understand, you would understand that causality would be meaningless.

DB: Ok.

AD: Don't-- don't be agreeable, be disagreeable.

LR: Well it's a--

AH (simultaneously): Anthony--

DB (simultaneously): No, well--

AD: Think about [S simultaneously: Yeah.] what I'm saying.

VM: You're saying no individuals, no pralaya?

AD: Huh?

VM (simultaneously): Are you saying that? No individuals and then there's no pralaya? No individual souls?

AD (simultaneously): No, I'm saying if-- if all you have is an eternal fixed Idea of the entire cosmos, [S: Oh dear.] alright, from the point of view, you know, of metaphysics, [VM simultaneously: Right, it's all there now.] alright, then you have no causality.

AS: Right.

VM (simultaneously): Of course, of course.

AD: For who?

S: For the World-Mind.

VM (simultaneously): For the World-Mind, for the World-Mind.

AD (simultaneously): For the World-Mind.

AS: Right.

VM (simultaneously): Sure.

AD: How about you?

AS: No.

S: We make it up as we go.

AD (simultaneously): Alright, then the ultimate point of view is the point of view of the World-Mind, there's no causality. From our point of view there's *got* to be causality.

VM: Sure.

AS: Now--

LR (simultaneously): Can I ask some questions? I mean, Phil really [S simultaneously: Anthony--] wanted to ask a question.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, go ahead.

AH: I really like to hear him finish.

KD: Let him finish!

S: Right, [S simultaneously: Yeah.] uh-hm, uh-hm.

KD: We'd like to hear him.

AD: No, go ahead.

S: I'm--

KD: Why don't you finish Anthony?

AH: Would you please [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): I'm finished. You see, I'm trying to point out, there's a mistake here, the way PB presented it. I-- the word 'mistake' is perhaps too--

LR: Seems misleading.

AS: Misleading, a [AD simultaneously: Misleading.] misleading wording.

AD: I-- I would try to present it differently. I would try to present the inconvertible fact of the fixity of the World-Idea, alright, and then show that the introduction of our misleading conceptions such as a beginning in time can only take place because we're bringing in a subject. That's the way *I* would go about trying to explain [AS assents] it. Then I wouldn't get caught in this cul-de-sac.

VM: Uh-hm.

S: Uh-hm.

AS: But [AD simultaneously: You--] then the-- I would-- I mean would understand that from the point of view we've spoken about in Plotinus, that the universe is eternal because the Ideas themselves are eternal, and that there's no point at which you could speak-- the Ideas contain from the beginning the entirety of the universe and this Mind has this eternal vision of these Ideas and that's the sense in which they're uncaused.

AD: That's the [AS simultaneously: I don't--] sense in which they--

AS: That's the sense in which the c-- when he sa-- he says also that the universe-- he holds the eternal existence of the cosmos, not in sense of the temporal derivation but in the sense of-- uh-- Well, sorry Anthony. I lost it.

AD (simultaneously): Yes, I follow what you say.

AS: Ok.

AD: From a point of view [VM assents] of the Ideas of course the entirety is complete, there's nothing it has to do. [AS simultaneously: Ok, what--] In other words, from the point of view of the univer-- the Nous, the universe is a completed Idea.

AS: Ok, well is that the point of view you're saying-- if you say the universe is eternal, it's only from that point of view?

AD: Alright, yeah. Now if, let's say, if let's say you have this mosaic, the World-Idea, ok, complete, imagine that I got it all on this still.

AS: Right.

S (simultaneously): Right.

AD: Now, suppose now I introduce a subject by me taking a small little magnifying glass and starting somewhere there [diagram] [student assents] [AS: Right.] start slowly proceeding, going across. [AS: Right.] I've created time in the very perception-- in trying to perc-- you know, perceive the universe, I could only perceive a little bit of it, I've created, so to speak, the spatial temporal [AS simultaneously: And--] relationships and causality.

AS: And in fact that-- that magnifying glass will really be momentary whereas the original Idea is not momentary but eternal.

AD: Yeah, so the mosaic [AS simultaneously: So that--] is always completed [AS: But--] in itself, always is what it is. So then this [AS drawing] notion of causality is brought into actuality by the appearance or [VM simultaneously: The individual, yeah.] the functioning of a subject. [AS: Alright now, now my que--] Now that's the way I would work this-- these four paragraphs.

AS: Kathleen, if [DR simultaneously: Isn't this (few words inaudible)] we can't interact then we can't have a class.

AH: Yeah but I'd like to hear what Anthony was just saying.

KD (simultaneously): Yeah but let him finish Avery, let him finish first.

AD: Well, no, [AS simultaneously: Ok, ok, ok.] that's alright, let's continue now, let's pick it-- let's try to understand it in *that* way [AS: Right.] instead of the way he's presented in here.

THE SOLAR LOGOS DOESN'T EXPERIENCE MOMENT-TO-MOMENT MANIFESTATION AS TIME

AS: Ok well, if I try [AD simultaneously: Go ahead.] and draw a picture of that, [drawing] then why can't I say that this universal Intellect is this mosaic, this eternal intelligence [diagram]? Now this is the only prob-- now it's-- now I say-- I don't see why I can't say, ok, the World-Mind internally has an eternal vision of this. He does say that the World-Mind has an eternal vision of the World-Idea. But it also has, or maybe it, along with that, it's manifesting this-- as you say, this-- it's like this magnifying glass. So on the other hand, the World-Mind as emanating, [drawing] the Sun as emanating, finds itself in some part of that mosaic and is putting forth that imagination instant-by-instant. And even-- in that sense it seems that that aspect of the World-Mind is not e-- is not eternal as such. That's like the foundation of this becoming [diagram]. Now I don't see why you ca--

AD (simultaneously): You say that insofar that the Solar Logos is contemplating the universal Ideas, alright, [AS drawing] in that act of contemplation, by reflex, [AS: Right.] the universe comes into what we would call manifestation through the moment-by-moment notion.

AS: Right, and then--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, but the Solar Logos will not experience that as time.

AS: Right, but the individuals will.

AD: The ex-- yes, the individuals *put into* that will experience it as time.

AS: Right. Because if we could take the point of view of that Solar Logos, then we too would not experience time. We would be at the point of view of the *principle* of time. In other words it's like [drawing] saying this Solar Logos manifestation is the *principle* of time. But from its point of view its vision is eternal. But from the creatures within it you're saying they would experience that changing consciousness as time, [AD simultaneously: Yeah, right.] as a beginning and a past.

AD: Yeah, the point that you made just now is-- is all to it because that's the principle of time and as such it will not experience itself *in* time. So, if we want, if we want to start explaining now, well you know, causality, spatial-temporal relations, in other words the categories, you can't use that. They all have to

arise within us. So causality is the way that we are-- the way our mental functions are fabricating a perception gives rise to what we're going to call causality, space, temporal relations and all the rest.

AS: Yeah.

AH: Are there-- are there other problems besides epistemological ones in this view?

AD: Are there other problems? Oh, there's [AH simultaneously: Like, it seems that--] going to be a lot of them but--

S: Uh-hm.

S: Yeah.

AH: It seems that all problems would be epistemological ones.

AD: It's not a question of a problem, I-- the point is this here. What [S simultaneously: Ok.] I'm trying to do is reset these four paragraphs in a different way so I could understand what he's trying to get at. Otherwise what I'm going to come up with is-- what I come up with is what I don't think he's intended.

AH: Anthony, you seem to have made a distinction between metaphysics and epistemology that I'd like to understand more clearly.

VM: Yeah.

S: But why?

AD: Well, epistemology is concerned with how do I know what I know.

AH: Yes. Yes.

[student assents, faint]

AD: Metaphysics of course is concerned with the rules or let's say the principles of ontology, of Being that's(--) Being itself. Now, in Being itself, alright, and if I'm saying that the World-Idea is the Nous, is Being itself, then the only way that I can bring in the fact that it is sensible being is to introduce an epistemological subject who's fabricating perceptions [AH: Yes.] of that Being-in-Itself. [students assent, very faint] Now, that's the way I think that these four paragraphs have to be handled, otherwise I can't see this, you know-- I can't see what he's doing here.

AS: Yeah. I just-- it's still not--

AD (simultaneously): I'm bringing out my own personal and private doubts.

AS (simultaneously): It's-- it's still not clear why the source of this epistemological-- of *all* the epistemological subjects should still be-- what-- as you said, fabricating perceptions, it seems that that *is* the job of a Sun Soul is to fabricate perceptions [AD: Yeah.] out of this eternal vision. Out of the eternal vision that it has within itself it has to fabricate perceptions for all the creatures within it because these creatures cannot grasp eternal visions, they can only grasp the fabricated perceptions, and those fabricated perceptions must be the instantaneous world-image that they receive that the World-Soul or the Sun Soul has-- has fabricated for them.

AD: So-- so then--

AS: I-- that's-- I mean I-- that's the way I would look at it.

THE SOUL OPERATING THROUGH A BODY GIVES RISE TO NOTIONS OF SPACE, TIME, CAUSALITY; SAUTRANTIKA SCHOOL

AD (simultaneously): So then in this-- in this third paragraph, he abolishes the metaphorical-- metaphysical truth of the notion of causality. He cancels the ultimate truth of [AS simultaneously: Oh yeah.] the law of cause and effect which governs--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe," p. 28, AD reading]: "When we recognize that the chain of reciprocally-dependent links which constitutes [AD reads: constitute] a cause is beginningless and endless we have to drop causality as a metaphysical principle."

AD: Uh--

AS: Right.

AD: It don't fit. That-- [AS simultaneously: Yeah.] those passages don't fit in there.

S: [couple words inaudible]

LR (simultaneously): I don't understand you.

AS: Huh.

LR: I-- I--

AH: If you're going to-- if you're going to [couple/three words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): For the very reason, for the very reason that Avery just announced.

LR: I don't follow. Sorry but--

AS (simultaneously, in background): Maybe 'cause Avery said it. (AS and VM laugh)

LR: We could go on but I'm just very lost.

AS (simultaneously, in background): The [couple inaudible VM words simultaneous with AS] parrot just talks, he doesn't explain.

VM (to AS): Right. (VM laughing)

AD: Well, what was it he just said? He just said that the Solar Logos is concerned with the organization or the fabrication of the way we can perceive the world. In other words, it is concerned basically with the organization of (a/the) perceptive faculty. This is what the Solar Logos is concerned with. [AS assents] Let's try to simplify that even more. What we're saying is that somehow God has to create creatures in such a way, or that these creatures function in such a way that when they perceive, there arises this notion of space, time, and cause. [AS assents] So for instance, in the universe itself there's no such thing as a beginning. We said that the cosmos is an eternal Idea. Well, the moment I'm born, alright, and I start functioning in the world and I become two, three, four, five, why is it I have the notion that there's a

beginning to things? [S: Yeah.] It's not in the universe itself. So where can it be? Well it has to be in me because at some point I came into existence, I appeared, alright, [AD snaps fingers] boom!, I'm going to surmise that everything, alright-- unconsciously I'm going to surmise that everything is-- had a beginning at some time or other, [LR: Because of body, right?] because *I* started that way.

LR: Because of body, the principle of body?

AD: Well, it's gotta-- it's gotta-- [LR simultaneously: What do you mean "I"?] body's gotta be understood in this very profound sense that body is fabricative of perception. As soon as the soul enters into body, there's a beginning to things. [student assents] So in other words my learning is phylogenetic and ontogenetic, I'm not learning in a vacuum. I learn that there's a beginning to time because I myself came into a beginning. But isn't that a lie, did the soul ever have a beginning?

S (simultaneously): (Yeah/No), right, yeah.

AS: Yeah, yeah.

AD: Now this is the interesting thing and very important thing because in the Sautrantika school they-- they try to show that all our knowledge is based on generality-meanings. Isn't that the term they use? What does that mean? Generality-meanings. Well any experience I have, I'm going to generalize on it. Alright, this is what I'm saying. This is where the work should've been done on the fact that-- that the mental faculties, the functions, is what creates for us these fictions that there's such a thing as a beginning. If cognition was truly cognition, I would never say that there was a beginning.

AS: Right.

AH: Are there-- are there non-fictions [AS simultaneously: Cognition is true.] within--

AD: Are there what?

AH (simultaneously): Are there non-fictions among the mental faculties?

AD: Are there non-fictions?

AH: Are there any *non*-fictions?

AD: Well, [S simultaneously: Truth, uh-hm.] I don't know. All I'm saying is that if cognition was true, then I couldn't come up with a lie. I wouldn't come up and believe that there's a beginning to the world. But cognition isn't true because cognition is based on the way my psychosomatic organism operates. I'm basing my understanding on the empirical world.

AH: With spatial and (time/timing) [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] principles and-- The dis--

AD: So there's a beginning.

S (possibly part of background): Yeah.

VM/AH(?): I don't--

AD (simultaneously): Imagine a dream, right, a dream is the same thing, [student assents] there's a (AD snaps fingers) beginning to the dream, there's an end to the dream, you remember when it started, you

remember when it ended. You get up and you say, “Well in the beginning of the dream,” alright, and most people, you know, say “It started this way and ended that way.” You get the feeling, “Ah, look, this is where the notion of “beginning” comes, this is where the notion of “finis” comes from.” They don’t exist in the universe. Have you been around to see its beginning or its end? Think about it for a while and you begin to understand what I think the Sautrantikas are claiming, and what even Jung claims when he says that what we call reason is an adaptation to biology.

AH: In the sense Anthony that the-- the process is seen as an epistemological one at the level of cognition for the Sautrantika.

AD: Well [AH simultaneously: That--] I-- I don’t know.

AH: They really elaborated the whole theory of cognition to ex-- everything is included there so it’s--

AD: Yeah.

[simultaneously] [student assents, faint]

AH: Gen-- generality.

AD (simultaneously): Alright, but you follow what I’m doing now?

AH: I would like to ask a question. You said that the notion of causality that’s posited in this chapter is-- that’s not in question, but what’s in question is this-- the description that follows the positing of this-- we have to-- we have to discard the metaphysical notion of causality, and are you suggesting that the next few paragraphs speak in such a way that we could perhaps think in a causal way about-- Go ahead.

AD: Well, no, if you follow the consequences of the premises I’m working with, then when he says here-- when he s-- when he says that causality-- that in the universe causality cannot be understood because there’s so many links, there’s so many factors involved in any one situation. In other words, this happened because an infinity of causes is behind it that made it happen. [AH: Yes.] Now I’m going to say that’s not the way to do it, alright now, please don’t misunderstand. [S simultaneously: I-- I understand what you’re saying.] You know I love you-- you know I love PB. But I gotta say this because I think it’s valid. I would say that’s not the way I’d work at it. I’m not-- if I go to the infinity of causes that are involved in the pr-- in the production of this one o-- this one event, alright, then I’m leaving the subjective world, alright, and I’m going back to that cosmic Idea and I’m trying to pick out all the factors in that cosmic Idea that are making up that one event. And I would say that’s where you’re coming from when you say there’s an infinity of causes that are bringing about that event. [AS assents] Now I wouldn’t do that. I would say I have to understand the causes, the epistemological causes, that bring that event about for *me*. There-- I can’t do the other one, [AH: Yes.] I can’t possibly look at the World-Idea and pick out all the causes and say they-- that-- they gave rise to this event because I would be claiming that I, first of all, have contact with that World-Idea, that I could pick out all the little causes involved in creating this one event. Whereas if I say, no, insofar that this epistemological subject functions in the way he does, and I’d have to itemize all these various ways that he functions, then that will explain the arisal of that event better than trying to get to the causes that are in the World-Idea.

AH: Yes, I understand.

AS (simultaneously): I-- but-- but if I-- I-- I think that's what he's saying though, actually.

AD: You think that's what he's saying?

AS (simultaneously): Yeah, we went-- a few weeks-- a few weeks ago we went through. He says--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe," p. 28, AS reading]: "Such a situation demolishes the metaphysical truth of the old notion of causality, although it leaves it quite untouched for practical purposes [AS reads: Such a situation demolishes the old truth, ok, cancels the ultimate truth, although it leaves it immediately untouched]."

AS: It seems that the immediate way that it is untouched, if I *just* consider like the factors that are in *my* natal chart, then that's-- you're s-- I mean maybe this is an interpretation too but, he's saying that if I just consider the factors that are in *my* natal chart I *can* understand causality. The factors that constitute me have determined my perception. But if I try and look to-- but if I do try and look to the World-Idea, to this chain going back to the beginningless past, then he says I can't know all the factors because in those terms only God knows all. So-- I mean I think that's what he comes to at the end. There will always be other factors which have not been ascertained, only God knows the World-Idea, but if I do just restrict my vision to what epistemological factors have caused-- have caused my world to be the way it is, I could find those out just by looking at-- at my own-- in my own make-up? See, I don't know, I thought there was still-- there was still one other level of-- I thought there was one other level of causality too that he ha-- that we didn't talk about Monday. Well, so--

AD (simultaneously): Well, of course I appreciate that Avery.

AS: Right. I mean-- I thought the third-- the third kind of causality that also-- that cancels *both* of those, as it were-- I mean, on the one hand you have the World-Idea which is so infinitely complicated that only God can understand it. So clearly we can't understand what makes us up. Ok. But from a relative point of view we can understand that all our perceptions are determined by the kind of vehicle we have, and that-- and more immediately that's the cause of each instant, that is the cause of our world, and we *can* see that. But in some way we can also-- but, it seems that there's a view, the original view we had seems to transcend both of those in saying that, no, it's actually-- a third way to understand the universe is just the self-manifestation of Mind, and that's not a caus-- that's not causal at all. That's just saying that every--

AD (simultaneously): Well you see, you see I'm not-- I'm rejecting that as an explanation.

AS: Yeah, the third one.

AD: Yeah, when he brings in Mind as an explanation I'm rejecting that, [AS simultaneously: Right, I think--] because that to me is no explanation.

AS: Exactly, that's what I'm-- I-- yeah. I think he's saying that's no-- that's not cau-- that's non-causal or, I mean that--

AD (simultaneously): Exactly, that's non-causal.

AS: I mean I don't know-- I don't know what you (want/mean).

S: What is non-causal?

S: The Mind.

AS (simultaneously): The f-- you can't-- it's like saying a con-- the relation of consciousness and contents is a non-causal relation or that [LR simultaneously: Can I--] Mind appears [S simultaneously: Well can--] as the universe.

ARE THERE ONTIC CAUSES?; PHILOSOPHY INCLUDES BOTH THE DUAL AND NON-DUAL POINTS OF VIEW

LR: I'd like to ask a couple questions.

AS (simultaneously): Yeah I'm sorry, go-- go ahead.

VM: Yeah.

LR: The first one-- [AS simultaneously: I don't know.] well let me ask this-- my second question first because it's on this. I don't-- I need to follow ev-- never follow this idea that causality gets canceled, the notion of causality gets canceled with-- when you go beyond epistemology. And-- I'd really like to see the way in which-- I mean, perhaps some kind of causal-- causality gets canceled when you go beyond the idea of the epistemological subject but I still see the principles as causal of the manifestation and I-- I don't see why that has to be dropped. I mean, isn't there such a thing as principial causality or logical, I mean-- Maybe it's called something else and that's why I don't understand it but to say that there are no causes past epistemology I just don't follow what that means. Aren't there ontic causes? Aren't there different levels of--

AD: [AD demonstrating] You know what that is?

S: [couple words inaudible]

LR: Please [S simultaneously: What?] try again.

AD: Come on.

LR: Red says-- (bit of laughter)

AD: It's a brain sucker.

S: Ok.

S (simultaneously): And he's almost--

S (simultaneously): Almost--

LR (simultaneously): Starving to death?

AD: And what is it doing?

LR (simultaneously): He's studying.

AD: Starving to death. Remember that? (laughter, student words) Well, let's try, let's try because that's [RG simultaneously: But I--] gotta be-- (getting me) done.

LR (simultaneously): I don't see it, I don't think we've ever dealt with causality [couple/three words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Oh yes we have.

RG: And to [S simultaneously: We have.] paraphra-- and to paraphrase Linda's question, you could do the same thing for me if you want, um--

LR: Tauruses have thick skulls Anthony. (bit of laughter)

RG: Inso-- to me--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah but, Taurus forces me to think.

RG: If you only hold to the epistemological level of conceiving of causality, we come under the same criticism that Jung leveled at philosophy. [S simultaneously: It's ok.] In other words, because you're i--

AD: Oh no, no, no, philosophy includes both points of view.

RG: Well, ok, then there has to--

AD (simultaneously, intensely, banging noises as AD speaks, possibly AD banging on something): Philosophy is the non-dual point of view *and* the dual point of view.

RG: Then there has to be a way--

AD (simultaneously): So I shut up-- I shut Mr. Jung up.

RG: Well, we have to do it on his point also 'cause he--

AD (simultaneously): No philosopher is told to trip over the chair as he's walking through the room because he can't see it.

S: Right.

AS (chuckles): Yeah, right.

AD (simultaneously): No, what you mean is Jung's *interpretation* of what philosophy is.

RG: Right. But I'm-- [AS simultaneously: It's all (there), yeah.] I'm asking that in-- at this level of understanding, if you limit yourself and say only because of my knowing do I then posit history, do I then posit historicity--

AD: Not my knowing but knowing. [AD bangs on board]

RG: Knowing.

AD: Individual knowing.

RG: Individual knowing, yeah.

AD (simultaneously): Uh-huh.

RG: Does that include a-- how-- what kind of souls does that include? Is it just-- couldn't we include a c-- a cosmic soul and a--

AD: Sure.

RG: It could.

AS: Yeah.

RG: Ok.

S: Any--

RG: So this level of talking about the universe and the World-Mind is not the same level as talking about one cosmic soul.

AD: Uh-hm.

RG: Talking about the totality of all cosmic souls that are held in one eternal vision.

AD (simultaneously): Well in principle, in principle, alright, if we-- if we speak just in terms of principle, could you speak of causality when you're in the realm of the non-dual?

RG: No.

AD: Alright.

RG: No, in the realm of Being you can't.

AD: But, does that cancel out the existence, so to speak, of the *dual* viewpoint?

RG: No.

AD: Alright, so then we have to maintain both points of view all the time, and philosophy is, if it's philosophy, both points of view are always available to it.

RG: Right.

AD: And it's not going to deny one for the sake of the other.

RG: Right.

AD: Because if it does that it's going to be catastrophe. Alright so, we're pretty safe. But let's try to understand this thing that *she*'s talking about, [RG: Right.] that beyond epistemology there is no causality, let's try to understand her.

RG (simultaneously): Ok. And wouldn't you say at the level of-- of a co-- of a cosmological understanding you conceive of causality and an inflowing and a--

AD: Only-- only from our point of view.

[student assents]

RG (simultaneously): Only from our point of view.

AD: An epistemological subject's point of view.

RG: Why not from a cosmological subject's point of view?

AD: You mean like from the point of view of the cosmic soul?

RG: I guess. I mean you've taught-- I mean I don't-- I mean, if--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, go ahead.

**# THERE IS NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN LATENT AND ACTIVE MANIFESTATION
FOR THE SOLAR LOGOS, IT DOESN'T COGNIZE SENSIBLY**

RG: --if you talk about a cosmic soul as-- as appearing and then not appearing or as arising and that there are many cosmic souls and many Sun Souls for many different cosmoses--

AD (simultaneously): Well, you-- if you remember, the way I put it before was something like this. That this distinction does exist, for us. [AS: But not for him.] But to speak about this distinction existing for the Solar Logos, that is, between time and timelessness, is really to like, you know, over-- over-extend our understanding. Because from their point of view this doesn't exist, this distinction between time and timelessness. [students assent, faint] Otherwise we would also have to say that between the Soul of the Sun and the body of the Sun, the sensible body, there's distinction. And between the Soul of the Sun and the Intellect of the Sun there's a distinction. [student assents] And then we wouldn't be able to say that the-- what is Intellectual in the Sun is immediately available to the body. You wouldn't be able to say that, we'd have to say that there's these differences and distinctions that it must run through before it manifests a universe. This is in no way what the Solar Logos or Ishvara is like.

[student assents, very faint]

S: Definitely.

AS(?): So-- so then--

AD (simultaneously): Now, you see how much of it depends on the semantics of the case rather than, you know, our understanding. It's-- we've got to say it in a certain way, otherwise we're in trouble.

RG: Let me try just one other way. So you're saying that for any cosmic soul or any non-epistemological subject, [background whispering, AD involved] that ev-- I mean the view of a-- an appearance and a cosmos or of a universe app-- going in and out of manifestation is ridiculous.

AD: Oh yes, when he says here "latent" and "active", that's nonsense.

RG: Yeah. "Latent" and "active" are only for us.

AD (simultaneously): Look, look. If we say-- yeah, if we say that this is the World-Idea, the-- this eternal mosaic, alright, what-- what does it mean to speak about latent and active there? Isn't it meaningless?

[student assents, very faint]

AH: It's from the point of view of the subject.

LR: Yeah but wait, that's-- but where is that at?

AD (simultaneously): Now look, look. You just said, we just said, that to the World-Mind [student assents] the World-Idea is an eternally fixed Idea. [student assents] It's not going to go around changing the Idea as the centuries go by-- "Oh wait, let me alter this a little bit, change that a little bit." Ok? You [student assents] remember we spoke about that, [AH: Yes.] the possibilities [student assents] that are in the World-Mind have all been actualized. It isn't a question it's going to actualize some now and some later. If you don't understand these-- these preliminary premises, we're not going to understand that this fixed World-Idea includes what you might call the active and the passive aspects of it existing simultaneously with it. [LR: Yeah--] It isn't that you have part of the World-Idea, then you have pralaya, then you have another part of the World-Idea, then pralaya. What kind of fixed World-Idea we're talking about? You're-- you're basing yourself on a concrete sensible understanding of what the World-Idea is.

[students assent, faint]

AH (simultaneously): Is it appropriate to speak of "latent" and "active" from that point of view of concrete understanding?

AD: From the concrete understanding only.

AH: Yes, uh-hm, yes.

LR (simultaneously): But, why-- but why-- I mean you don't have to maintain that the World-Idea is partial to say that there's evolution in the World-Idea, it just means that the manifestation of it is evolving. In other words, you could have that, you could have the actual-- the total actualization of the whole World-Idea and still see that here it's evolving. I don't see why you can't do that.

AD: *Within-- within* the World-Idea you could speak of evolution, not-- [LR simultaneously: Then what--] not if it's a cosmic Idea.

LR: Ok. But isn't the Solar Logos itself something, a Soul, a subject which is-- which his vision itself is expanding?

AD (simultaneously): Oh no, no, no don't use that analogy. It--

LR (simultaneously): But you-- no I have to because just--

AD: The Solar Logos is like a World-Mind. Why do you have to use that analogy?

AS (simultaneously): And, in fact, it's-- it *is* a World-Mind. (AS laughs a bit)

LR: Because, I'll [AD simultaneously: Go ahead.] say why. Because of some of the things you said about, even to the Solar-- this is the-- this is where I-- my question comes from, when you said even to the Solar Logos there is no latent-- no difference between a latent manifestation and an active manifestation. And I-- I have a big question for it, because you say that idea of latency only arises with a subject. And insofar as the whole universe is participating in the body of or is within the body of that Solar Logos, it would seem that that Solar Logos would be very aware of whether there was sensible manifestation or subtle

manifestation going on. I mean it *would* make a difference whether it was sensible or not. Now it doesn't change the World-Idea to say that.

AD: No, no, no, you-- you see what you just did, what you just did was to give the Solar Logos the cognition like a sensible [AS simultaneously: Oh I see.] creature.

S: Uh-hm.

RG: Uh-hm.

AS: I see. Linda, you know, when you sa--

LR (simultaneously): Why couldn't it have prajna? Why (doesn't/does it)--

AD (simultaneously): I'm telling you, it's not the way it is!

LR: Well-- [AS simultaneously: I (few words inaudible)] yeah alright, if you just want me to say ok--

AD (simultaneously, intensely): Its cognition in no way-- its cognition in no way is sensible.

AS: I believe you, I do.

LR (simultaneously): Well I believe you [AD simultaneously: You--] but I don't understand you.

AD (simultaneously): You don't have to.

AS: Yeah, Linda--

AD (simultaneously): You could go on fighting with me.

AS: Li-- Linda--

LR (simultaneously): No, I don't want to, I just, you know, it's a question [AS simultaneously: (It/If--)] of believing it or understanding.

AS: You know when you just said *when* it-- I think the thing you said, you said *when* it knows its body is manifesting, and then you said when it knows it unmanifest. [student assents] I think what he's trying to say is that both those-- those-- the cycle in-out in-out in-out is got to be known, from its point of view, as-- as eternal. Because otherwise you say it knows it when it's-- it knows it's manifested *now* and then now it's not?

JL/S(?): That's only from the lower, isn't it though?

AS: No, I got what she-- no, she doesn't want-- I won't try but she want-- she wanted--

LR (simultaneously): Yeah, yeah, you could try, I just don't follow yet.

[student assents, very faint]

AS: It was you-- your [AD/S(?) simultaneously: Well--] statement, you made the statement, you said doesn't it know when there's manifestation and when there's not manifestation?

LR: Yeah, yeah. So?

AS: But, from its [LR simultaneously: I said that, so?] point of view there's *always* manifestation and not-manifestation.

LR (simultaneously): Yeah, in subtle form or in sensible form.

S: No. [couple words inaudible]

AS (simultaneously): No, no, no, I mean I think he's saying that it--

S (very faint in background): Yeah, right.

LR: Is there no difference?

DB: For us there is.

AS (simultaneously): Isn't that difference too within its eternal vision?

S: Yes.

LR: But there-- but you can't deny the difference.

AD: No one's denying the difference, what we're-- what you have to clear up here in your understanding is that the knowing that the Solar Logos works with is not of that nature that you can use a word like 'manifest' and 'unmanifest'. [VM simultaneously: Or 'when'.] Its understanding is not based on that. It doesn't understand that way. The word 'manifest' and 'unmanifest' is for us.

LR: I know, I heard you say it, I mean [one/two words inaudible]

LD (simultaneously): So you're saying that [S simultaneously: Right.] sensibility only arises when the individual su--

AD (simultaneously): Now, now, now-- now just common sense, I mean, you don't have [AS assents] to even be a philosopher. (AS laughs a bit, students assent) Does the World-Mind know this pole the way I know it!!!

Few students at once: No.

AD: Well then why argue it?

S: Yes, it really is.

LR: No, I'm really not [AS/S(?) simultaneously: You can't have it two ways.] trying to say--

DR (simultaneously): But the other side of it is that, is the process of unfoldment of the universe as we know it in time through, you know, the course of eons, is that totally unknown to the Solar Logos, is that only [couple/three words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously, intensely): I didn't say that the-- I didn't say-- I didn't say that the Solar Logos doesn't know that pole. I said it doesn't know it the way *I* know it!

LR: Yes, and isn't that--

DR (simultaneously): So--

AD (simultaneously, intensely): The Solar Logos doesn't have sensible knowledge!

DR: But there-- but if there is some--

AD (simultaneously, intensely): Now wait a minute Dave. If it doesn't have sensible knowledge, how are you going to use the word 'active' and 'latent'?!

[student assents, faint]

LR: Because there's a reality to the evolving-- to the--

DR (simultaneously): I don't know how I'm going to-- how I'm going to say whether it is [LR assents] active or latent, I don't have a direct answer yet, but I do have a strong idea--

AD (simultaneously): Well then you better stop [one/two words inaudible] till you get one.

DR: What?

AD: Stop and try to get one.

DR: Well, that's what I'm looking for. If I say that--

AD: How does it know then?

DR: If I say that it only knows by grasping the entirety in one whole--

AD (passionately): No that-- even that, even that's bunk. By "grasping the entirety" (AS laughing) you get the feeling here's the World-Mind [AD bangs on board] "I got everything!" (laughter) That's not what I mean when I said "grasp everything".

DR: Well, to say the universal-- if you say the World-Idea is eternal, that there is no latency and no activity, then the image that I get is that there's one completed picture for all time that it knows. [AS simultaneously: But that's not a picture.] And that is its Idea.

AD (simultaneously): Well, even that's not proper. [AS assents] [DR simultaneously with AS and AD: I didn't think so.] Even that's not enough.

AS: It's not a picture.

AD: Well, I think we're getting off the point if we try to discuss and understand [student assents] the nature of the World-Mind's cognition. (bit of laughter) But I can tell you from one point of view, and it truly-- it-- a real point of view, it's not sensible. [student assents] And it would-- to the World-Mind there's no such thing as manifest and unmanifest, active and, so to speak, passive. [VM simultaneously: Before and after.] Those are words that we use. It doesn't *have* those words. In other words, if there's a withdrawal of, let's say, the manifested universe, what is withdrawn?

[student(s) assenting]

LR: It's not far--

AS (simultaneously): Yeah, what is [DB simultaneously: Me.] withdrawn?

DB: Me.

LR (simultaneously): The qualities.

S (possibly part of background): [few words inaudible]

DB (simultaneously): Wouldn't it be the subjective source of consciousness?

AD (simultaneously): Wouldn't it be the sensible qualities of the object?

DR: Alright, [S: Uh-hm.] alright.

AD: So if in a dr-- if you're having a dream and the sensible qualities of the object are withdrawn, does that mean that the dream has been withdrawn? That the complex factors that all make that dream to be what it is, they're withdrawn too?

DR: Well now it's in latency.

AD: That's what *we* say.

S: It's always been there.

LR (simultaneously): Yeah but what--

DR (simultaneously): Right, that's how [S simultaneously: Yeah.] you view the dream.

AD: That's what *we* say. Now [DR: Right.] would [student assents] the Solar Logos say that, "Now it's in latency"?

DR: I don't know.

AD (simultaneously, intensely): Was there ever a removal of the essence?

S (possibly part of background): [few words inaudible]

LR: No but what-- but--

DR: But even so then, I mean when [AS simultaneously: (couple/three) 'cause--] we speak of the universe, whether I comprehend--

AD (simultaneously): She's going to beat you up when you get home. (AD laughs, some laughter)

DR: When--

AD: Don't let me argue this point.

DR: I don't really want to see what the World-Mind's view is. I just want to know what you say the universe, and we're talking about what this universe is, I have to have some idea what we're dealing with.

AD (simultaneously): Well that's why, that's why it was absolutely necessary to bring in the epistemological subject.

DR: Is that the only way we can speak of the universe?

AD: I don't know of any other way. Any other way takes you right to the Void. I mean if you're in the Void there's no universe there. [student assents] The universe comes out of there, but so does the subject.

DR: So the entire process, this process of ever-becoming, this gradual process of manifestation, this is all in epistemology.

AD: What's becoming?

DR: These sensible qualities are unfolding.

AD (simultaneously): Well, wouldn't you say that a *subject* is becoming, a *mind* is becoming?

DR: Alright.

S: Becoming.

S: Become, uh-hm.

AS: An individual mind.

S: Uh-hm.

DR: And let's say the development of all these minds in totality, that's--

AD: That's exactly the Buddhist position. [student assents, faint] That's the world you're talking about, the functioning of all these minds here [diagram].

DR: Is-- is that e-- is that epistemology?

AD: Yeah. And that's *their* epistemology too. In other words, if we say the kinetic memory of your mind is what gives rise to the world that you're experiencing, that's the way the Buddhists would put it. This is what he's doing too. But, as I'm trying to say, in these paragraphs he did not succeed.

MIND IS NOT THE CAUSE OF ANYTHING

S: Anthony, [S simultaneously: True.] when-- when he says the chain of causation would go back and back and it stops in Mind, what you want to say is it starts with an individual rather than it stops in Mind, you know.

AD (simultaneously): No, because-- because then he would [AS simultaneously: (Right.)] have to say, you would have to say that the Idea of the universe is something which arises within the Mind, the World-Mind. The World-Mind, so to speak, has this whole Idea in front of it which is beginningless and endless, alright, alright. So then, if-- if that is so, when this World-Idea arose out of the World-Mind, so he's tracing the world back to Mind. Whereas I'm saying no, causality [student assents] would have to be traced within the Idea of the universe and not going back to Mind. [students assent, faint] Because there's nothing to trace back into the Mind. If you go into the Mind you're not going to find it be the *cause* of anything. [students assent] You'll go into a non-dual point of view, there's no causality to talk about.

S: But with the Ide-- with the arisal of the Idea of the universe, that would be-- with the arisal of the Idea of the universe, that would be the first arisal of its causes or [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): That's as far back as you can go if you want to trace what causes give rise to other things.

S: Not--

AD: To go back-- to go back-- in other words, to trace the Idea back into the Mind, you will not be able to come up with anything because you're going into *nothing*. [following sentences spoken very intensely] So you can't say that that's the *cause* of anything! If I trace an idea back into my mind and my mind is nothing, how could I say nothing is the cause of something?!

RG: Emptiness.

AD: Yeah I know, that's the word that they like to use.

RG: No but then--

AS (simultaneously): Nothing is its own cause.

RG (simultaneously): But Anthony, in the sense of-- pick a dream for example where I'm-- I follow what you're saying I think in that you have to establish the World--

AD (simultaneously): You see-- yeah, Richard, I just gotta make this comment. You see, the way-- the way I operate is something like this. That to me is wrong. I gotta get around it. What do I do? I get around, start thinking creatively of another way of explaining it, rather than banging my head about the fact that I don't like this explanation or I consider-- consider it wrong. I'm never going to be creative, alright, if I keep thinking about those paragraphs which I think are wrong. So I start rethinking the whole thing over! (laughter) "Well, how else can I do it, how else can I say it?" And then I gotta come up with my own ideas. And this is what we don't like to do.

[student assents, very faint]

AD: Well, [RG: Fair enough.] alright, now go back to your [one/two words inaudible]

RG (simultaneously): I-- I think-- I think your point is, and let me just try to rephrase it so that I understand it, the World-Idea is where causa-- causality stops and that the-- the I-- the comprehension of the World-Idea as an eternal, fixed, total, inclusive picture of all-- of all possibilities is the prin-- the principle a priori of all [AD simultaneously: Yeah, yeah.] causality, ok, and then-- and you have to trace the universe back to that principle.

AD: Yeah.

RG: Ok?

AD: Or anything that arises within the universe back to that.

RG: Right.

S: Yeah.

RG: But in another way isn't there a way that-- when we say for example we have a dream, and you say you have a dream and you say what caused the dream. Now you can analyze the-- the psychological factors or the contents that went into making up your dream.

THE NOTION OF A BEGINNING ARISES WITH THE INSERTION OF A SUBJECT INTO THE COSMIC CIRCUIT

AD (simultaneously): Alright, let me [S simultaneously: (Exactly.)] give you an analogy this way. Imagine the cosmic circuit, [RG assents] ok? Now, you don't insert a subject in that cosmic circuit. Is there any notion of beginning or end to you?

RG: No.

AD: Doesn't the notion of beginning (and/or) end only arise when I insert you into that cosmic circuit? [students assent, faint] Now (AD snaps fingers) you say there's a beginning, there's an end. Now you say that there are mental factors, that there are so-called constituents that go into the making of the event and make it to be what it-- now you're getting my point.

DR: Anthony, I have some appreciation of what you-- of what you're trying to do, but it seems like there's still some gnawing difficulty that-- [AS: Yeah.] that has to do with this-- this notion of-- if you take all the unfolding entities, isn't there some overriding notion that you say "this is the universe of unfolding entities," and that universe is-- is a-- is something in its own right. And, you know, if that's the case (and/then) you still have to speak--

AD: This is the universe of unfolding entities [diagram].

DR: If you say that you can only speak of a beginning or end if you speak about one entity's appreciation of this Idea--

AD (simultaneously): If I speak about a subject, [DR simultaneously: Some subject.] a consciousness.

DR: Some subject.

AD (simultaneously): In other words, if I speak about a consciousness getting in circuit-- inserted into the cosmic circuit, he's going to say, alright, there is a beginning, there is an end, there are certain a priori principles that are organizing the experience I'm going to have. Is this so, I mean from what we understand of mentalism?

DR (simultaneously): Yeah, yeah.

S: Yeah.

AD: Then in that case, alright, then in that case what I'm saying is, if you want to get to the origin of a notion like beginning and end, you look to the subject inserted in the cosmic circuit. You don't look to the cosmic circuit without the subject, it's meaningless, there isn't any such thing.

RG(?): Right.

S(?): Right.

DR: I think I see. So now if-- if I then want to differentiate out what really is the universe in this subject's experience, then that would be another story. You'd want to say what's the origin of the Idea that this subject is experiencing and then you trace that to the universe. But that would no longer have those qualities of space, [student assents] time, causality.

AD: So, if I wanted to understand, alright, why-- why do I think that there's a beginning, [S: Right.] you know, why did Moses say that the world was created in six days, wouldn't I have to attribute that to the fact that a subject consciousness, by getting inserted into the cosmic cir-- circuit and understanding the cosmic circuit through the experience(s) that are acquired through the vehicle that it operates through, alright, that it's basing itself on *that* for its understanding of the world.

AS/S(?): Yeah.

DR: I don't know if I follow you.

[student assents, very faint]

[short pause]

DR: Could you just go over that?

AD: Let me try this way. You know, in some of the examples we use, maybe this might be meaningful. We speak about my soul or your soul, we speak about our Selfhood, we speak about our soul as participating in the Selfhood of the Sun. In other words, the Soul of the Sun and my soul are conjoined, they're the same. Ok?

DR: Right.

AD (simultaneously): Remember that, we spoke about?

DR: Yeah right.

AD: Now, the-- [1 1/2 second pause] The idea ran away.

DR: Where?

AD: It was there (in-- in my) [one word inaudible]

RG: Uh-hm.

AD: Anyway. Maybe if I talk a little bit it'll come back. Anyway, we do this. [S: Alright.] We imagine that the S-- the *body* of the Sun is creating the Solar cosmos, ok, our cosmos, and that the *Soul* of the Sun, alright, which is like the Father of us all, our Overself, alright, projects a soul into the cosmos. Now, what-- as I--

[Audio File 1984 0902a Ends]

[Audio File 1984 0902b Begins]

AD: Oh. Now, from the point of view, I want to understand causality, alright, if I don't have the individual soul entering into that cosmos but I think of this ceaseless eternal functioning of the planetary

systems, to speak about time in that kind of situation, to speak about beginning or end, or to speak about any particular event, is utterly meaningless. Because that's the cosmic circuit functioning in that pure eternal spontaneous wisdom. There is no time there. It doesn't have any notion of time. The soul doesn't have any idea what time would be or what a particular thing would be. Now how could it have an experience of a cosmos? Well, our Father sends us down, alright, he sends us down, he says "You go inhabit that body." And once the soul gets into that body, the consciousness must experience the functioning of that Solar system to the extent that it does through that body. Now what develops out of that is what we would call the phylo and ontogenetic development of the entity. This is where it's going to learn. Now, what would you attribute-- in other words, in the prior-- in the prior situation where the soul wasn't in the manifested vehicle, alright, you couldn't speak of causality. You can't speak of something coming before or after or doing this or doing that. You can't.

DR: Right, that's an attribute-- that's attributed to those [one word inaudible] right.

AD (simultaneously): So when can you speak about it? When you take a soul and you insert it into one of the bodies and now that has the experience of something happening before or after.

AS: Uh-hm.

AD: Alright?

DR (simultaneously): Yeah.

AD: But not when it's disembodied. Alright now, if we take the former to be metaphysical, then you can see that causality is meaningless there because everything is happening in a spontaneous way. There is no before or after, counting comes only with sev-- severation. What-- how do-- what's the word?

S: [one/two words inaudible]

AD: But as soon as we are *in* the body, now counting begins. Now, so to speak, we have items, pieces of knowledge. Right or wrong, we got pieces. Now you start speaking about "manifest" and "unmanifest".

AS: Hm.

DR: And now, in those descriptions, I mean there's a-- you can see that the distinction between what you gain by the universe, which would be the former, which would be what that world is in itself, which doesn't at all correspond to the ideas that we would ask af-- after having already experienced it in the second way, which was "When did it start?" Because it was all the [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Yeah so-- but the way you experience it in the second way, you see how irrelevant your questions would be in regard to the way it actually is. That's why I was trying to point out, to speak about active and latent is meaningless. That's only from *this* side...this side of death. Go ahead Anna.

AP: Well, um--

AD: All I wanted to do was try to work out these four paragraphs, that's all, and in order to do that I have to change what I understand he's saying to something I can understand. And I'm saying that if I'm looking for causality I will not look to the World-Idea, I would look-- to understand *practical* causality I would have to look to the subject. That's all I'm saying. Go ahead.

ORDER; HOW DOES THE SUN WORK?; MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE LIGHT

AP: Well just, when-- when you speak about the Solar Logos manifesting from instant-to-instant, is that what has to do with the fabrication of the bodies then?

AD: Yeah.

AP: So it has in the bodies based some kind of order or the-- not as we experience this time but it's--

AD: Order, the principle of order, is not causality.

AS: Nor is it in time.

AP: No, no, but some kind of ordering-- order that makes [one word inaudible] a form and in our consciousness.

AD: Well we're [S simultaneously: Yeah.] going to-- we're going to remark about how remarkable it is, you know, how well ordered everything seems to be. (some laughter) Of course some people might disagree (with--) (some laughter)

S: Yeah right. (S laughing, bit of laughter)

AS: But that-- but that's where Plotinus points out that even reason couldn't order the universe, it had to be a fixed, eternal wisdom at the level of Intellect, and that that order, what sets the universe in order is not some kind of process but it's like the-- it's the eternal vision or the eternal Intellect that's *ordered* and (that/then)-- [Note: Plotinus, IV.4.10-12.]

AD (simultaneously): You follow that?

S (very faint in background): (Think so.)

AS: And we take off from that, I mean--

AP: I--

AD (simultaneously): The Intellect, there is no ordering in the Intellect. It doesn't reason "I'm going to do something."

[simultaneously] [student assents, faint]

AP: No, no. I understand [AD simultaneously: Ok, you follow it, go ahead.] on that level that there is a (process) but what I was asking was, before, when we started class, you said that the Solar Logos manifests from instant-to-instant and I was trying to understand that, would that like-- from *our* point of view it may seem like that but evidently it's from the soul-- I mean it is something that we participate in that for us becomes the unfoldment of time [AD/S(?): Uh-hm.] and if I st-- it would have to do with the planetary circuit or some-- something so I was trying to understand what it is in the planetary circuit that becomes for us time and if that has to do with the fabrication of (body/bodies), that the Solar Logos fabricates the bodies for us.

AD: I'm sorry Anna, I lost the--

AP: Well, the-- the manifesting of instant-to-instant, this has to do with the planetary [students assent, faint] circuit or--

[student assents, faint]

AD: Yeah.

AP: And I was trying-- I was-- my question was about, in what way, how is it in oi-- if-- if we withdraw from it, if all creatures withdraw from the planetary circuit, what would be left? [TS, in background: Everyone.] Would there be any [few words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): I mean, what color is the green tree if no one's there to see it?

AP: No, would there be any reasoning-- any reasoning activity that you said manifests instant-to-instant?

AD: Any reasoning activity?

AP: Yes. But when you said it manifests instant-to-instant irrespective of our souls, what would that be? [students assent, faint] [couple/three words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): If I follow you, if I follow you, you're asking me: how does the Sun work?

AP: Yeah.

AD: Yeah. (laughter) Well, again, again, if you-- if you, you know, throw the mind out of gear, or if you throw the senses out of gear so that you're functioning only with the mind, one of the obvious things is this pulsation of light that takes place. This is the instant-to-instant that we're talking about, the Sun's effulgence. But if you ask me, "What's going on in that light?" I don't know.

AP: No, but this instant to-- isn't that from the point of view of the *individual* mind? It *appears* as-- I mean the individual mind is *fed* by the Sun and it feeds. As it feeds it's like this instant-to-instant. It's-- would you talk about it from-- irrespective of the individual?

AS: But the individual doesn't create that instantaneous transmission. I don't--

AD (simultaneously): You're asking me for something I have-- I have *no* idea. [student assents, faint] You're asking me, and again I'm going to repeat what I said before, how does this mystical light that the mystic sees, how does that fabricate the universe. I don't know.

AP: Uh-hm, I know.

AD: But I can tell you if you're in it you know that it knows everything that has to be done, and you won't know how it knows what it knows. [student assents] And I don't think the person who knows that knows how *he* knows it. (some laughter) That's why very often that experience, the person walk-- walks away, thinks he-- thinking he's omniscient. I can understand that divine madness. A person who has that experience does think he knows *everything*, and he walks away thinking he knows everything; and you dare not criticize him...at least then. (bit of laughter, student words) But it is in that light, and how it works, I got no clue.

TS: Could you stand a fairy tale on that?

AD: Sure, go ahead.

TS: Well, it's a little long.

AD: Little long? Well, do you have enough time?

S: Uh-hm. Have plenty of time.

AD: Will it be done before sunset? (some laughter)

AS: In fact, it'll be done *by* the sunset. (AS laughs)

TS: Yeah. Sure enough.

AD (simultaneously): Go ahead, Tim.

S: Uh-hm.

TS: I just have-- it was [couple/three words inaudible] it had to do with something we've been working on the Monday classes, we've been working on particularly. I'd like-- what do you think Avery?

AS: I don't know.

[couple students at once, few inaudible words, very faint]

TS (simultaneously): What? We'll go over that but--

AS (simultaneously): He-- I told you, you decide Tim.

TS: Well, it seems [AS simultaneously: You use your feeling.] to follow what you're doing a bit as an analogy but maybe we should do some paragraphs from this.

S: Yeah.

AS (simultaneously): Ok.

AD: Well I have to leave it entirely up to you because I don't know what you're referring to.

[student(s) assenting, very faint]

TS: Oh.

AS: Yeah.

[student assents, very faint]

AS: Well--

TS (faint in background): Hey Paul.

AS: He's got a fairytale about the way that this manifestation--

TS: Comes out of light.

AD: Comes out of light?

AS (simultaneously): Comes out of light.

TS: Yeah, the working with the idea of the photon and the wavelength.

AD: Oh. Well I'm sure Vic should be interested in it, I am.

TS: I've been trying to explain it to Vic, uh--

VM: I thought-- it was very brief and I'm help-- trying to help him with some of the mathematical aspect of it. It may be madness but it's interesting madness nonetheless.

[short pause]

TS: (What do you think), anything?

VM (simultaneously): I don't know, you-- I would suspect Tim that you're-- you need more than half an hour, you need, you know, some time.

TS: Ok.

VM: Otherwise, [students assent] otherwise-- no, otherwise it'll come out too jumbled and too confusing and sort of the beauty of it, it just--

TS: Well but, I should wait then but [VM simultaneously: Take it from somebody who's impatient.] it seemed like the analogy that-- well, I mean it seems like what were we doing there is a [VM: Yes.] very close analogy there.

VM (simultaneously): Yes, I think so.

TS: Ok.

KARMA DETERMINES THE GROWTH OF THE KNOWER; BECOMING AS A RECORD OF THE INDIVIDUAL SOUL'S DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERSTANDING

AH: Anthony, I have a short question.

AS: Uh-hm.

AH: Could I ask a short question? (bit of laughter)

BS (amidst laughter): (Short/Sure), it's everything.

AH: You describe this cosmic circuit as a unific situation and we've also described how we may speak of causality at the level of our cognition. Should we also *not* think of a causal relationship between that cosmic circuit and cognition? That's not a causal nexus there either, is it?

AD: A causal connection between?

AH: That cosmic circuit as a eternal, non-causal situation, cognition here where conventional causality is appropriately spoken of, and you take those two things, we can't connect those two things causally either. Is that so?

AD: Uh-huh, [AH: Yeah.] karma does that.

AH: What?

AD: Karma does that.

AH: But not a notion of causality.

AD/S(?) (very faint): Uh-hm, yeah, uh-hm.

AS (simultaneously): Karma *is* the notion of causality that connects them.

AH: Is it a billiard ball kind of causality?

AS (simultaneously): That's not the only kind of causality there is.

AD (simultaneously): You know, it's like you're asking, when do I reappear into the universe, alright, and when do I make my entrance again. You know, we all have entrances and exits. [VM simultaneously: 49 days.] Well-- I mean the time-- the time for your appearance is something which is a causal relation. I mean you're not inserted into any period of time but certain [AS simultaneously: It's not arbitrary.] periods of time. And that certainly depends on some kind of causal relation.

AH: So there is a causal nexus between the cosmic circuit and cognition.

AD: And cognition, yes. You see, the only place there isn't any [student assents] causal(--) causality, alright, and [couple inaudible AS words] we-- we should go back to these paragraphs, is we have to understand what does causality mean. Is it something-- if a person says-- ah, gone. A person says that causality isn't ultimate, alright, it's not real, it only exists practically. This is what he says here. Now-- again we-- here's the cosmic circuit, alright, this eternal spontaneous functioning of a universe which is already a totally accomplished fact [AD hits something]. [VM: Yeah.] The entrance and the exits that I make into that World-Idea are something which, let's say, is going to build the knower in me, the knower in me grows through those experiences. The knower in me through those experiences begins to understand that, you know, if you bring a bouquet of roses to the law of gravity it's not going to change its functioning. I begin to become impersonal after a period of time, I begin to understand certain things. Now, what I understand, alright, these things that I understand, is the very means that I'm go-- no, how did I put it? [44 second pause] I-- I think I'm too tired to--

DB: Anthony?

AD: Alright, just read the three paragraphs over and-- Go ahead, (Dave).

DB: I was just wondering if-- if you put-- what was being said could be phrased in the fashion that karma or causality was a-- a function of the individual's understanding or knowing and that depending on the level of the knowledge that's been built up and so forth over the appearances and so forth, that that would determine the type of causality that he was working with or capable of or whatever.

[students assent, very faint]

AD: Yes, we said that, [DB: Yeah.] but there was more that I was trying to say, and it was basically in reference to these paragraphs, that the explanation that PB started working out with when he starts that there is no particular moment in the universe, etc, that his whole-- this whole understanding, alright, was

based on the objective truths that are embodied in metaphysics or the understanding that the World-Idea is an eternally fixed Idea. And I simply wanted to point out that this was not adequate, that what has to be brought in is the intrusion of the subject into that cosmic circuit and the growth of his understanding through the experience in that cosmic circuit and that's the point that has to be followed up, not the fact that the objective universe, if we understood it properly, alright, would-- would not permit us to speak about things like causality. That's-- that in a thumbnail is what I was trying to get at.

AS: Uh-hm.

AD: And everything else seems to, you know, diverge or run away from that or doesn't want to get preoccupied with that notion.

BB: Well doesn't he later in the chapter get preoccupied with that? I mean isn't this--

AD (simultaneously): (Yeah/No), well show me, quote it.

BB: Well, when he starts dealing with the aspect of karma and the idea(s)(--/.)

AD: No, no, give me-- give me quotes, read the quote, uh--

BB: Well, I don't know why it's-- I was just-- all I was really going to say is is that I don't see where in the first three cha-- three paragraphs he deals with causality at all, I don't see where he [AD simultaneously: No, he doesn't--] deals with the idea of subject or-- or bringing a subject in. I think he's only making a-- a-- a statement here as to a general approach, a top down approach as to the-- how the cosmos and so forth, the universe, was born, and dealing with the concept of World-Mind and Mind. I-- I don't see that it's anything that, you know, that you can get into specifics about at that point, I think that later on he gets into the process, he gets into the idea of a subject and when he brings in the idea of karma later on, karmic impressions. But I don't know. [AD: Well--] It's been such a while since I've fully read this thoroughly, I've read it today but I just-- I'm just saying that, it seems to me, just from the-- the first three paragraphs that I think you're way off on a tangent. And I think that all he's doing is something very simple.

AD (simultaneously): No, I think you're off on a tangent, I think you people are off on a tangent, and I think PB is off on a tangent. I'm making myself very clear and I'm putting myself on a pedestal where you can throw tomatoes at me. (bit of laughter) [BB simultaneously: You'll throw 'em back.] I'm saying something which I don't want to say and which, you know, I should've learned from last week, shut up. But I'm going to say it again, the way I said last time and the way I told the two-- the Richards, that there's places here where he uses 'consciousness' the wrong way, where he uses the term 'mind' the wrong way.

AS: Yeah.

AD: You remember them, huh Richard?

RG: Uh-hm.

[simultaneously] [student assents, faint]

AD: Alright, now what I'm saying here is, he's going to say something here very specific. He's going to show us in this-- in these first two pages, alright, that our understanding, alright, is faulty, that the world the way it is is not according to our understanding. Such things as causality does not exist, and in order to prove the point that causality does not exist he has to take the world in its ideational state, he has to take the world or he has to think of-- he has to make us think about the World-Idea the way it is in itself, and he says now if you understand that, alright, you understand combined dependent origination, you understand spontaneous wisdom functioning, etc, etc. And I'm saying, that's not going to ever help me to understand, alright, the notion of causality. The only way I can understand causality is by introducing my subject into that objective fixed World-Idea. Then I can have an understanding of how the notion of causality, right or wrong, can arise, and why I can't use it to explain it. I know what I'm talking about Bob. [AS simultaneously: So-- so you s--] I get this all the time from a lot of people. When I make a remark, I've thought about it a long time. These are passages that I meditated on. I didn't *read* them. I went to work at night and *meditated* on that and when people wanted tokens I used to tell them, "Get in (there), stop bothering me!" (laughter, student words) I know. And I got a legitimate thing. If I'm not-- if I'm not correct, I want someone to show me why. [AS: So--] If PB taught me anything it was to think for myself. You think I'm going to forget that now? [AS hums in background] But you [AS simultaneously: (Oh boy.) Class over.] get your quotes. When you got something, you get the quotes out and I'll listen to them.

BB/S(?): Right.

AD: I've got a brain.

VM: Well--

AS: Ok.

AD: I have no wind. You finish it.

[couple seconds of faint background student talking]

VM: We are finished, it's time for meditation, isn't it?

[short pause, students shuffling about, background student talking/whispering]

S: Stand up?

BB/S(?): Yeah.

AD: Not this-- not yet, uh-- I think it's better if I meditate first and talk later.

S: Right.

AD: If I talk first, then I can't meditate, I-- I can't move.

AS: Well we'll change the order of how things happen to accommodate that.

AD: Well soon--

AS (simultaneously): But it's really arbitrary.

AD: Yeah, but it'll be getting cool pretty soon and that's what I really want.

AS (simultaneously): But it's-- it's also very arbitrary which way [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): I'm-- I'm in a fix because on the one hand I don't like the damn machine while we're trying to understand something and on the other hand shut off the machine and I-- I'm sweating.

S (simultaneously): Can't do it, there's no way.

AD: So, we'll wait a week or two when the weather's [one/two words inaudible]

AS: Uh-hm. You seem to be saying that becoming is a record of the individual soul's own development of understanding, and that-- [AD simultaneously: Of course, of course.] and that's what becoming is.

AD: And I'm not-- I'm never going to ascribe any other way.

AS (simultaneously): And-- and when he-- and when he says that all of the action through vision, anything which already has vision doesn't need to become. [students assent, faint] So--

AD: Doesn't start up!

S: Yeah.

AS: So, if you don't-- if you can contemplate you don't become. But if you're not contemplating then you're becoming. And contempla-- contemplation or-- becoming is just a falling away from contemplation. So if you're contemplating there can't be any becoming 'cause becoming-- *because*-- and that's *because* it's all within Mind, because the principle of manifestation is Mind. Manifestation just means it's aware to-- it's become aware to a subject. If your awareness is of eternal verities, then there's no becoming. Becoming-- becoming is just a--

AD (simultaneously): Yes, yes, you should've said that before.

S: Uh-hm.

[shuffling about, background talking]

[Audio File 1984 0902b Ends]