

**CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
September 19, 1984
PB PARAS; PHILOSOPHY;
TWO KINDS OF CONSCIOUSNESS**

TOPIC: PB Paras

SUBJECT: Philosophy

SUBSUBJECTS: Two Kinds of Consciousness, Sage, Serpent's Path, Mind, Buddhism, Vedanta, Nirvikalpa vs. Sahaja, Non-duality

CONTENTS:

TWO KINDS OF CONSCIOUSNESS

MOMENT-TO-MOMENT CONSCIOUSNESS

ONLY THE SAGE KNOWS BOTH KINDS OF CONSCIOUSNESS; VEDANTA VS. BUDDHISM

COLLECTION OF BEINGS COLLECTIVELY PRODUCE MANIFESTATION

WORLD-IDEA AS DISCONTINUOUS, EACH MOMENT CONTAINING WHAT HAS GONE BEFORE

BEING CANNOT EXIST

WE ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE MIND'S PRODUCTS, NOT THE MIND'S ESSENCE

COMBINING MYSTICISM AND METAPHYSICS TO BRING ABOUT PHILOSOPHIC REALIZATION OF THE OVERSELF

NIRVIKALPA VS. SAHAJA; SOUL AS ONE AND MANY

SERPENT'S PATH; NON-DUALITY

SUSTAINED CONCENTRATION ON THE VOID LEADING TO RECOGNITION OF I AM; MORE ON NIRVIKALPA AND SAHAJA

INCLUDING THE OVERSELF IN CONSCIOUSNESS ALONG WITH THE BODY, EMOTIONS, AND INTELLECT; MYSTIC AND PHILOSOPHER

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives*, published 1984-1988. Some Paul Brunton Notebook paras are, as of 2018, unpublished, and are noted as such.
- Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*
- Jeffrey Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness*
- C.G. Jung, CW 14, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*

- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)
- Ken Wilber, *Quantum Questions: Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists*

PLOTINUS QUOTES READ OR REFERENCED: VI.5.2

NOTES:

- This is the last class Anthony Damiani gave at Wisdom's Goldenrod; it was on a Wednesday.
- Excerpts from this transcript appear in *Astronoesis*, "Notes on the Solar Logos/Cosmic Soul," pp. 336-38.
- Anthony Damiani and WG group met with His Holiness the Dalai Lama Sept. 29, 1984, and therefore many WG classes in Aug-Sept. 1984 had at least a semi-focus on Buddhism.
- Partial transcript (Scan File 1984 0919C2-13R05.PDF) exists. There are also multiple other partial transcripts of this class, possibly as many as five or six. In 1993 this class was transcribed from the audio cassette tapes as part of the set for *Living Wisdom*.
- Unpublished PB paras, even if sourced, should be proofread.
- This class is related thematically to WG Classes 1984 0620, 0802, 0808, and 0822.

TRANSCRIBED Verbatim by IT 2017 (based on JF 2007 version). Reformatted from V11a version by JRM & JF 2019-2020, with TOC/Subheads by JRM. In 2023, IT reformats again to accord with new conventions, fixes prefatory matter and footer, updates audio file name, expands Subsubjects, alter some Subheads to make more accurate, completes Book List, adds Plotinus quotes section, fixes typos/minor errors, adds new notes within transcript. **Archival verbatim transcript – V14.1a.**

AUDIO FILES: 1984 0919a, 1984 0919b. [Note 1: "Tape" and "Side" refer to original audio cassette tapes later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files. Note 2: The first side of the first audio file and the first side of the second audio file is not in good shape and very difficult to hear in certain places.]

1984 09/19 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Philosophy; Two Kinds of Consciousness
Archival verbatim transcript

TWO KINDS OF CONSCIOUSNESS

[Audio File 1984 0919a Begins]

S: Next question.

S: [few words inaudible]

AS (simultaneously): Yeah but your history is so-- (some laughter) [very faint] Oh, you're welcome though. (some laughter).

[couple seconds of background student whispering]

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: "There are two kinds of consciousness, one is in ever-passing moments, the other ever-present. The one is in time, the other out of it. The ordinary person knows only the one; the enlightened sage knows both."

[16¼ second pause]

AD: It's a good project, go ahead.

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: "There are two kinds of consciousness, one is in ever-passing moments, the other ever-present. The one is in time, the other out of it. The ordinary person knows only the one; the enlightened sage knows both."

AD: Ah, David. [very faint] No more sleeping.

[40¾ second pause with flipping of pages, noises, background student whispering/talking]

AH: Tony? You think-- you think it's significant that--

AD (very faint): Is what significant?

AH: He's not describing one consc-- one consciousness manifested in two modes?

AD: No, read that again!

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: "There are..."

AD: We're going to get something straightened out tonight, Andrew.

AH: I hope so.

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: "There are two kinds of consciousness..."

AD (passionately): Not one consciousness with two modes. There are TWO KINDS.

AH: That's the question I asked, is it significant that it's described as two?

AD: Two kinds. [students assent, very faint] Ok.

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: “. . . one is in ever-passing moments, the other ever-present. The one is in time, the other out of it. The ordinary person knows only the one; the enlightened sage knows both.”

[11¾ second pause]

AD: Go ahead Andrew.

AH: I think it's significant that these described as two kinds of consciousness rather than the conventional conception of one consciousness manifest in different modes. I think there's a-- there's a-- an important thing there and I would like to understand it. What is meant by two distinct consciousness? Obviously the one that's manifest moment-to-moment can be spoken of as something belonging to an individual mind-stream.

AD: How about, how about the world we live in, the whole universe that we live in?

AH: That one too, uh-hm.

AD (simultaneously): Isn't that moment-to moment?

AH: That's moment-by-moment also.

AD: So then, so then the World-Idea and its contents are projected from moment-to-moment and is not an abiding consciousness.

AH: Yeah.

[short pause]

AD: What about the other?

AH: I think it's also significant that that other one is not described as mind but as consciousness.

[14½ second pause]

S: What do you mean by that Andrew?

AD: Well you still have to say something. (bit of laughter, student(s) assenting)

AS: The fact that it--

AH: Well, what-- what's a typical distinction we might make between the principle of mind and the principle of consciousness?

AD: Right now they're irrelevant, you could use either term, 'mind' or 'consciousness'.

AH: Alright.

AD: There are two kinds of mind or two kinds of consciousness.

AH: Alright, we're going to stop there.

AD (simultaneously): Doesn't matter.

AH: Ok.

AD: Alright, and he says one kind is a kind which is authentic, abiding, alright, always is what it is, doesn't change. And then there's the other kind which is constant from moment-to-moment changing. So that now-- these-- this is fundamental, we have to understand what are we talking about here because if we don't understand this point, we're never going to come to any kind of agreement, you'll never understand me. Nor will Hopkins. [Note: Reference is to Jeffrey Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness*, which was being studied at this time.]

MOMENT-TO-MOMENT CONSCIOUSNESS

JB/S(?) (very faint) (I have a question Tony.)

AD: Go ahead, please.

JB: Did you say in the first kind that consciousness should be understood to change moment-to-moment or that just these contents change?

AD: He says there's two kinds of consciousness, [JB simultaneously: Well one is (half/one word inaudible)] one is changing constantly, [student assents, very faint] uninterruptedly, incessantly, and the other is always self-abiding.

[9¼ second pause]

LD: In either one of those ones you've spoken about, can the ordinary person be said to know either of them? I mean, I really don't--

AD: Well, you-- don't you know that moments are going by?

LD: Only reflectively. The world seems very stable to me.

[student(s) assenting]

S: You call that conscious?

LD: I-- I think-- I-- I would say that--

AD (simultaneously): You don't have a feeling of the passage of time? What are you, intoxicated? (laughter, student words)

LD: No but, the-- the whole universe is in manifestation moment-by-moment, that is a form of consciousness I would say I'm not aware of. It's (a/uh)--

AD: You *are* aware of change, incessant change. Aren't you? Maybe not.

LD: No. I look at that pillow, it looks so nearly the same that I can't--

AD (simultaneously): Well, if you look at the sky, you see the clouds moving, right? You look into your mind, thoughts are changing, right? You look at the pillow, it's standing still, alright, it seems to be abiding. But you know enough about life that that's not so, you know that that's decaying, rotting away.

Didn't Madame Curie get the Pulitzer Prize for that? (laughter) That everything rots and decays? (more laughter, student words) Come on Louis, let's stop kib-- kibitzing. (more laughter, student words) You don't know that things are changing every moment? You may not know imperceptibly that this pole [AD hits pole] is changing from instant to instant, although scientifically you know that now.

LD: Yeah, that's what I mean, reflectively I know that.

AD (simultaneously): Scientifically you know through analysis that there's this constant-- Alright. But that which, let's say, not the pole, but other things around you, you know that that's all changing.

[students assent, very faint]

HS: You shave every day.

LD: Sure.

AD: Sure. (bit of laughter) Good. So you *are* aware of change. And if anyone tells me otherwise, I would simply have to walk out because there's no sense talking. There, isn't there change, right there, look, see her moving? (some laughter) She's not in the same place from instant-to-instant. (laughter, student words) You have the same thought you have now as you had a moment ago?

LD: Ok.

AD: Alright. If we have to argue points like this, what we should do is go play Russian roulette. Now let's go-- let's go to the next point, please.

JB: Ok, I'll play, I'll play. (some laughter, student words) Well it's easy for me to acknowledge that *things* change. The connection to say that consciousness changes, is that just a-- a mentalist transposition?

AD: Well we'll move into that.

JB: Ok.

AD: We have to move into that.

S: Yeah.

[short pause]

AD: Well, who's gonna try?

[short pause]

DR: What if we hear it again, so to say?

S: Uh-hm.

S (very faint): Read it.

S (very faint): Let's go through it again.

LR(?): Read it.

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: “There are two kinds of consciousness. One is in ever-passing moments, the other ever-present. The one is in time, the other out of it. The ordinary person knows only the one; the enlightened sage knows both.”

[students assent, very faint]

[short pause]

AD: Keep that in mind, Andrew, in regard to Hopkins’ remarks about the ability of the sage to know two--two levels of reality.

CdA: What does Hopkins say to that?

AD: Well, he denied that.

LR: No he didn’t.

S: No he didn’t.

S: [one/two words inaudible, possibly same S as above]

PD (simultaneously): He said the Buddha’s the only one that had it.

LR (simultaneously): He said the Buddha’s the one that knows them both simultaneously, only the Buddha.

[student assents, very faint]

S: Yeah.

LR: Everyone else only knows one.

S: Uh-hm.

AD: Is that the way it was?

LR: Yeah.

[students assent, very faint]

AS(?) (simultaneously): Yeah, that’s the one.

AD: I thought it was put a little differently.

LR: Well, it *was* put a little differently, I don’t know [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Ok, let’s get to the part that was put differently. (some laughter)

S: Yeah.

LR: I’ll read it to you.

AD: No, we’ll wait for that, we’ll wait for that class. Right now I’m more interested in this one. So, where do we go from here? There’s [S simultaneously: Well--] two kinds of changes, one of them is a kind that’s

always changing, consciousness is always changing. Now, you don't know consciousness is always changing, right? [S, whisper: Yeah.] What do you know is always changing? What's always changing?

SC: Whatever level of experience you have, the-- the wh-- the universe, the cosmos is always changing, and I was thinking that when you speak about the consciousness changing it's because somehow that consciousness is not other than that changing world, it's [AD simultaneously: Ok, yeah.] one side of that [one word inaudible]

AD: Yeah. [student assents, very faint] Yeah, because all that you can *ever* possibly know are states of your own consciousness. You can't know a *thing*. You can only know states of your own consciousness, which means ideas. Ideas are constantly changing. They're never, so to speak, static or abiding. Ok, so then you know that your consciousness is always changing if you examine deeply enough into the content of your experience. Go ahead.

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

AH: So it's not-- it's not real precise to say that forms are changing but rather that [AD simultaneously: What do you mean?] con-- that consciousness itself is (that--)

AD (simultaneously): Well what would you say, the forms are changing or consciousness is changing? Let's go over it again.

S: Uh-hm.

AH: Well--

AD: Do you know forms or do you know states of your mind?

[students assent, very faint]

[short pause]

AH: I-- I don't know quite what that question means [couple words inaudible]

AD: If we're mentalists, Andrew, ok, and we agree that we can only *know* our own mind, what our mind gives us, alright, [AH: Ok.] if that's all that we could know, then what is it that we ultimately and fundamentally know, isn't it changes of the mind? Mind changes, consciousness-- contents of our own consciousness. Our own consciousness is what's changing. [AH: Yeah.] Now that's not the same as the other consciousness which doesn't change. [student assents, very faint] Go ahead-- [student assents] So let's--

ONLY THE SAGE KNOWS BOTH KINDS OF CONSCIOUSNESS; VEDANTA VS. BUDDHISM

JB (simultaneously): I want to agree but I-- I think we *have* changing consciousness, but when you say we *know* changing consciousness I want to understand what that knowing is like 'cause consciousness to me is the-- is the knowing. They're saying in the quote the sage-- the enlightened sage *knows* both consciousness. Does that mean he *has* both or that he knows about them, that's the kind of question--

AD: Let's try the first part, [JB: Ok.] let's try the first part, first part.

JB (simultaneously): Just ask it again? The idea that I *know* states of my mind or that I *know* my states of [AD simultaneously: Uh-hm.] consciousness, that seems to be adding in a level of interpretation that I've not seen-- that I haven't experienced.

AD: In other words, in other words what we're saying is, automatically there's already two states. Right?

JB: I guess.

AD: In order for me to know that consciousness is changing, [S: Yeah.] there's got to be part of a consciousness which doesn't change, because if consciousness was changing with the contents [JB simultaneously: Right. Then knowing would change with the content(s).] of what we perceive, then it couldn't know change. So right [AD claps hands] there and then we're saying: look, I not only *know* the world is changing or the states of consciousness indicate that the world is changing, alright, but I know that there's something in me which stands as a WITNESS to what it is perceiving.

JB (very faint): Yeah.

AD: So It abides.

JB: And since I can say that with confidence, I wonder why this kind of knowing is reserved for the enlightened sage-- I mean I know I'm not enlightened--

AD (simultaneously): Well, you can say it with confidence but you don't have the *experience* of that.

LR: No, but he doesn't say that kind of [one/two words inaudible] he says you have the [few words inaudible]

JB: No, it says to know both Linda, not to have them. That's what I asked.

LR: The sage knows both.

JB: *Knows* both, doesn't say *has* both.

[student assents]

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: "The ordinary person known only the one; the enlightened sage knows both."

[students assent, very faint]

JB (simultaneously): So the "knowing your consciousness" is what I'm asking about. I mean it can't be [couple words inaudible]

AD: Yeah you see, that *abiding* consciousness, that Witness-consciousness, or whatever term you want to apply to it, cannot be *known* because it's self-evident. Self-evidencing is nothing that you could know. It would be like consciousness trying to look at itself, it just won't work. [S, very faint: Ok.] So, here we are in this peculiar situation where I know that the world that I know or the contents of my mind are constantly changing and then I know that consciousness therefore is a changing moment-to-moment, alright, but I can't know that principle which knows it. [student assents] Only a sage, so to speak, is

identified with that changeless awareness, alright, and at the same time, because he's *aware* of that changeless-- or he *is* that changeless awareness, he also knows the *contents* [S: Right.] of the consciousness which is changing.

JB: So that the second knowing is the identity, [AD simultaneously: Yeah, yeah.] is knowing by identity, and our way of knowing them both is inferential.

AD: Well, we don't know both.

JB: Yeah.

AD: The first one we know, alright, empirically and directly; the second one we only infer. [student assents] We can only have the experience through inference.

S: But--

AH: Is it fair to consider that-- that that which we *do* know is say the consciousness that we-- that we know is in some sense obscuration to this other kind of knowledge?

S: Yeah.

AD: Well, in itself it's not an obscuration. The sage who perceives the regular world, the world that you and I see, that world doesn't obscure his vision. It doesn't act as a deterrent to it.

AH: For him it doesn't.

AD: No, for him it doesn't, [AH: No.] because he's gone through a certain training, alright, whatever that is that's irrelevant now, but the point is that he'll see the chair or the table or whatever else, alright, and also have an underlie-- the view of what the underlying reality is.

AH: I was going to ask, what is there about the moment-by-moment consciousness that precludes this knowing by identity?

[short pause]

AD: What does identity mean?

AH: Well the second kind of consciousness that's in this quote obviously has to be known by identity.

S: Uh-hm, yeah [couple words inaudible, possibly another student]

AH: You-- you would know it by being it.

S: (Ok.)

AH: But (this is) apparent that there's something about [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Well, well, if we took an ordinary example, alright, I say that I am myself, alright. The identity that I'm working with is false in the sense that I know that I'm not the same person I was twenty years ago--this body's not the same, nor will it be twenty years hence. I don't see your point.

S: Hm.

[student assents, very faint]

AH: Yeah. Ok. (You--)

AD (simultaneously): You're asking me to deliver, alright, what that knowledge by identity is. And we said that the most that we could do at our level, alright, is to infer it. I don't have direct communication with it. In other words, I'm not situated in the fourth state of consciousness where the other three states are passing panoramas. But the sage is situated in this-- in that state, where he *is* in the fourth state of consciousness and the other three *are* passing panoramas, you know, something that he could alter. I can't tell you what that state is. But I *can* say that, on the other hand, if we're-- if we're situated in the empirical or in the passing consciousness, alright, then I don't see how you-- I mean you say, doesn't that provide identity? It-- In other words, the discontinuous can as easily provide an identity for the subject as the continuous. And this is the claim that a Buddhist make.

AH: That second-- that his notion of identity--

AD: No, the discontinuous consciousness, in other words, the consciousness is-- that is moment-by-moment is discontinuous, [AH simultaneously: Exactly.] right? It's like a beat, you know, pulsation, one shot after the other, alright. [AH: Yeah.] That's discontinuous. Now the Buddhists say that that consciousness can provide us with the wherewithal for self-identity, for memory, anything you want. They say that it can be done.

S: [couple/three words inaudible]

AH: They also say I think that it can provide (for the) perception.

[student assents, faint]

AD: Yes.

AS/AH(?): If it's experienced--

AD: Alright, so the point-- the point that we're getting to is this, ok? That the mind as a continuum is a sufficient explanation of any question you could ask about the soul. [student assents, very faint] The Vedantist(s) would say no, that that does not provide the identity that *they're* seeking.

[student assents, very faint]

S: [couple words inaudible]

AS: Yeah, mind as a continuity means changing consciousness.

AD: Yeah, changing consciousness.

AS (simultaneously): Continuum in a sense not of identity.

AD: Uh-huh.

AS: Con-tinuous rather than identical.

AD: On the one hand, we have the notion that the mind is a cognitive is-ness, alright, which is Vedantic

notion--mind is abiding, consciousness abides, doesn't alter, doesn't change, alright, and then on the other hand the Buddhist notion, alright, that consciousness is discontinuous, it's moment-by-moment, and so is the whole manifested universe, everything. In other words, transiency, change, is the law of the universe. This is fundamental, we got to get to it, we've got to see what we're talking about.

[student assents, very faint]

LdS: Anthony? So, if the Buddhists can account for our experience with this moment-by-moment (consciousness), in other words, they can explain [few words inaudible]

AD: Yeah, so if we take example of that.

LdS: Uh--

AD: Because I just want an--

S (very faint): (Example.)

S: Example?

AD: Yeah.

LdS: (Remember we used) [couple words inaudible] identity that I experience from day to day, when I get up in the morning I feel like I'm the same person I was yesterday or basically the same--they're saying that all these (processes are) within the moment-by-moment (consciousness).

AD: In other words, that this moment, alright, is dependent on the previous moment, and that previous moment will supply all the information I need to account for this moment. This moment is going to account for the next moment. Everything that has occurred within this moment will be in the next moment.

LdS: Yeah, nothing's lost.

AD: Ok? Now you've got to get the feeling of what these people are talking about, it's a snowball idea, [S: Right.] keep rolling it.

BS: How does that explain it, Anthony?

S: Yeah.

AD: How does what?

BS: How do they-- that-- how does that image--

AD: Well how-- how-- why doesn't it-- why shouldn't explain it?

BS: Well they're discrete moments, you said that they're discontinuous.

AD: Yes.

BS: Now it's true that one could say--

AD (simultaneously) But at this moment-- In other words, here's a snowball, you know what the snowball

is? I roll the snowball down the hill, right?

BS: It's always (growing/rolling).

AD: No, that isn't the point Bert.

S: What does that mean? (some laughter)

AD: The point is that it's got what it had before. What it had before is not lost. As it's rolling down the hill, alright, at this moment it's at line one, the next moment, line two, at the next moment, line three; when it's at line three, it does not forego what it had at line two and line one. It's included [student assents] it within line three.

BS: It has to be discontinuous in the sense that something's either being added or taken away each instant.

AD: No, Bert, you must understand *their* theory, not yours or mine. And their version is that this moment includes the moment previous. That means that everything that happened the previous moment is now in this moment.

BS: I can agree with that.

AD: Well then [BS simultaneously: But that's it.] that can account-- wait. Then through that they can account for memory.

BS: Yes, I can agree with that.

AD (simultaneously): Then with that they can account for identity, self-identity.

BS: But aren't they leaving out something, you know that as well as I do.

AD (simultaneously): What, what? (laughter) No, no. I know they're leaving-- they're not leaving out something. [BS simultaneously: Each moment--] It's much more complicated than that.

BS: No, I mean each moment does contain the previous moment. But PB says there's an occult link between each two moments that he calls Mind. [Note: See Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*, p. 39, Rider 1943 edition.] Now they--

AD (simultaneously): No, we're not coming from this quote.

BS: Then I can't understand where this quote's coming from. (bit of laughter)

AD: That's-- that's the purpose of classes, to discuss these points which are very difficult. Because a quote like this will show how much of PB you understand. As a matter-- from *my* point of view, now-- now this is opinion--as far as I'm concerned it shows me how much you understand the doctrine, alright, but from another point of view you can say-- I can say well, this-- how much do you understand of PB, a quote like this will show me. We started out by pointing out a long time ago that there's some quotes that are really, you know, go right-- are like the gist of the doctrine, and if you don't understand that quote, I can easily tell you don't unders-- you're not acquainted with the fundamentals yet. [student assents] Now, [AH simultaneously: Anthony--] let's go back to something very interesting. We spoke about this in a different way. Look how complicated it is. The World-Idea, alright, arises and descends, moment-to-

moment, the World-Idea. The consciousness of the individual, the Overself of the individual, does no such thing. It is always what it is, never alters, never changes, doesn't get projected forth, alright, is not a continuum. Alright, that's your-- that's the soul. Now, the individual soul, we have said, or at least in the notes that-- as we understand them, projects from within itself the World-Idea, which naturally, alright, has for its substratum the World-Mind. Ok? So you have to have this paradoxical thing going on at the same time: a consciousness which is always what it is, never altered, and then the World-Idea which is being projected out from within itself and which is discontinuous, moment-to-moment. Alright? Now, to complicate it even more, within that World-Idea your consciousness has taken residence in a body which belongs to the World-Idea and which is altering moment-to-moment. The consciousness that you know is the one that's in the body that sees the constant change all around. The consciousness that you *don't* know is the one that's manifesting the World-Idea. So far?

[short pause]

AH: Just one-- one question Anthony. The consciousness [couple/three words inaudible] that we know is-- it's known as a-- as a kind of change that is not the fundamental change of that moment-by-moment presentation.

AD: It is!, it is. Your cognitive states are momentary states of consciousness.

AH: But as Louis was describing earlier, we do have these impressions that there's something-- something continuous about our life-stream. We don't experience those stills.

AD: There's something continuous about the life-stream, that there's something self-identical? That there's an "I" which is always what it is? Yeah, sure, I-- I don't disagree with that.

AH: I'm trying to get to the mis-perception of--

AD: Why don't you follow-- follow this way? Try this way.

AH: Ok.

AD: Try this way. Because even the Dalai Lama is going to speak to you that-- as m-- of mind as a continuum and also as a cognitive is-ness. But we want to get back to this feeling to see if we can understand, if we can *feel* this paradox in our self. Like it's trying to stretch your mind, divide it in half-- "How could that be?" On the one hand, alright, I am this pure awareness, like the Vedantins speak about, and that's it. On the other hand, the Buddhists aren't wrong, because they're bringing (in) the fact that I, this empirical self, alright, this, alright, entity lives and is part of the World-Idea. Now, forget about the soul, there is no soul for the Buddhists, right? So the only thing they're going to talk about, alright, is the fact that you are inhabiting this body and working through this body. So everything in your experience has to be explained in terms of the World-Mind's Idea, the Idea-- the World-Idea. Don't go outside of that for an explanation; don't bring in a soul. Isn't that so?

[student assents]

AH: Yeah.

AD: Alright, so-- I'm not saying they're wrong, I'm just saying this is their premises. They're starting

with an analysis of experience, and that means that they have to locate themselves in the World-Idea and in this body. So they analyze the experience and they find that they *know of nothing, absolutely nothing*, which isn't changing. Is that so? And the Vedantists, just as vigorously, for two, three thousand years, say "But we *know* [AD hits something] a consciousness which doesn't change."

AH: They insist on *that* as their premise.

AD: Yeah.

S: Yeah.

AD: Read the quote again, [student assents] please.

PB [V13, 19:3.182, LD reading]: "There are two kinds of consciousness, one is in ever-passing moments, the other ever-present. The one is in time, the other out of it. The ordinary person knows only the one; the enlightened sage knows both."

[student assents, very faint]

AH: Is it to-- is-- is it accurate to say that the Vedantic premise is not based on experience?

S: No. [few words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Well how would they come up from it? You know 'experience' is one of those words that's huge. My experience is very limited, alright, this-- the experience of PB is enormous, it includes states of consciousness that I can't even imagine!

AH: Oh yes, that ex-- the experience of the sage certainly.

AD (simultaneously): So-- alright, but when you say 'experience,' who's experience are you referring to? The nincompoop? The sage? The savant? Who are you referring to? So there's many Vedantists who say "Hey, I've had the experience, don't tell me I-- it isn't so, and I'm having it now."

[students assent, very faint]

S (very faint): Dalai Lama.

AD: Like I told the Dalai Lama: they *both* can't be wrong. I can't conceive of either one being wrong.

AH: Anthony, do you think-- do you think--

AD (simultaneously): Now don't move away. Can you see why I told him that?

AH: Yes.

AD: I can't conceive that the Buddhists are wrong or the Vedantists are wrong. These are traditions that are thousands of years old. I says, "How can *either* of them be wrong?" Can I say the Buddha's wrong, Shankara's wrong?

AH: Don't you think there are schools of Buddhism that posit that continuous awareness?

AD: Which one?

AH: I think-- I think the Madhyamika does.

AD: Look, I don't take anything for granted, you know me by now. I get finished with a text, either I'm exhausted and I-- you know, I've had it, or I just throw the book away, but if I'm going to work out a text I'm going to have to work it out, and I have to disagree with the text we're working with. [Note: Jeffrey Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness*.] I think the man is using too many words. But we'll talk about that differently, you know, I just-- I want you to understand what is so readily available in the simplest language that PB could write, he made it available to us.

A COLLECTION OF BEINGS COLLECTIVELY PRODUCE MANIFESTATION

PC: Anthony when--

AD: Yeah.

PC: I'm sorry.

AD: Go ahead.

PC: When you were explaining this projection of the World-Idea within the individual soul, you said that it has to-- the Wo-- that World-Idea has the World-Mind as its substratum?

AD: Yeah.

PC: Now when-- when you're referring to World-Mind, do you mean something other than the moment-to-moment World-Idea and the individual soul, you mean something other than those two?

AD: Yes, they would speak about BEINGS.

PC: Beings.

AD: Beings, yeah, that the en-- the entire manifestation's due to the collection of individual beings who have a similar karma, alright, and their co-presence, alright, is what makes possible the manifestation of the world that they perceive.

[student assents]

PC (simultaneously): And that's what you mean by the World--

AD (simultaneously): In other words, each one of us is a little god making his own world. And because we're all similar, in certain respects-- there's others that are not similar but they're not here in this world. They would perceive the world differently than we do. But because of the, let's say, the similarity of the kinetic history of each individual minds that is here, that collection of human beings, alright, is what's producing the world, alright, and that they're *based* in a being who is similar to they-- to them.

PC: Now--

AD: So all these beings that are similar to one another, alright, live together, are producing the world in common that they perceive, but each one has to do it for himself. That's basically also the Jain theory.

RG (aside): Who's book?

PC: Now, are you referring to the cosmic soul in a sense when you're--

AD: They don't use those words.

PC: Who doesn't use those words?

AD: They don't use those words.

PC: Who?

AD: The Buddhists.

PC: No, I know that. But you're going--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah. They speak about a hierarchy of beings.

PC: Ok, so that's what you're--

AD: Yeah, that's what I'm referring to.

PC: So when you say the World-Mind, you mean this entire collection of--

AD: Of minds [PC simultaneously: Minds.] which is supporting this manifestation. Shall we stop now and speak to David? (laughter)

DB: I've already been told twice.

S: Uh-hm, uh-hm.

AD: Ok.

BS: Ok.

S (very faint): Please, (go ahead).

DB: But, please go ahead.

S: Yeah.

[short pause]

AD: Yeah.

WORLD-IDEA AS DISCONTINUOUS, EACH MOMENT CONTAINING WHAT HAS GONE BEFORE

JB: I'm stuck in Bert's earlier question, if that's alright. Could you say something about the-- what-- what part of the outline you gave us, that discontinuity actually is in-- is the-- is the discontinuity actually in the pulsating World-Idea or is it in the way our soul reflects (the Idea)?

AD (simultaneously): Well, well everything that you've understood about quantum physics, what does it tell you?

JB: It says it's in the very *prima materia*.

AD: Yeah. Out of this nothingness, alright, comes forms of energy which we're going to call particle and wave.

[student assents, faint]

JB: But, then I think what I understood was Bert's question, can we fathom the way that the present moment includes the previous if there's a real discontinuity there? Can we [student assents] accept the notion that they're discontinuous, withdrawn and re-emanaed, and yet the present moment includes the one prior?

AD: I didn't get the question.

JB (simultaneously): (You know), I mean to try to use the snowball analogy, in the snowball [one inaudible AD word simultaneous with JB] each layer is [AD: Uh-hm.] still there. In the withdrawn and regenerated--

AD: Well, isn't that-- isn't that the-- isn't that the results of the experiences that paleontology, or let's say ontology, shows? [student assents, faint] Or let-- better still, what are-- how do we refer to it when we speak about the [S simultaneously: Phylogenetic.] development of an individual in terms of his ontogenetic [few students talking at once simultaneous with AD, few words inaudible] and phylogenetic development is in-- included right in the-- I'm not saying that as a fetus you were a-- you are a fish or anything like that. But obviously in this body, alright, all the forms are already included, everything is already there. [S: Yeah.] The same theory for instance we have that you recapitulate most of your past lives till you're about Saturn's age.

JB (very faint): Yeah.

S: Ok.

JB: Exactly.

AD: What are we saying there essentially?

[9 second pause]

JB: Well, I'm looking for the link between the moments.

AD: Hm?

JB: I'm asking for the link between the moments and wonder how the Buddhist notion (is--) coheres.

AD (simultaneously): Well, don't you get the feeling that-- yeah, but don't you get the feeling here that what we just said shows that the-- when we're speaking about a person or a [student assents, very faint] mind continuum, alright, basically we're including the entire [JB simultaneously: The whole.] kinetic history [S: Everything.] and memory of this entity.

S: Yeah.

[student assents, very faint]

JB: And the whole cosmos in fact is [AD simultaneously: No.] incorporated.

AD: Yeah. [student assents, very faint] They would run parallel. Embryology and cosmology would run parallel courses.

[students assent, very faint]

JB: Yeah, that's the-- the hologram [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): But then, but then look how complicated it becomes, alright. Here we spoke about this soul, alright, which we said was this abiding consciousness. Then we speak about the soul, alright, or the Buddhists won't speak about it but the others would have to, they speak about this soul as inhabiting a body, [student assents, very faint] alright. Now this body was fabricated by the World-Idea. [student assents, faint] The World-Idea now is-- can be understood or reached through this body.

S: Yeah, that's right.

[student assents, very faint]

AD: So you have a combination of these two things, you have a combination of the I AM principle, alright, and the consciousness that le-- let's say the consciousness which is within the body which has been fabricated by the World-Idea. Now this I AM principle can investigate in a *never-ending sequence*, *never-ending finality*, the nature of this World-Idea, it will never comprehend it.

S: Yeah.

[short pause]

AD: Why don't you pick another quote, Louis, let me see if you can pick a quote that is in direct relation to what we're talking about. You're going to put out the categories of philosophy? Well each and every one of you are going to get a hammer on the head from me. [short pause] I'll haunt you if you don't get it.

[student(s) assenting] (bit of laughter)

[short pause]

LD: But, I think the-- the next one is very similar, uh--

AD: Yeah? Alright, let me hear.

AS: [couple words inaudible]

PB [V16, 25:2.123 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 25: World-Mind in Individual Mind, #21, LD reading,]:
"When duality is blended with..."

AD: Uh-uh.

LD: No? (laughter)

S (amidst laughter): Not here.

S (amidst laughter): Just not here.

S (simultaneously): It's ok.

S: It's ok, (let's/just) do it.

[6 seconds of background student talking, laughter]

LD: Well, I-- I have no potential of understanding (our speaker).

S (simultaneously): Yeah.

S: Ok.

BEING CANNOT EXIST

AD: There's a short one there that, you know, we could put in for-- No matter what the mind does it cannot think IT.

[student assents, very faint]

PB [V16, 28:2.120, LD reading]: "Nothing that the mind can think into mental existence is IT."

AH: Pace Chittamatra.

S (possibly part of background): Vic--

AD: Go over that Louis.

[short pause]

PB [V16, 28:2.120, LD reading]: "Nothing-- Nothing that can..."

S: [couple words inaudible] (laughter)

PB [V16, 28:2.120, LD reading]: "Nothing..."

S: Read it again.

AD: You-- did you [S simultaneously: Read it.] find it there?

S: Read it again.

LD (simultaneously): Yeah.

AD: Yeah? Read it.

PB [V16, 28:2.120, LD reading]: "Nothing that the mind can think into mental existence is IT."

LD: Capital Mind.

[students assent]

JB: (Isn't it free of itself?) I mean the way it's (spread).

S (simultaneously): Is 'mind' a small [few words inaudible]

S (simultaneously): Right.

[students assent, very faint]

AS: So he's just saying that the pure unchanging consciousness can never become an object.

SC: Yeah.

S: What?

JB: That's what [S simultaneously: Yeah.] it says, man.

AS: The pure unchanging consciousness can never become an object in this-- in this changing consciousness. The changing series is the result of the mind's activity of putting things in-- putting things into existence. [JB simultaneously: Do you-- do you--] But IT, the pure awareness, can never be in existence.

JB: Oh, you mean the IT's a pronoun that isn't in the sentence?

AS: I think the capital I-T IT refers to pure-- [JB: Ah.] pure awareness, pure consciousness, [student assents] [JB simultaneously: Ok, sure.] and IT can never be put into existence [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Let me put it in your language: Being cannot exist.

AS: Right.

LR: But why don't you read it that way Avery?

AS: Because the capital I-T IT referred to the pure consciousness which always *is* whereas in it is his Being and it can never exist. The only things that can exist are these changing thoughts. The pure consciousness never exists, but to exist is to become other than itself than by IT(--/,) from IT.

LR (simultaneously): But then you would have to read the quote out of con-- I mean-- if you just pick up that--

AS: Well, read the sentence again, what does the I-T IT refer to? [S simultaneously: Put a lot (one/two words inaudible)] It's capital I-T IT. [LDS simultaneously: It's capital (couple words inaudible)] I don't think the capital I, capital T is the-- is a reference to anything that's in the rest of the sentence. It's ir-- it's IT, it is-- it's just IT, the ab-- the-- [couple inaudible student words simultaneous with AS] the reality.

LR (simultaneously): And I'll-- I mean that's not unusual for PB [AS simultaneously: Yeah. IT is not a (referent/reference).] to do that and assume that he doesn't do [AS simultaneously: He--] that, he does it a lot.

AS: Oh, he does it-- he-- I don't think he would use the I-T IT as the reference to anything else in that sentence.

S: [one/two words inaudible]

S (simultaneously): [one/two words inaudible]

[couple students at once, few words inaudible]

BS (simultaneously): But if you already assumed everyone else though at the same time.

JB: The other two ways are not--

S: No.

AD: Read it once more, Louis, and look at-- it's like a sledgehammer. [students assent, faint] One sentence--it's a sledgehammer.

PB [V16, 28:2.120, LD reading]: "Nothing that the mind can think into mental existence is IT."

AH: I suppose it's possible for having IT refer to mind as principle.

AD: Well, yeah.

S: [couple/few words inaudible]

RG (simultaneously): Yeah but [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Mind as principle, alright, cannot exist.

AH: In itself, it has to be thought of as non-existent.

AD: Uh-hm, or *Beyond Being*, if you wanted to be more accurate. Being is enough for us because it's-- we know what we're talking about when we say Being. So what he's saying is Mind is Being. [said with emphasis] Being cannot exist because to say 'exist', the very word means that it must be outside of itself: *existere*.

S: Ok.

AS: Yeah.

AD: Can't.

AH: Now, therefore, therefore--

AS (simultaneously): And whatever's authentic can't do that.

AH: Any-- any phenomenon is judged as existent.

AD: Yeah. Phenomena is existent, yeah.

S: Right.

AH: Therefore, any phenomenon lacks Being.

AS: But Andrew, you said judge--

AD (simultaneously): Can't be spoken of as Being.

S: Right.

AD: Uh-hm.

AS: But Andrew, you said it's *judged*-- well maybe we shouldn't get into that. I mean you said it's *judged* as existence. If by "judged" you mean the activity of thought, it's not just apparently.

S: No.

AS: In this q-- Never mind. I--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah.

AS: I'll leave that.

AD: Yeah. It's not a question that it's redundant. [couple inaudible AS words simultaneous with AD] It's a question that [S: It's pounding.] it's pounding the n-- the nail [AS: No I--] in too deep.

AS: I-- (students assent, bit of laughter)

SC: No, you're-- so you're saying--

AD (simultaneously): You-- can we hear that quote once more? And, right after you've--

SC: Yeah.

AD: Once more, let's hear that quote.

PB [V16, 28:2.120, LD reading]: "Nothing that the mind can think into mental existence is IT."

AD: Go ahead.

SC: I understand the part of saying that anything that's brought into existence isn't the pure-- isn't pure mind. But when you say that that IT, that pure mind at the end of the sentence might not be the mind at the beginning of the sentence, I'm not quite sure I get that. Because he do-- at the beginning he says "Nothing that the mind can bring into existence..."

AH: Mental existence, uh-hm.

AD (simultaneously): That's alright, into existence, sure.

SC: Ok now, what it brings in--

AD (simultaneously): Can be IT.

SC: What it brings into existence [one word inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Nothing that the mind-- anything that the mind-- let's do it this way, anything that the mind, alright, does, any effort it makes, can-- can it, so to speak, come into existence, can it become sensible, can it--

SC: All of those things are existence but that mind that's doing the thinking or the producing, *that* doesn't come into existence.

AD: That can't, the whole point he's making is that it *can't* exist.

SC: So I-- ok then, I was thinking then that the IT at the end *is* the very [student assents, faint] mind at the beginning prior to its thinking. [AD: Which--] And that seems like creating a rel-- an interesting relationship between pure mind and the production that comes out of it.

AD: No, the-- I don't think that's the point of this here quote. The point of this quote is that no matter what the mind does, alright, [AD speaks the rest of this paragraph with emphasis] it cannot create itself. [student assents, very faint] [couple inaudible LR words simultaneous with AD] It cannot bring itself *into* existence. It cannot *alter* its nature. It must always remain what it is.

LR: What *does* the mind bring into existence?

AD: What?

LR: What *does* the mind bring into existence?

AD: Well--

LR: And is that not mind?

AD: Is it mind? Is it mind? Or is it the *activity* of mind?

S: [one word inaudible]

[short pause with very faint student words in far background]

AD: Can I say that the thought I'm expressing to you now is the same as mind, which has no form, no shape, no weight, no size, no inside, no outside? [student assents] Whereas you just said that what I said to you was mind.

S: Yeah.

S: Yeah.

RC: Is this a place where the Buddhists really differ in principle, that they would say (were/where) the (images) apart from this incessant activity of thought there is no mind. There's no mind other than that incessant activity of thought.

AD: No, I don't think they would agree with that. There are one or two early schools who would believe-- who made that a point but there are schools that point out that that's all adventitious to mind, all that activity is adventitious. And especially the Prasangikas would say all that is adventitious. Mind doesn't need *any* of that. It could, you know, [S: Could--] exist or survive without any of that.

S (very faint): Yeah.

[Transcriber note: On Audio File 1984 1919a it sounds like Side 1 of audio cassette tape ends here but the tape includes the following lines which I have no access to and were transcribed by June F.]

AD: Good, let's try another quote.

AH: Could I ask one question? What's remarkable about that quote is that he doesn't say just existence but he says mental existence.

AD: But there is no other kind!

AH: But even at that level of mentalism the reality is denied.

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1984 0919a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

[Note: 0:47:02.2 to 0:49:16.7 -- student discussion of what to read/focus on in Buddhist class, etc. LR/TS mention AD's suggestion that they read PB quotes on the Sunset meditation. AD not present.]

AS: The concept of existence, I mean I think he means the act-- the-- [students assent, faint] the existent.

AH: There is no other existent apart from a mental (existent).

S: Uh-hm, right.

AH: Yes but (he--)

AS (simultaneously): PB would say that, [AH assents] yeah, and that that mental existence, namely the thoughts or those changing thoughts, at least in this case he's trying to say is not and cannot be that pure principle of Being or mind or-- or pure consciousness, [AH: Right.] or that that-- or that that pure consciousness or mind, at least in this quote, is *not* being brought into existence, whereas thoughts *are* in existence. [S: Geez.] I mean, at some other quote they may be brought back together but here there seems to be a huge that-- a real split between them. [student assents] Even though-- and that's-- that seems paradoxical. If there's a huge split between them, even though as you've said all of existence is mental, that seems to be a paradox. You say, all of existence is mental from that side but on the other side the mind or pure consciousness or Being is never *brought into* existence.

AH: Is never brought even into *mental* existence.

AS: No, no, no, not even men-- that's the only kind of existence there is.

AH: Well that's the point, you know, that that's the only kind of existence there is.

S: Andrew--

S: Uh-hm.

AH (simultaneously): I'm sorry uh, it-- I attempted to make a speculation about the Chittamatra view as actually in the quote.

S: Yes but--

AS: But why do you want to keep saying that existence is something which is only a con-- concept? It real-- it-- he means really-- I mean, it's true-- it's real existence, it's not reality but it-- it e-- it's existence.

AH: But if it's *mental* existence, how is it not of the nature of that mind?

AS: That's-- that's what he's saying is the paradox in the quote. It's-- the only existence there is is mental, but mind is never brought into existence.

AH: Yes. Now that-- that's [AS simultaneously: (I mean--)] good, that's good.

AD: But stop right there and just think for a minute. Isn't that so, even though it's paradoxical?

AH: Yeah.

AD: The thoughts we have are mental, we know they're mental. But that doesn't mean that they're mind. The thought I'm expressing to you is a mental thing, alright, but *it's not my mind*.

AH: That's hard for me.

AD: It's not hard, and I'm telling you, most of the truths in life are paradoxical. Anything-- God could never do anything simple. (laughter)

AS: It's a picture.

AD: Everything is complicated; it has many, many aspects.

[students assent, very faint]

LD: I mean--

AS: Wait, but that's catch-22, that proves that He *does* manifest something of Himself, because if His own nature is paradoxical, (VM laughing) and the world [student assents] is paradoxical, in that-- insofar as that's so--

AD: You say through paradox He reveals Himself. Yeah.

AS: (Thought.)

LD: Anthony, isn't that-- when we speak of thoughts as being of the *nature* of mind but not mind-- [students assent, very faint] when we use terms, is-- isn't that the distinction between monism and non-dualism? That we-- if we do-- did away with the thoughts and said they were non-existent we would end up with a monism, [AD: Uh-hm.] with just pure mind, or if we said they were *identical* with mind we would end up with a monism, but if we say they are of the *nature*--

AD: If you say that they're of the nature of mind, you could have both, and you'd call that non-dualism.

LD (simultaneously): But yet they're not two different things.

AD: Uh-huh. This doctrine is very, very profound. And, your mind has to become like a razor. You have to s-- sh-- you know, cut your way through all the garbage that we built up, you know, through our environment, our schools, you know, TV, all that. We've got to throw all that stuff out to get to what these people are talking about. And it's not going to be easy.

LD: I found a similar quote I think, now--

AD: Well, the count has--

WE ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE MIND'S PRODUCTS, NOT THE MIND'S ESSENCE

JB: Yeah. Can I ask you to [S simultaneously: Let's go on.] say a word more?

S: Oh ok. (laughter)

JB: I count-- (laughter, few seconds of student talking) When you say that things are made of mind-stuff, what I really want to do is get a permissible language, because I want to sort of adopt a view that the language perverts thinking clearly, wrong language affects us, so-- Things are made of mind-stuff

[students assent, faint] and things are of the *nature* of mind, and-- but that isn't mind manifest as mind. Is that a proper way of saying it? It's not mind but it's of the nature of mind. I could just [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] be saying that over and over but (some laughter, student words) is that the only way of saying it that makes sense?

AD: That all manifestation *must* be of the nature of mind, I think we've begun to understand that when we say that, for instance, the entire world that we perceive is the world that our mind has given to us. So, we're familiar with the *products* of that mind, we're n-- we are *not* familiar with, or in any way *know* the *essence* of mind.

S: Ok.

JB: When you ask what's the thing made of, it's thought.

AD (simultaneously): We know that it's mentally-- it's mental.

DB: Isn't-- yeah.

AD: In other words, if we took this [student assents] pole apart and tore it down analytically, all we would come up with would be a series of ideas, no matter how far the analysis goes.

JB: Yes, it's made of ideas.

AH: That analysis won't lead to-- I'm sorry Jonathan.

JB: No, no, I-- I don't know where to go.

AH: That analysis in itself won't lead to [one word inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Won't lead you to the essence [student assents] of mind. [AH: No.] That won't give you the experience of mind. It'll point its finger and says, "When you could stop yapping you might get the experience." But it's going to take the greatest amount of analysis in order to reach that point to realize that it's your thinking that stops you from getting to the mind-essence itself.

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

JB: Well-- but that's what Andrew asked before, does the-- does the thinking things into existence interfere with knowing the mind [AD simultaneously: Of course!] as in itself? But wasn't that your earlier--

AD (simultaneously): Sure. That's why I tell you, "Shut up." (some laughter)

JB: So I'm playing Russian roulette with you now.

AD: Well, you know, when they say-- when you sit down to meditate they-- the whole point is stop thinking. But, you know, PB's path is he wants you to first understand what you're doing and *then* go ahead and do it. And then he asks you to bring in thinking, you know, to understand what it is you did. Alright, Louis, you said you found another good one, huh?

LD: I found two very similar I [AD simultaneously: Uh-hm.] think. [one/two inaudible student words] Did you write these? (laughter)

AD: It's not my handwriting, is it?

LD: No, it's terrible, I was gonna say (more laughter) your-- your handwriting has definitely gotten worse.

S: It's my handwriting Lou.

LD: Oh. (laughter)

S: But, I'll see you later. (laughter)

[9¾ seconds of laughter, background student talking]

COMBINING MYSTICISM AND METAPHYSICS TO BRING ABOUT PHILOSOPHIC REALIZATION OF THE OVERSELF

PB [V13, 20:4.134 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What is Philosophy?, #5, LD reading]: "Two things have to be learned in this quest. The first is the art of mind-stilling, of emptying consciousness of every thought and form whatsoever. This is mysticism or Yoga. The disciple's ascent should not stop at the contemplation of anything that has shape or history, name or habitation, however powerfully helpful this may have formerly been to the ascent itself. Only in the mysterious void of Pure Spirit, in the undifferentiated Mind, lies his last goal as a mystic. The second is to grasp the essential nature of the ego and of the universe and to obtain direct perception that both are nothing but a series of ideas which unfold themselves within our minds. This is the metaphysics of Truth. The combination of these two activities brings about the realization of his true Being as the ever beautiful and eternally [LD reads: eternal] beneficent Overself. This is philosophy."

AD: Alright, you chose it, you explain it.

S: Just read it again [one/two words inaudible]

S (simultaneously): Just read it again.

S: Yeah.

AH: Before you explain it, let me read it again please.

S: Page 250 Andrew.

LD: Four or five times.

S (simultaneously): Yeah.

S: I know.

S: I didn't get it.

[11¼ second pause with some faint background student talking]

PB [V13, 20:4.134 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What is Philosophy?, #5, LD reading]: "Two things have to be learned in this quest. The first is the art of mind-stilling, of emptying consciousness of every thought and form whatsoever. This is mysticism or Yoga. The disciple's ascent should not stop at the

contemplation of anything that has shape or history, name or habitation, however powerfully helpful this may have formerly been to the ascent itself. Only in the mysterious void of Pure Spirit, in the undifferentiated Mind, lies his last goal as a mystic. The second is to grasp the essential nature of the ego and of the universe and to obtain direct perception that both are nothing but a series of ideas which unfold themselves within our minds. This is the metaphysics of Truth. The combination of these two activities brings about the realization of his true Being as the ever beautiful and eternally beneficent Overself. This is philosophy.”

S: We’re on page 250 (in discussing) [one word inaudible]

[short pause]

LD: I think he-- he brings in the-- the two aspects of mysticism which is this-- the one, mysticism, which is this consciousness that is ever-identical and ever the same and this is experienced in the heights of mysticism. And maybe a phrase that would describe it somewhat is when-- when they speak about knowing without image is to be, and this is the only way to know this unchanging consciousness is to be it. And this would be the heights of mysticism, to experience this. The second, the metaphysics of Truth, this would be an understanding of the ego and the World-Idea, which the ego is within the World-Idea, as a moment-by-moment presentation by the World-Mind, which we had just spoken of as these beings that dynamically instantiate any content and anything that has name, habitation, form. [S: Right.] And this would be what instantiates this within this unchanging consciousness. The combination of the unchanging consciousness and the World-Idea arising within it and how these two go in to-- both these would have to go into an explanation of philosophy, which would be a discussion of our Overself which is both simultaneously.

S (very faint, possibly part of background): Yeah, I think so.

S (very faint): Hm.

[short pause]

AD: Alright Louis, would you read it again and see what might be contributed in understanding that quote?

PB [V13, 20:4.134 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What is Philosophy?, #5, LD reading]: “Two things have to be learned in this quest. The first is the art of mind-stilling, of emptying consciousness of every thought and form whatsoever. This is mysticism or Yoga. The disciple’s ascent should not stop at the contemplation of anything that has shape or history, name or habitation, however powerfully helpful this may have formerly been to the ascent itself. Only in the mysterious void of Pure Spirit, in the undifferentiated Mind, lies his last goal as a mystic. The second...”

AD: Well that seems to be-- he seems to be referring here to Nirvikalpa, right?

LD: Yeah.

AD: Uh-huh.

PB [V13, 20:4.134 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 20: What is Philosophy?, #5, LD reading]: “The second is

to grasp the essential nature of the ego and of the universe and to obtain direct perception that both are nothing but a series of ideas which unfold themselves within our minds. This is the metaphysics of Truth. The combination of these two activities brings about the realization of his true Being as the ever beautiful and eternally beneficent Overself. This is philosophy.”

AD: Sure, go right ahead Alan.

AB: I was trying to understand why they’re in the order that they are. The first is to experience the stillness. But I-- I thought that this-- the ever-changing mind which is continually producing thoughts, because we’re identified with those thoughts we can’t experience the discontinuous nature of that mind and its being a part of the World-Idea which is always flashing. But first you have to get dis-identified from that mind completely by achieving the stillness and then you can use that perspective to see the momentary flashing of the ego and its world simultaneously. But perhaps you can’t achieve the second until you’ve achieved the first because the-- they-- achieving the first is required to perceive the ego-World-Idea relationship.

S (very faint): Fantastic.

S: Uh-hm.

AD: Yes, I would agree with what you said.

LD: Alan, would another way, he’s saying that Nirvikalpa has to be achieved before we could speak about going for Sahaja.

AB: Right, definite.

AH: (What/Would)--

AB: And Sahaja would be the state of consciousness achieved in Nirvikalpa *with* the world present.

LD: Yeah.

AB: And in that state then you would see the world as it’s flashing, momentary, continuous change, whereas perhaps that’s the only awareness that is outside of the change that could experience that *as* change. Right?

AD (simultaneously): In conjunction with that quote, I’m-- and I’m-- I’m mentioning something here which I usually don’t advise, but there’s a quote there that speaks about Awareness and the awareness of Awareness; one is equivalent to Sahaja. [short pause] It’s a short quote, but it would-- it would cap this quote here. Do you see it, [S: (Uh-uh/Uh-hm).] [student assents, very faint] top of the page?

[9¾ second pause, flipping of pages]

NIRVIKALPA VS. SAHAJA; SOUL AS ONE AND MANY

LD: Ok.

AD: Well, this is a very interesting quote, practically the same thing, but he’s coming from a different angle.

LD: Well, tell me if this is it.

PB [V16, 25:2.140, LD reading]: “*Sahaja samadhi* is the awareness of Awareness, whether appearing as thoughts or not, whether accompanied by bodily activities or not. But *nirvikalpa samadhi* is solely the awareness of Awareness.”

S: Hm, huh.

S: [few words inaudible]

S: Maybe one more time.

PB [V16, 25:2.140, LD reading]: “*Sahaja samadhi* . . .”

AD: Very slow, very slow, let-- let them concentrate.

PB [V16, 25:2.140, LD reading]: “*Sahaja samadhi* is the awareness of Awareness, whether appearing as thoughts or not, whether accompanied by bodily activities or not. But *nirvikalpa samadhi* is solely the awareness of Awareness.”

[student assents, very faint]

S: This is like the quote we started with. The two states (corresponds) to the two kinds of consciousness, [students assent, very faint] how it's like it.

AD: Talk.

S: Like it in that the--

S (very faint in background): It's the present.

S: Well, never mind.

KD: Yeah, right. (KD laughs)

AS: Yeah.

[couple students at once, few words inaudible]

EM (simultaneously): Isn't the basic idea just that with Nirvikal-- kalpa-- that with Nirvikalpa there can't be contents, there aren't contents. [students assent] And with Sahaja there may or may not be.

S: Yeah.

AS (simultaneously): Huh.

EM: But it's there-- that state is there no matter if there are objects and experience or not.

[students assent, faint]

AH: Yeah, ok.

LD (simultaneously): So when there's not content(s) there's Sahaja.

EM: There's still Sahaja.

LD (simultaneously): We're speaking about the Nirvikalpa aspect.

[student assents, very faint]

EM: I don't know about-- [LD simultaneously: That's what you mean?] I don't know about that. I just [one/two words inaudible]

JG (simultaneously): But, would you read it one more time please?

LD (simultaneously): Sure, sure.

[student assents, faint]

PB [V16, 25:2.140, LD reading]: "*Sahaja samadhi* is the awareness of Awareness, whether appearing as thoughts or not, whether accompanied by bodily activities or not. But *nirvikalpa samadhi* is solely the awareness of Awareness."

LD: And it-- I don't know if it makes a difference but always the second Awareness is capitalized.

S (very faint): Ok.

S (very faint): Uh-hm, uh-hm.

S: Yeah.

AB: Awareness has capital.

LD: Awareness.

AH: Is it-- is it-- is it accurate to express then, Sahaja includes Nirvikalpa along with the direct perception of the other quote?

AS: That's not going to [few words inaudible] (AS laughing)

AH (simultaneously): No notion [couple words inaudible] (some laughter, student words) Sahaja *is* Nirvikalpa but is also that direct perception--

AD (simultaneously): What is Nirvikalpa, Andrew?

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

AH: Awareness of Awareness.

AD: Ok, or consciousness of Consciousness.

AH: Yeah.

AD: Alright. What would you-- if you-- if you let your mind, you know, speculate, what would that-- what thoughts would arise in you with that kind of notion: [AH simultaneously: For me arise?] awareness of Awareness?

AH: Non-existence.

AD: Non-existence?

S: Uh-hm.

AD: Ok.

LD: Pure Being.

S: Uh-hm.

VM: Yeah.

S: Pure Being.

AS (simultaneously): Pure Being. (some laughter, student words)

LR: That's a Buddhist way of saying [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Alright, I agree, I agree that-- (more laughter) [S simultaneously: It isn't sensible.] I agree that at that level, alright, the sensible world doesn't exist.

AH: Well that's what I meant, obviously.

AD: Ok, ok, I agree with that.

AH: I have no [AD simultaneously: Ok.] way of-- I have no way of referring to that.

AD (simultaneously): Does any feeling arise in you as to what it might possibly be to be a-- for your awareness to be aware of itself and nothing else? I mean, couldn't you see that as a completely subjective state, [student assents] an *extreme* introversion...where what is self-evident knowing, so to speak, knows only itself and nothing else?

AH: Those are just words, Anthony, for me I-- I can't--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, I know but I'm trying to pick them very carefully.

AH: Yeah. I thank you for that but-- (some laughter)

AD: But try.

S (simultaneously): Cannot be (aroused). (some laughter, student assents)

AD: Try this. [AS: He can.] This principle within us which we refer to as-- you know, the quote that you often like to refer to, this consciousness, this illuminating principle which is immediately available for all perceptual usage but cannot in any way be objectified? (bit of laughter) [student assents] You got a feeling for that? I don't mean roses, you know, bouquet but you have a feeling for what that might be?

AH: Any feeling I have for it is beside the point, isn't it?

AD: No, I have to work with your feelings here. [S, very faint: Doesn't--] [AH simultaneously: Yes well I--] I don't expect an explicit, you know, conceptual--

AH (simultaneously): Yes I have a feeling for that.

AD: You have a feeling for it?

AH: Yeah.

AD: That your awareness is solely preoccupied with itself and nothing else. [AD snaps fingers] That would be awareness of Awareness. That would be Nirvikalpa samadhi. That would be complete subjective introversion. No World-Idea, they-- nothing else would exist, if I could-- if I could be outlandish and say except YOU. It is the highest kind of solipsism that is available, although actually the truth will be that it itself is placed in reality so it can't be really solipsistic. But in a sense it is the highest solipsism that's available to us. It is, so to speak, being that I AM principle; where nothing else matters. Then the next point he says is now, Sahaja is different than this here. You take *that* principle--the awareness of Awareness--and the awareness of Awareness, the second Awareness, the latter Awareness, can remain what it is or be transformed into thought. This he calls Sahaja. Go over it. Go over it in your mind.

S (very faint): Yeah.

LR: Anthony?

AH: That's the part I can't--

JG (simultaneously): In Nirvikalpa if you think, doesn't it slip out right [S simultaneously: Yeah, why--] away, right?

AD: Huh?

JG: If you did that-- the [one word inaudible] with the-- excuse me Li-- Linda, with the-- with the Sahaja instead you have both at the same time, [AD: Yes.] you see. [AD simultaneously: And you're identifi--] You would have the highest consciousness--

AD: Yes, you're identified with that.

JG: With that, and yet you perceive also that awareness of thought(s), yeah.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, or non-thoughts.

JG: Or none, you know, it come--

AD (simultaneously): Either way, doesn't matter.

JG: It-- yeah. You would be still.

AD (simultaneously): So the sage could be aware of the perc-- the perceptual world, [JG assents] or the world could be abolished [JG assents] and be just the consciousness [JG assents] before it transforms itself into the world.

JG (simultaneously): Uh-hm. Whereas if you're at the stage, I mean at-- a person being, you know, developed at the stage of Nirvikalpa, then the minute the thought would come in you would be [AS: Out.] hurled out in the regular world again.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, you'd be thrown out, yeah.

S: Right.

AD: So in that exercise, in the Serpent's Path which [JG assents] is the one that, you know, very often we're called upon to use, he speaks about this dynamic concentration--he says it's an extremely dynamic concentration. [Note: See Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*, Chap. 14, "The Yoga of the Discerning Mind," A Meditation on the Serpent's Path.] [JG assents] When you try to penetrate between two thoughts, your attention has to be so sharp, you know, sharper than any surgical knife, [JG assents] and it has to get in-between two thoughts, so it has to be so attentive that I can't see-- well, I *can* see why he didn't *call* it Nirvikalpa. [JG assents] Because that's the kind of concentration that's going to be required [JG assents] for you to insert your attention between two thoughts, [JG assents] in order for the exercise to succeed. [JG assents] So in that exercise there's-- as a prerequisite what's required is this dynamically alert attention that can insert itself in-between two thoughts that the World-Mind is producing.

PC: Yeah.

CdA: I just read a quote where PB quoted the Buddha, and I think you might be but-- familiar with this quote but-- where he-

AH (simultaneously): Can't hear you Carol.

CDA: You may be familiar with this quote but I just came across it where PB was quoting the Buddha and said-- he referred to this as the Serpent's Path exercise and sort of validated it by this quote where the Buddha says between-- that Nirvana lies between two thought-moments.

S: Well--

AD: Yes, I came across that [CDA simultaneously: Yeah.] too, (uh-huh). But you see what we're dealing with here now, you get a feeling what you're dealing with? [student assents] How these two things are held, you know-- Yeah?

RC: I-- I don't know if this'll apply to the point or not but I have a question when we speak of this awareness this way, if we're speaking of something that in Plotinian terminology we'd call an intrinsic-- or *the* most fundamental and intrinsic process of the soul itself or-- or if this is something different than that simple Life that's being called the fundamental nature of the soul.

[short pause]

AD: No, I would say that they're in agreement here.

RC: That that word 'life' and 'awareness' would be--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, they're in agreement.

RC: So-- so-- then when it's said that-- that the soul is-- is both one and many, can the same be said of this-- this awareness that we speak of, that this awareness is both single and manifold?

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, yeah. Yeah. [RC simultaneously: And--] And-- and that's awfully

complicated because to me that has two different references. I speak about the soul as one and many. You remember the quote we read last week where he speaks-- where we spoke about the-- the Self of the Sun is the-- is my "I". [PB: "The God in the sun is the 'I' in me"--this put tersely is the essence of man's relationship to divinity. A whole book may be needed to explain it, a whole lifetime to get direct experience of its truth as insight." (25:1.1.)] Remember, [student assents] we used that quote? Now, if my "I" is the Self of the Sun and her "I" is the Self of the Sun and the other one, alright, then we could say that these many souls, alright, are also one Soul. But we could also say that that one Soul is these many souls, and to try to change the language to accommodate us the way we think here would be a disaster. And I try to point out, like in one case Jung says "Well, it's obvious, there's only one soul." You remember in the quote? [Note: See C.G. Jung, CW 14, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, p. 534, paragraph 761.] It says, "No, that's his interpretation." And the other one who says "It's many soul." That's his interpretation. To leave it the way it is--it is *both, one and many*.

RC: Ok. Does-- does the recognition of that correspond with these two samadhis that we're speaking of? Like is Nirvikalpa a-- a recognition of the-- the oneness and--

AD: No. In the Nirvikalpa, in the Nirvikalpa you're not required to go through the metaphysical discipline. You could meet some extraordinary-- mystics of extraordinary attainment who've achieved Nirvikalpa but have no understanding of the cosmology that there's this-- has been worked out, whether here or Plotinus or any of that.

[student assents, very faint]

AS: I think that-- that--

AD: [possibly student: Uh-hm.] Don't make the assumption that because a mystic has achieved Nirvikalpa he's going to understand what we're saying here.

RC: No, I think that they're (contiguous) but I'm trying to understand this, that if you-- if in Nirvikalpa, I've realized something true about the soul. I've realized that the soul is-- is single and that singleness is all-embracing.

AD: You won't be able to realize that the soul could be many.

RC: Exactly.

AD: There-- not even the World-Idea exists in that situation or that state.

RC: Now, it has to-- to get specifically to the question I'm trying to ask about Sahaja, it-- there's a natural tendency to want to fall on the side and say well, Sahaja would be discovering something else which is true about the soul, which is the-- it is also many. But it seems to be more than that.

AD (simultaneously): I'm sorry.

RC: Well--

AD: No, just repeat what you said.

RC: It-- it seems to follow to say that [students assent, possibly part of background] Sahaja is a discovery

of something else that's true about the soul [student assents, very faint] and it's a discovery of the truth that the soul is also many. But it seems to be more than that. It seems to be--

AD: Well here I would go as far as Plotinus. The soul now can achieve or understand various states of being. And these states of being of course are manifold, whether-- whether we speak about just the undivided mind of our solar system, you know, or whether we speak about the various levels of Intellectuality that we find in *Mahat*, you know, the great Buddhist reasoning. [students assent, very faint] Sure, that's why Sahaja, and the whole point of the *philosophic* development is not only that-- On the one hand, the mystic wants to find out he has a soul, fine. But then also we have to understand that what these people are telling us, or as far as I can understand, is that the soul is being sent to school. And that there are no classes that say "This is it, now you've graduated, you're finished." There's no such thing in the universe that the soul is *finished* with learning, [RC assents] because there's *no* possibility of ever comprehending the World-Idea. So we get glimpses of what it might mean.

RC: So then when-- when we speak in terms of the-- the Soul being like simultaneously (strung) from both the One and the Intellectual-Principle--

AD: I'm sorry.

RC: When we speak of the Soul as being simultaneously suspended from-- from both the One and from the Intellectual-Principle--

AD: No, I wouldn't-- I wouldn't put it that way. I think I see what you're saying. What I'm trying to-- what I'm trying to say, Randy, is the way we say it, the context we use in what we say these things, is all-important. [RC assents] That we have to avoid this linear kind of progression or definition that we've been taught: if it's not this, then it's that. Well, we have to forget about that kind of logic, because the way Plotinus points out, he says, we have to reason essentially. [Note: See Plotinus, VI.5.2.] That means that we have to reason according to the dictates of the soul and not according to the way we understand the world here. So it isn't that I'm disagreeing, I'm just trying to point out, if-- if you notice when-- when I'm talking I try to use a *contextual*, a-- a frame to be understood rather than that a word itself should give my understanding. [RC assents] It can't do it. So I try to give a whole context, and also the particular *in* that context, to make it available. I am not-- I don't say I'm succeeding but that's what I try to do. So-- excuse me, just one more, so when I was trying to define the meaning of soul as one and many, I had to use that whole context, alright, I have to use the context that the S-- the Self of the Sun is her soul, it's also my soul, alright. Now in that case I could see that it-- since that Self is one, these many souls are one. But then I reverse it around and insofar that each and every one of us is projected forth from that Self of the Sun, and each one has a historicity that's different from the others, alright, and that has, let's say, intrinsic powers which are developing which separates it from the others, then it's a many. In this context and only by using a conte-- contextual language can that be understood. It *cannot* be understood by saying "Well, it's one. No, it's not, it's many." That's all nonsense. [RC assents, very faint] That's talk of book-readers. You know, people who read books: us.

S: Yeah. (laughter, student words)

RC: Well, I guess what I was really trying to drive at is it seems as though the way Sahaja is spoken of as the-- the goal of the [AD simultaneously: Philosopher.] philosophic development, that-- that it-- it's

actually a more-- more unific state.

AD (simultaneously): The Sahaja.

RC: Yeah, it's a state that reflects, um, [11½ second pause] non-duality more than just [AD simultaneously: Exactly.] either-- either singleness or multiplicity.

AD (simultaneously): Exactly. It expresses non-duality more than any other. Consciousness of Consciousness or awareness of Awareness regardless if that latter Awareness changes into thought or not. That's the na-- that's non-dualism. And that was the point I think we were discussing before. *That's different from monism*, which reduces everything to one homogeneous block.

[student assents, very faint]

RC: Yeah, in doing that it seems like-- like for soul to discover something of its own nature seems to be-- it seems to be quite a-- quite a step up from ego-consciousness. And then for soul to discover something of its being grounded in the Nous seems to be even more of a complete attack. So it seems that this-- the Sahaja takes even a step beyond that and-- and brings out something of the First Hypostasis itself.

AD: Yes, nondualism, yeah.

[9¾ second pause]

AD/S(?): Well--

LD (simultaneously): Why would you say it that way and not the other way around?

S (whisper, possibly part of background): Not necessarily.

LD: Is that the awareness of Awareness alone seems to be more of the [one word inaudible] even [RC assents] if-- even if you might [one/two words inaudible]

RC (simultaneously): Well that's why I was really trying to drive at it that way because on first impression it would seem that way. But the more I've been hearing about it it seems that it's more the way that I said it the second time, that the-- the Nirvikalpa isn't really an experience of the One in any way. It's like something of unity of the soul is different than the First Hypostasis. [student assents, faint] And that it's only in the Sahaja state that an awareness of a-- of a unity which is greater than the unity of the individual souls are--

AD: You remember the quote that I'm fond of using about Atmananda? About this gentleman who was quite capable of going into Nirvikalpa, some people can-- can get (in/it), and Atmananda says, "Ok, now that you've achieved it, alright, now the work ahead of you is to become a philosopher and that is to understand the World-Idea." [RC assents] Once you understand that, then you'll become a philosopher. This is also strangely enough the story of Heisenberg. If you read his life, it's really quite extraordinary. I'd like to recommend it. But he first developed this tremendous power, you know, this capacity to concentrate where he actually achieved Nirvikalpa samadhi. And after that, alright, he understood something about the nature of the world, and he told Weizsacker, he says "Eh. I wasted all that time. It's not real!"

[student assents, very faint]

S: Is it-- is it--

S: [couple/few words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): But, you see, he went through the development naturally. Very concentrated introversion, a high degree of introversion to the point where he achieved the samadhi, Nirvikalpa, and then that was brought to bear on the problems he was working out in physics. [S: Yeah.] Alright? He applied that.

RC (simultaneously): Well you probably saw that-- that note of PB's, I would imagine that's what you're referring to with [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Oh no, I'm reading-- I was reading this thing on *Quantum Questions*. [Note: Ken Wilber, *Quantum Questions: Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists*.] I don't know if any of you know about it. There's a collection of essays by five or six different men--Vic told me about the book--and there's Schrödinger and Einstein and Planck and-- it's-- it's really very good reading, it's better than television. (bit of laughter)

RC: Well PB pulled that quote out of somewhere, it said that Heisenberg said to von Weizsacker on his deathbed that it was a waste of time to study [student assents] physics, the [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] world is an illusion.

AD: Yeah.

S: Uh-hm, yeah.

LR: Anthony?

AD: Sure.

LR: I think-- I think I-- my question was related to what Randy was saying about how-- The quote uses the term awareness of Awareness in both cases, from the (quote) Nirvikalpa and Sahaja. And yet it seems that the state of Sahaja is not just-- because of the way it's stated, the awareness of Awareness is different in each case. In other words, in Nirvikalpa there are no thoughts. In Sahaja there may or may not be thoughts. So if one were in Sahaja and did not have thoughts, it wouldn't be the same as being [AS simultaneously, very faint: (In Nirvikalpa.)) in Nirvikalpa.

S: Hm, yeah.

LR: In other words, the state of Sahaja without thought is not the state of Nirvikalpa, it's (apperceived).

S: Why not?

LR: Because-- I think this is what you were saying too, wasn't it Randy, something like that?

RC: Say more, I didn't get the--

LR (simultaneously): Well--

S (very faint): Yeah.

LR: Because it seems that the state when he said Sahaja is Sahaja with or without thought.

AD: No, he doesn't-- he didn't say that, he didn't say that.

LR: He said--

AS (simultaneously): Sahaja's awareness of Awareness.

LR: --"whether appeari-- appearing as thoughts or not."

AD: Whether that Awareness or whether that Consciousness remains as Consciousness or transforms itself into thought.

LR: Right.

AD: Alright.

LR: Ok, now the way-- the way I understood that was-- I know we didn't--

AD (simultaneously): How-- before you understand any more, (some laughter, student words) what situation or what position would you have to be in to comprehend that statement?

LR: Not my position, obviously.

AD: No, and-- I-- Linda, I'm not trying to be facetious or, you know, critical. I'm trying to, you know, get across something. What situation would you have to be in or what would be required of you in order to be able to say that's just pure Consciousness or that's thought, Consciousness transformed in-- into thought? What would *your* situation have to be?

LR: Well you have to be in a state of ni-- of pure awareness.

AD: Yeah.

LR: So?

AD: Ok, go ahead now.

LR: I-- that didn't-- I--

S: Yeah.

AD: You see what I mean, I work [LR simultaneously: No, I don't.] contextually?

LR: No, I don't understand what you mean by that.

AD: Alright, ask your question. Go ahead, try again.

LR (simultaneously): Well you may have answered it but I didn't get it.

AD: Try again.

LR: It seems that there is something different-- there's-- ok, here's another way to put it. There's more

than one difference between Sahaja and that-- and Nirvikalpa. In other words, it's not just the presence of thought that separates those two states. There's-- one is a more complete state. One perhaps is able to traverse prajna consciousness, dream consciousness, wakeful consciousness, [student assents, faint] whereas the other seems to be only-- only in one state.

[students assent, very faint]

AD: Yes.

LR: And-- so that what-- if one were in Sahaja, even if not-- even without thoughts appearing, it wouldn't be necessarily the same as being in Nirvikalpa.

AD: Uh-huh.

LR: Even though they're both called awareness [AD simultaneously: Uh-hm.] of Awareness, [AD: Uh-hm.] one traverses [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): But why would that be so? [S, very faint: Yeah.] Wouldn't we say something like this, I think-- I think this is the explanation that would be offered.

[Audio File 1984 0919a Ends]

[Audio File 1984 0919b Begins]

SERPENT'S PATH; NON-DUALITY

LR: You made one statement before that I-- that [few words inaudible] something that [couple words inaudible] [students assent, very faint] You were talking about the Serpent's Path exercise.

AD: Yeah.

LR: And you said penetration between two moments of thought would land you in Nirvikalpa?

JG: No, [AD: What?] no, that's not what Anthony said.

LR: [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): I didn't hear you, I didn't hear you. Not only I can't yell at you but I can't hear well.

LR: I thought you said that if you penetrate between two thought-moments-- [AD: Yeah] tonight I thought you said, [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] you could arrive at that state of Nirvikalpa.

AD: No, uh-uh. No, you're-- I said what is required is practically Nirvikalpa in order to *penetrate* into those two thought-moments. In other words, you have to have an attention that is so acute, so steady, so precise, you know, like an acetylene torch, you ever see an acetylene torch? A flame comes out and you can go down (on a) steel and cut it right in half? Well your attention has to be that steady, alright. With that kind of attention, I can't see what the difference is between that and Nirvikalpa.

LR: Now is Nirvikalpa a state of the-- of awareness of the soul and not the [AD simultaneously: Well--] World-Idea the way you said?

AD: It's awareness, sure. Nirvikalpa [LR simultaneously: Yeah.] is awareness.

LR: And it excludes the World-Idea?

AD: Excludes the World-Idea.

LR: And, I believe you said one-- that if one-- that if-- if one were able to penetrate between two thought-moments, he would arri-- he would arrive at the World-Idea.

AD (simultaneously): You use-- you use that concentrative ability to penetrate between two thought-moments.

LR: And where does that get you to?

AD: Where does that get you?

S: [few words inaudible] (some laughter)

LR: Wouldn't you say that was the World-Idea?

AD: Well--

JB (simultaneously): World-Mind (the two of us) had in common.

AD: This-- this is where his point comes in again, nonduality comes in. He finds out, alright, that underlying the World-Idea is the World-Mind. Right? The World-Mind is what projects the World-Idea. Your mind, your I AM principle, is a *particle* of that World Mind, right? You come to non-dualism. Now don't argue with me; listen to me. Your mind, your-- your soul, is what projects forth the universe for *you* as an individual, alright. Then your soul, getting involved in the fabrication of the World-Idea, alright, wants to know something about the World-Idea, it must penetrate into the World-Idea. This consciousness-principle, this principle of consciousness within you here and now, this self-evidencing principle, let's say, is available to you. You're sitting down and you're meditating. I-- one thought after another follows, alright. Now remember, you're way beyond any kind of sensorial experience. You don't have any experience of the world sensually when this is going on. The world is coming into manifestation as a thought and exploding as the world that we would-- we-- we would call the world. It's between these two thoughts, [AD speaks softly for the rest of the sentence] now I-- in between two seed-thoughts, then you get to the World-Idea, I mean to the substratum of the World-Idea, the World-Mind. But what is the World-Mind? Didn't we just say that your mind was a *particle* of the World-Mind? Didn't we just say that? But then what we're saying is, you find out that you're part of the World-Mind, that your soul is part of the World-Mind.

AS: But then--

[student assents, faint]

AD: Your soul is a particle of the World-Mind. And you come to non-dualism. And this is an absolute affirmation. No two ways about it. The other way has got nothing to do with non-dualism. Avery, if you want--

AS: (Can't/Just) get into that thought(--/.) So that means that in fact in that Nirvikalpa-- because there was

something he didn't realize about the soul he-- he was not completely self-gnostic, just to bring it back to another question we always have, that namely if you have--

AD (simultaneously): If I could interrupt you-- if I could interrupt [some inaudible student words simultaneous with AD] you now, Randy put me onto this quote, and that was the quote where PB says now, in this lifetime, alright, you don't get beyond a Nirvikalpa samadhi trance, but you will be required, Nature will force you to come back [RC: Right.] and complete the trip. [S: Yeah.] You can't leave it halfway. So Nature will force you to become a philosopher and [AS simultaneously: I--] achieve Sahaja. You remember that quote?

AH(?) (very faint): Yes I do.

AS: Now, I think what the-- what the Mahayana Buddhists mean when they say that you *can't* end up as a Solitary Realizer. No matter what they-- no matter what the solitary realizers think in the Han-- Hinayana school, after you've [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] attained the Solitary Realizer state, you'll-- the-- the World-Mind-- Idea will force you to go on [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] to the Bodhisattva school.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, the Mahayanists are, I think, absolutely correct there.

AS: And they claim you'll have-- I think that's the same thing as saying you'll have to become a philosopher [student assents] [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Whether you like it or not.

AS: That you won't be-- you won't be allowed to stick with that kind of realization.

AD (simultaneously): But still there is a great deal of reason for their ordering, you know, the Solitary Realizer, the [student assents] Hearer, and [AS simultaneously: But it--] the Bodhisattva.

AS: But it-- but this puts it into an ordered perspective, [AD: Perspective.] as in the quote where he says you have to attain the Nirvikalpa first. And a Solitary Realizer could mean just what you said, you realize the solitariness-- I mean the solitary realizer, he's realizing solitariness of his own soul.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, as a matter of fact if you-- if you read through a history of medieval mysticism, you'll be amazed how many of them used to hide and you'd never see them again. [students assenting] You'd never see them, they'd go off into the mountains and you'd never see them, they won't come out. [students assent] Who was-- well, just think of a few people like Ruysbroeck who had-- you know, very hesitant about having anything to do with people, they just used to back off, didn't want to get involved. But they weren't philosophers. They were heading in that direction, but they weren't there yet. Later on, if you read the later writings of Ruysbroeck, he starts condemning people who do that, who-- who run away from the work that's ahead. You're getting a feeling for this-- the abyss of this doctrine, how vast it is?

EM: I feel like I'm getting a little bit of a feeling about what PB really meant when he always said that he was a student. And--

AD: That's all we'll ever ever ever be.

EM: And-- but it starts to take on-- I mean I heard the words but it's pretty frightening.

AD (simultaneously): I mean it's so-- it's frightening to-- to realize how ignorant we are.

EM: But even at that stage [S: Yeah.] being open to learning, you know.

[short pause]

AD: Well--

JL (simultaneously): (Is it--)

AD: Sure Jeff.

JL: One-- a little more on the Nirvikalpa. Ok, I-- I mean I can say that it is-- there are no-- there's no thoughts and this World-Idea is not present but is it-- is it-- is there really noth-- I mean I can't imagine there's nothing there, with my presence is what-- is what is lacking-- I'm trying to figure out what the lack is still there in-- I'm imagining something more like a beatific vision rather than-- even though it's beyond the ego, I can't help but something else is delivered except the person isn't receiving it, but--

AD: When-- when he goes into Nirvikalpa?

JL: Yeah.

AD: The greatest miracle of all is received, the miracle of subjectivity, which has been completely hidden from us today with their stupid, you know, remarks like you're 98 cents worth of chemicals or \$10 worth of-- [student assents, faint] But the miracle of subjectivity is something that the vastness of a galaxy can't comprehend. [S: Hm.] That's what's delivered. And I can't-- I can't possibly communicate that. I don't think anyone can.

SUSTAINED CONCENTRATION ON THE VOID LEADING TO RECOGNITION OF I AM; MORE ON NIRVIKALPA AND SAHAJA

AS: He-- he almost does it in one quote but I--

AD (simultaneously): Please, if you got something like that.

AS (simultaneously): --maybe I'm-- maybe I'm off the point but, on this page 327. At least it'll unfold my own misunderstanding. 'Cause I don't-- well I think you'll see.

[student assents, very faint]

S (very faint): Avery?

AS: Alright.

AD: I can't hear you.

AS: Yeah. He says--

PB [V15, 23:8.118 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 23: Advanced Contemplation, #76, AS reading]: "We must withdraw every thing and thought from the mind except this single thought of trying to achieve the absence of what is not the Absolute. This is called Gnana Yoga: "*Neti, Neti*" [(It is not this)], as Shankara called [AS reads: calls] it. [AS: Hope this is the right one. Alright.] [And] he must go on with this

negative elimination until he reaches the stage where a great Void envelops him. If he can succeed in holding resolutely to this Void in sustained concentration--and he will discover it is one of the hardest things in the world to do so--he..."

AD (simultaneously): *The* hardest thing. What do you mean "one of the hardest"? (laughter, student words)

AS (amidst laughter): I don't know. So maybe there's other (hardest) [one word inaudible]

PB [V15, 23:8.118 and *Perspectives*, Chapter 23: Advanced Contemplation, #76, AS reading]: "...he will abruptly find that it is not a mere mental abstraction but something real, not a dream but the most concrete thing in his experience. Then and then only can he declare positively [AS adds: now], "It is *This*." [AS: Capital "T".] For he has found the Overself."

[short pause]

S: Can we hear this again please?

AS: Ok. [few words inaudible]

AD: Well, I think that there are more passages where he does. But this whole business, you know, of-- [AS: Yeah.] to try to recognize the miracle of our own being is something that [student assents] I-- I don't think *can* be communicated. It might happen occasionally, you know. I'm not talking about the miracle of our ego, because that's-- it's a whole different ballgame.

AS: Another miracle. (bit of laughter)

AD: But to die to the ego and to realize that you really ARE now, even if it's for a moment, you really ARE now, this is what I mean about the miracle, the prodigality of our own subjectivity, that we are Consciousness or Mind. Alright.

S: Anthony? And--

AD (simultaneously): You know how long the-- how-- how much time-- what does Andromeda or a galaxy take in terms of time and space and all that? And I said it's a greater miracle than that. As a matter of fact they're like terrestrial incidences in your consciousness, the galaxy. But could God do any less? If He gave you something, wouldn't He give you the-- the best and the greatest there could be, that He couldn't *do* better? [few inaudible student words simultaneous with AD] If He could do better He wouldn't be God.

S: Yeah.

AS: Doesn't that quote say if He gave any more than-- I think "He dares not give any more or lest He would be God Himself."

AD: Oh. (AD laughs a bit) [students assent] You're coming from Eckhart.

AS: Yeah, the book. (bit of laughter)

[students assent]

AD (quietly): Just-- just sleep on that tonight. Yeah, Linda?

LR: Well, I-- Can I just go back to that quote on [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Sure. [S: Yeah.] Go back on that.

LR: I just have another thought about it that, you know, I--

AD (simultaneously): But yell at me Linda.

LR: Oh. Well, I was wondering again at this difference between those two states, Sahaja without thought and Nirvikalpa which is always without thought.

AD: Yeah. Go on.

LR: If the world only arises with thought, and Sahaja could be a state of attainment with or without thought, *then* how would you describe the difference between the Nirvikalpa state and the Sahaja state without thought? Because if it's without thought there could be no world-consciousness. Is that true or not? No, I might-- I haven't had attainment, right?

AD: Remember Ramakrishna was looking at a cat? And he says "It's nothing but consciousness." Then the next minute he says "Oh, it's a *form* of consciousness."

LR: Go on.

AD: What could I tell you? That's what a sage is. The form, alright, and the consciousness are both available to him. If he was a mystic, he wouldn't understand that. [S simultaneously: Yeah but--] He couldn't even reach it!

AS: Linda, maybe you could ask your question by asking if the sage could still go into Nirvikalpa even though he's attained Sahaja.

AD: But then, then [LR simultaneously, very faint: No, that's not what--] he wouldn't be *seeing* anything. He *can* go into Nirvikalpa, the sage can go into Nirvikalpa, [AS simultaneously: Yeah, I--] alright, but-- but then the World-Idea has to be crossed out.

AS: Exactly, and I-- I thought that question you-- I thought (that's/that was) the question she's asking.

LR: No, I guess-- I guess what I'm asking then is how-- how can you have conscious-- how can you be conscious of the World-Idea without thought?

AD: How can you be conscious of the World--

LR (simultaneously): I thought the World-Idea rise-- ar-- arose every minute with the process of thinking, that e-- that the mind thought the world into existence moment by moment.

AD: Yes. I'm sorry, go on.

LR: Ok. So in some ways the World-Mind uses the individual mind to manifest itself. I mean that's just one way of saying it but--

AD: Go on.

LR: So if the mind were thoughtless, or without thought, in what way would the person be conscious of the world?

AD: But obviously he won't be conscious of the world.

LR: But then there *would* be no difference between the state of Sahaja and the state of Nirvikalpa.

S (very faint): Exactly.

AD: No, no, you're doing the same thing.

LR: I don't see why.

[short pause]

AD: Why don't you go [BS simultaneously: Would I be asking the same question--] over what-- go over in your mind what I said rather than have me repeat it.

LR: Ok, I'm sorry Anthony, I-- Does anyone else understand?

[one/two students, few words inaudible]

JB (simultaneously): Everybody, well ask everybody what--

AD (simultaneously): Yes, (everybody).

BS: Would I be asking the same question if I asked how does embodied awareness not think? Is that what you're asking?

S: No.

S: [couple/three words inaudible]

AS: Tim doesn't think.

S: Hm?

JG: [couple words inaudible] [few inaudible TS words simultaneous with JG] but then you're no longer embodied.

S: Yeah.

BS: No but that seems to be the-- [S simultaneously: Seems like it's-- right.] part of the Sahaja state.

S: Why is it [couple words inaudible]

MB: [one/two words inaudible]

S: Nonsense. [one/two words inaudible]

TS: I-- I *think* this is an answer, I mean-- In the statement that was read, "*Sahaja samadhi* is the awareness of Awareness, whether appearing as thought or not"--

AD: Whether the LATTER appears as thought or not.

S: Yeah.

TS: Does it say that?

S: Uh-hm.

S: [couple words inaudible]

S (simultaneously): It has to be--

AD: No, I'm just-- I'm just adding that.

JB: Oh.

S: I see.

AS: That's going to wreck us. (bit of laughter)

TS: Yeah.

S: Yeah.

TS: And I've got this-- I've got this-- whereas-- but Nirvikalpa samadhi is solely the awareness of Awareness, I had the idea that you could speak of Nirvikalpa as solely the awareness of Awareness where the awareness is the changing consciousness that comes in-- that collapses into the unchanging consciousness, so that it would be aware-- the lower case awareness is the changing consciousness that collapses by the cessation of its activity into the higher Awareness or the unchanging Awareness. But in the first case, when he speaks of Sahaja samadhi as the awareness of Awareness, then it is the changing consciousness now as the emanant or emanation or act of the unchanging consciousness. So that the changing consciousness as-- is the awareness of Awareness but now that aw-- that lower case awareness can appear as thought or not.

S: Then you're [few words inaudible]

LDS (simultaneously): But then you're doing it by the notion of consciousness is the one consciousness.

TS: No.

AB: No he hasn't.

S: You still have one concept.

AD (simultaneously): Tim, maybe, maybe you might follow me astrologically? If you think of [TS simultaneously, chuckling a bit: I got this.] the pure Awareness, alright, the awareness of Awareness, the Sahaja, if you think of that as the Sun-centered consciousness, and then if you think of the awareness, the second awareness, as the functioning of the undivided mind which can be either pure consciousness or particular manifestation.

S: Hm.

AD: I even got a pill for you to take if you bought-- if you took that one. (laughter)

TS: If it'll help!

AS: Swallow it up. (more laughter)

AD: Go over it in your mind. The Sahaja awareness is like the Sun-centered Awareness: it knows both. It knows the undivided mind functioning as pure consciousness or producing spontaneously.

TS: Right, yes, ok.

S: It--

TS: Whereas the--

AD (simultaneously): So the Sun could know both, right? It could know the functioning of the undivided mind, the planetary powers, it could know that, it could know that as just pure Awareness. It could also know the *product* of that functioning. [S: How(--/?)] And know them BOTH simultaneously.

S: That's ok.

TS: Whereas the-- the undivided mind has to cease in its functioning in order to discover that solar consciousness.

[students assent]

AD: Yes.

S: Yeah.

AD: In both ways as a matter of fact. It will cease knowing also like when it gets involved *in* one of the products, then it has to cease knowing itself. In other words, the undivided mind functioning through me has to stop knowing itself, in order for me to know *myself*, in order for Tony to say "This is Tony." If the undivided mind works through me, I'm not going to say "I'm Tony." So the undivided mind has to forget itself when it comes into manifestation, when it manifests through a body.

TS: And for the undivided mind to manifest through the body and not forget itself, it must be functioning as the pure [AD simultaneously: No but--] Awareness of the Solar consciousness.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, now you got somebody. (TS laughs a bit)

S: Right.

TS: Got any Advil?

AD: Yeah-- well, we had one. Well--

S: Ok, go ahead.

AD: Well, I'm kind of tired. Read one more and maybe somebody would like to read a couple next week from that list and talk about them?

[couple seconds of background student talking]

AD: Anyone volunteer?

JB: If you'll have class next week Anthony.

AD (simultaneously): Huh?

JB: Yeah [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): I mean the next week.

[few students talking at once, few words audible and inaudible, few seconds]

AD: Anyway, if anyone would like to read a couple and talk about them. Louis, you hand over that paper and I'll keep digging up a few more. Because I [student assents] want to get a little, you know, I want to get you in there now. Read one more, Louis. [short pause] And you discuss it; you people discuss it, go ahead. [student assents] Make it short, Louis, don't get a big one.

S: Don't get a big one?

S (simultaneously, very faint): Yeah, (don't get a big one) today.

[10 second pause]

LD: Um-- Should I just read one or should I--

S: [three words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Yeah please, I'll cut you off if it's--

LD: Just figure it out before I-- (some laughter, student words) rather than reading it.

S: That's right Lou.

AD (simultaneously): No, I'm trying to-- it-- it isn't that you can't do it, it's just that there's easier way to-- rather than harder, you know. There's some things if we discuss first, then we'll discuss other things they're more meaningful, you know? In other words, like you gotta know arithmetic before you could do calculus so if we discuss some, then we could discuss others. So it's just a question-- I didn't put them in an order because I assume that I'd be here when they were read. So read one and I'll scream.

S: Yeah.

INCLUDING THE OVERSELF IN CONSCIOUSNESS ALONG WITH THE BODY, EMOTIONS, AND INTELLECT; MYSTIC AND PHILOSOPHER

LD: Ok.

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading. This part of 20v/109/1 was NEVER typed into the PB database; JF checked the motherlog. 20v/109/1 = 20:4.92 "If a man sinks..."]: "That of which everyone is immediately conscious is-- [AD simultaneously: Very good, yeah.] is the body, the emotions, and the intellect. When he can include the Overself too without however excluding these three themselves, he shall have attained the properly matured divine consciousness. If the mystic attains his highest aspiration when the world is lost from his consciousness, the philosopher attains his only when the world is again restored to his consciousness."

S: Just wanted to read that (book/quote).

S (very faint): Uh-hm [one/two words inaudible]

LR (very faint): Read it again.

S (very faint): Uh-hm. (Read it.)

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading]: “That of which everyone is immediately conscious is the body, the emotions, and the intellect. When he can include the Overself too without however excluding these three themselves, he shall have attained the properly matured divine consciousness. If the mystic attains his highest aspiration when the world is lost from his consciousness, the philosopher attains his only when the world is again restored to his consciousness.”

[short pause]

LR: This is something Tim was saying.

JB (very faint, possibly part of background): I don’t know.

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading]: “If the mystic attains his highest aspiration when the world is lost from his consciousness, the philosopher attains his only when the world is again restored to his consciousness.”

S (very faint): Reread.

S (whisper): Yeah.

[38 second pause]

S: Would you read the very beginning (sentence)?

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading]: “That of which everyone is immediately conscious is the body, the emotions, and the intellect.”

AD: Ok so far?

[students assent, very faint] (some laughter)

S: [three/few words inaudible]

AD: (Yeah.) (AD laughing)

AS: That’s what they-- (some laughter) So-- sorry to bring in a Buddhist idea but I think that’s what they mean by transforming the body, speech, and mind into the three kayas.

AD: Three kayas? Ok. [AS simultaneously: Yeah. That way--] But isn’t this better and simpler?

AS: Yeah, I know, I’m just--

AD: I mean we don’t have to use a Sanskrit word, ‘kayas’.

AS: I know, but--

AD: I don't know the word.

AS: I know but I just seem to be on this track of trying to understand what they're saying--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, I know, I know what you mean.

AS: --using-- using these words and-- 'Cause it's the-- it's basically the same idea as the other quote about going-- the mystic attains Nirvikalpa but then has to bring the world back in order to have [AD/S(?) simultaneously: Uh-huh.] Sahaja. But it seems that when he now brings them back from the Sahaja state, they're transformed because he knows them to be consciousness. So now they're not just the-- they're not-- now they're not just the-- he knows-- in the first sentence he says he *knows* the body, speech and the mind, he knows the body, the emotions, and the intellect, but he only knows them as the-- as the-- as content or as other or as if a-- But in-- after going through the whole thing of finding his Overself and then bringing that state of awareness back again, he now knows them as also continuous with the reality and therefore he-- in that sense only they're transformed.

AD: You got all that out of the first line?

AS: Yeah.

AD: Ok. (AD laughing)

RC: [few words inaudible]

S: Now [few words inaudible] export.

AD (simultaneously): Marvelous. (AD laughs a bit more) [short pause] All this-- this Buddhist controversy has got us all stirred up, huh? (bit of laughter) Trying to figure out what they're saying. But you have to remember, Tibetan Buddhism, alright, is not Buddhism. Buddhism is much bigger than Tibetan Buddhism. And often, I find, that when I'm in difficulty in understanding, I go right to the Hin-- Hindus themselves. Because in this world, all of us, I think, have the feeling that India has been the spiritual teacher for a long time, and still is. They have a literature that's so vast you can't even imagine it. They got quite a background, the Hindus. So very often I go to them when I try to understand some other school, alright, and I try to get through them insights into what these people are talking about: Tibetans, Chinese, or any of the others. Because it emigrated from India, spread out from India. It didn't spread out from Tibet or China or Burma; it spread out from India.

AS: 'Kaya' is a Sanskrit (term) [one/two words inaudible] (laughter, student words)

AD: There's nothing I can do with him, he's-- he's got the kaya on his mind. Alright, let's have that first part again, huh? Everybody's aware of his body, his feelings, and his intellect. So far we agree. Ok? The next part.

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading]: "When he can include the Overself too without however excluding these three themselves, he shall have attained the properly matured divine consciousness."

AD: Alright.

S: Right.

JG: The properly what, ma-- matured?

AD (simultaneously): Attained consciousness.

[students assent]

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading]: "When he can include the Overself too without however excluding these three themselves, he shall have attained the properly matured divine consciousness."

AD: In other words, [AS simultaneously: In other words, Sahaja.] the-- at the end of evolution.

EM: Quite a leap [three words inaudible]

AH (very faint): Yeah.

AD: You're right at the finishing line.

AH: Is that-- is that to imply that--

JG (simultaneously): I never thought that divine consciousness has to mature.

AD: No, but we do.

AH: The idea that one may have glimpses of that Overself from time to time, is that nothing like this matured divine state?

AD: No, nothing at all.

AH: No?

[short pause]

JA: Anthony, you said earlier that the sage, and I assume that when he talks about the philosopher here he-- he's referring to the sage, transcends both the I AM consciousness and the World-Idea.

AD: Yeah, by that I mean not so much transcending or above but like it includes-- he includes both [JA: Yeah.] in himself.

JA: So that's what--

AD: Yeah, that's what I mean.

JA: Ok.

AD: (Uh-huh.)

S (very faint): Ok.

S: Anthony, is-- is it--

AD: Now a person like that would know what his role is in the world, alright, and, you know, work with the World-Idea. So on the one hand he understands something about the nature of the World-Idea and the direction it's heading, and he also knows the nature of his own soul, and him you can-- we can call a

philosopher. [short pause] A little bit more.

S: Yeah.

S (very faint): Just reread.

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading]: “If the mystic attains his highest aspiration when the world is lost from this consciousness, the philosopher attains his only when the world is again restored to his consciousness.”

S (very faint): Do that one again.

PB [unpublished, 20v/109/1a, LD reading]: “If the mystic attains his highest aspiration when the world is lost from this consciousness, the philosopher attains his only when the world is again restored to his consciousness.”

[10¾ second pause]

AD: Well you remember I told you the story about Vivekananda, he told Ramakrishna, he says, “I want to be submerged in the Nirvikalpa for weeks and weeks.” And Ramakrishna says, “You’re a greater fool than I thought you were. There’s something better than that!” That’s what he was pointing to.

LR: Remember when he did go into it and Ramakrishna couldn’t get him-- he didn’t want to [couple words inaudible] get him out.

AD (simultaneously): Couldn’t get him out, he didn’t want to come out, no. Didn’t want to come out.

LR (simultaneously): He said he wouldn’t do it. (LR laughing, bit of laughter)

AS: No, there wasn’t-- [LR simultaneously: Wasn’t that--] no, no, it wasn’t quite-- it was-- it was Ramakrishna said no. The other guy wanted him to come and-- one of the other disciples wanted Ramakrishna to come down and get Vivekananda out, and said Ramakrish-- [LR simultaneously: Yeah that’s--] that he wanted it long enough, let him ha--

AD: Let him have it.

AS (simultaneously): Let him stew in it for a while. (AS laughing)

AD: Let him stew in it.

AS: I mean, let him--

LD: That’s when he lost his head, right?

AS: And he couldn’t-- he didn’t know how to get back.

LR: And he couldn’t get back in, [AS simultaneously: Yeah, couldn’t get back.] right [few words inaudible] he has or--

AS (simultaneously): But-- yeah, yeah.

S (very faint): Well, go ahead, read it.

TS: That was a great [one word inaudible]

AS: Yeah, right. (AS laughs a bit, bit of laughter, student words)

AD: Is that finished? Or read on. Read on.

LD: Another one?

AD: No, it's finished.

LD: Yeah.

AS (simultaneously): That's bad.

AD: Good, I'm gonna call it quits, I'm tired. I should get my voice back so I could properly yell at you people.

S: Hm.

S: Uh-hm.

S: Uh-hm.

S: (Uh-hm.)

AD: Thank you.

Students: No, thank you Anthony.

[short pause]

AS: He had one-- he has [one word inaudible]

S: [couple/few words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Well, we'll be-- we'll be-- [LR/S(?) simultaneously: We're not going to (few words inaudible) right?] (going) to get-- does anybody wants to read a few of them and get 'em ready? Come on, don't be bashful. (bit of laughter)

S: Alright.

[students getting up to leave, milling around, talking]

[Audio File 1984 0919b Ends]