

## ***TWO EXCERPTS from Transcripts... first is in LIVING WISDOM***

**PB:** " 'Intuition' had come to lose its pristine value for me. I cast about for a better one and found it in 'insight.' This term I assigned to the highest knowing-faculty of sages and was thus able to treat the term 'intuition' as something inferior which was sometimes amazingly correct but not infrequently hopelessly wrong in its guidance, reports, or premonition. I further endeavoured to state what the old Asiatic sages had long ago stated, that it was possible to unfold a faculty of direct insight into the nature of the Overself, into the supreme reality of the universe, that this was the highest kind of intuition possible to man, and that it did not concern itself with lesser revelations, such as giving the name of a horse likely to win tomorrow's race, a revelation which the kind of intuition we hear so much about is sometimes able to do." Perspectives p. 276 and 20.4.152

**S:** I thought the experience of intuition itself was outside the psyche.

**AD:** It's not outside the psyche. It's outside the psycho-somatic organism.

It is the intellect that was manipulating the memorized modifications of bodily functioning, not the mind coming into the mind. I'm using the language as precisely as I can. If we speak about the intellect as that biological communication that can take place within the psycho-somatic organism, and which has a propensity to retain its experiences, organize and classify them, etc., that's intellect the way it is used in contemporary language. The intellect can be preoccupied with a problem that you cannot resolve. Then we speak about some intuition arising within and pointing out to the intellect to combine things in such and such a way, and the discovery is made, or some invention comes forth.

But we could say this much: Intuition deals with and is within the domain of relativities. I think we feel pretty sure about that. It's always OF something. I get an intuition to do something, or I get an intuition of an idea, or an intuition of a feeling that should be the underlie of a certain experience. The intuitions are of something, so they are within the realm of relativity.

If we go a little further, then: It seems that the intuition has to do with the coordination between the cosmic circuit or the World Idea and the individual psyche's response to it. Whether it is correct or incorrect is only something that reason will be able to demonstrate.

Do you see what I'm saying? You have the World Idea, with the entire potential of all circumstances, situations, events, bits and pieces of knowledge that can be brought together or not, and you have a reasoning about that World Idea on the part of an individual. And intuition very often attempts to coordinate the state of knowledge within the individual and the so-called World Idea.

Now notice the distinction: there's like two different levels or frameworks being used. On the one hand the Cosmic Idea and on the other hand the individual's relationship to that idea and how he understands it. Up to a certain point the intellect is adequate, but then, after that point, intuition has to be brought in to get deeper and deeper into this understanding of the World Idea. So intuition will always be about relativity--something in the domain of the relative: the coordination of the knowledge that the individual soul or the Witness-I has concerning something of the World Idea.

But insight is not that kind of knowledge, a knowledge of relativity. Insight would be the soul understanding itself. It's not something outside or external to itself, the World Idea which is imposed upon it, but soul understanding its own nature. That would be insight. So you can see that they're qualitatively different. Insight is reality understanding itself. And if we say it's ``life," it's axiomatic to say it would understand itself--in a way that's peculiar to itself, and we can't imagine. But it would, being a reality, also have to include knowing itself. So that's where I use the phrase ``knowing knows itself," and then I restrict it: ``knowing knowing." But intuition, as you can see, is like the soul now externalizing, trying to understand something which is not itself: the World Idea. And the correlation or coordination between these two is where intuition is functioning.

**S:** Is intuition a faculty found within the ego or would you say . . .

**AD:** I think it works both ways. On the one hand it's a faculty we develop of learning, after we've exhausted all our efforts to understand something, to be able to keep still so that the World Idea itself could try to influence us or suggest something. So that given the appropriate opportunity, for instance, like in the study of some of these charts where a person has exhausted every possible resource to understand something, and he tries to give up the problem on an auspicious occasion--a good aspect shows up--and it's like the universe is trying to inform him. The planets aspecting each other are trying to inform that person. So you can see that this would be in the domain of relativity, whereas the other is not at all.

So, in a case like, for instance, we speak about Einstein had a septile going to his saturn/mercury, and the intuition came in of relativity. It was like the World Idea was trying to inform the soul something about the way IT works, and that receptivity to receive it and then to work it out with the equipment that this ego had.

**S:** Insight is the highest form of intuition?

**AD:** I don't think it's intuition at all. I think that in our language, in English, the highest form of knowledge was always considered by philosophers to be intuition. So even when Plato speaks about intuiting the ideas, you think that he's referring to intuition. But like in the seventh Epistle, he says very clearly, he says this spark that bursts into a flame and consumes itself: He's speaking there about insight, not intuition. And he even makes the remark, ``I have never written about it, nor will I ever write about it," because it's a faculty

that's almost impossible to understand--the nature of insight.

But you see the distinction here? Insight is like reality understanding itself, and when I say reality here, I mean the soul understanding itself. It is a knowing knowing. But then when we speak about intuition we're speaking about how the soul is relating to the World Idea, trying to understand it. So that there would be sense intuition, and then there would be intuition of one's own Self, or knowing that I am, the way the Buddhists speak about it. And then they speak about intuitive knowing, which means a direct access, or a kind of intuition is given to the individual to know what the nature of that object is. So, you can see, the intuition will always be about the domain of relativity.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From 1984 0215** (may be in *Living Wisdom*)

**The finite minds which are the offspring of the One Mind may not hope to rise in power or understanding to its altitude. Nevertheless, because they are inseparable from it, they may find hints of both these attributes within themselves. The Divine Essence is undiscoverable by human sense and intellect but not by human intuition and insight.**

(25:1.112)

**db:** Would insight be the higher faculty used to understand the Overself unfolding the entirety of the World-Mind and all the powers that it has?

**Anthony:** What you're saying is correct. Insight refers to the faculty of recognizing the substratum, so that with insight you would see that consciousness underlies this object and that object and the third object. So insight is insight into the ultimate Reality that you are searching for.

Intuition is the reasoning about the objects. It involves an absolute or, we could say, a highly developed willing, feeling, and knowing. Because any of these three, if they're highly developed, tend to be of the nature of intuition, that is, a stillness, a stopping, a silence. You know something, but not anything in particular.

Insight gives you the understanding or the actual perception, the mystical perception, that water is common to both the ocean and the waves. When we speak about insight, we're speaking about the fact of the recognition of what the perceiver and the perceived have for their substratum consciousness. That's insight. But intuition is reasoning upon objects to understand the nature of the reason principles. Now PB says that with these two faculties you can find within yourself those attributes which are also reflections from the Intellectual-Principle. In order to understand something about the World-Idea which is within your soul, these two faculties of insight and intuition are necessary.

...

One is self-knowing and the other is other-knowing. Knowing-knowing and knowing-the-other. So the two faculties that we need in order to realize the attributes of the World-Mind within us are insight and intuition. Insight is the nature, the perception, of reality. When you attain insight, you know that the underlying reality of that object is consciousness, or Mind, the same way that you know that it is your reality, and there is no distinction between them because there is no relationship here. So to take an analogy, when you recognize--or know--that the waves and the ocean are water, that's nondual. There are no two things. There's only water. That's insight.

Now intuition is the reasoning employed on any object in manifestation. You employ the reasoning--and you can call it intuition; PB calls it intuition, but I'm trying to expand it because if feeling is developed to the utmost, and willing and knowing, it is intuitive. It doesn't operate like we know it in the separative intellect. Now, with that faculty of intuition, you can intuit what the reason principle is that underlies this particular object, and at the same time you have insight and recognize that consciousness is the substratum of all objects.

If you work with only insight, then there isn't knowing of anything. There's nothing to know anything about. But that's not the situation. The situation is the same for the sage as for us, in the sense that there's not only a substratum of reality that underlies the appearance, but there's also the appearance which will persist. Now you want to know something about that appearance, so you have to employ the reason.

The soul has these two faculties. When it wants to know or at least understand something about the World-Idea which is within it, then it has to use these two faculties. It cannot use opinion [in the Platonic sense, i.e. doxa, the doxastic intellect --ed.]. It cannot use the separative intellect, egoistic understanding, any kind of imagery. That's all out.

Insight is the mind perceiving itself. Intuition is always of something. One we can refer to as the Higher Knower and the other as the Lower Knower. But they're not really meant as a hierarchy. I think it's better to think of them as two aspects of the soul.

**lc:** Is the higher knower the essence of soul?

**Anthony:** Essence of Soul is Soul. We come up with this definition of Soul--what makes it to be what it is--that's its essence.

**s:** How would you describe the insight of a sage?

**Anthony:** When the sage operates with insight, when the I AM has insight, it means that the ultimate reality, the sub- stratum of the apparent world, is recognized to be Mind, consciousness, whatever word you want to use. This insight is in two directions: on the one hand, to its prior, the Intellectual-Principle from which it descends and where it has its source, and, on the other hand, into its content. That's what insight is. It works both ways. Insight is the recognition that Mind is the ultimate reality whether you face up to the transcendent source of your being or face down and look at the substratum of the manifested world within you. Either way, you will see that Mind is the substratum. That's insight. There is no variation. Intuition can be applied to the lower phase. You can intuit, in the manifestations that are taking

place within this I AM, the reason principles that constituted that object and made it to be what it is. Intuition into the higher realm doesn't work. But intuition will be necessary to formulate what insight is. You would have to use an intuitive approach to language to formulate the sentences in a certain way to give a person an understanding.

*jfl:* What is meant by insight into the World-Idea?

**Anthony:** Insight, as we said, is seeing into the substratum of the World-Idea. When the commentators say that the sage sees only Brahman, that's not true. The sage also sees the world. What they mean when they say that the sage sees Brahman is that the sage has insight; the sage recognizes that Mind or consciousness is the substratum. To say that if you are a sage, you don't eat your food, is absurd. The sage also sees the food, and eats it. So these two faculties are necessary in order for the soul to understand itself.

*vm:* Can we talk about the 'finite minds' in the quote?

**Anthony:** In terms of a comparison to the Intellectual, they're finite. I think PB is being drastic, but nonetheless to the point, so that no one would dare make the comparison that the finite mind could become identical with the Infinite Mind. He makes the gap uncrossable; finite mind and Infinite Mind--you can't jump that. There's no way you're going to get over the hurdle.