

EGO AND OVERSELF

16. WITNESS I

24. LIGHT OF OVERSELF, EGO IDENTIFICATION LEVELS

47. SUTRATMA

63 EGO AND DWELLER

68 EGO

81 THE EGO [8.1.8]

OVERSELF

84. OVERSELF: AWARENESS AND FAITH IN HIGHER [22.3.186]

87 PART 2 [22.3.4 NO REAL COMMENT]

4 OVERSELF/SOUL

6 SOUL OVERSELF DOUBLE KNOWER [Persp. p. 382 and 28.1.52 NO COMMENT]

8 REPRODUCTIVE SOUL AND LEVELS OF KNOWING

11 GERM OF CONSCIOUSNESS

21 SOUL AND WORLD IDEA. SOUL DOUBLE NATURE. NIRVIKALPA. [16.2.71]

40 EVOLUTIONARY JOURNEY OF THE SOUL

41 PARADOXICAL NATURE OF SOUL

42 WITNESS I (and 360 degrees)

SUTRATMA

50 THE DOUBLE KNOWER and NONDUALISM

80 BETWEEN LIVES

93 EVOLUTION OF CONSCIOUSNESS

EGO AND OVERSELF

16. WITNESS I

S: When you say life and psyche, are you, I don't want to use the word equate but I'm at a loss for another word. Can we equate that then with the totality of this Overself so that we're really talking at the level of insight where now the soul knows itself as Nous knows the Soul, which would require the totality of or in the entire Overself? I think psyche sometimes gets limited.

AD: Embodied psyche.

S: Right, that's not what you're saying?

AD: No. Most people think of psyche as embodied but it's also **unembodied**. It's the principle of all existence.

S: Anthony, ahamkara and Witness I, are they equated? Are they the same? On the diagram the Witness I would be outside the 360 degrees.

AD: Identified with the 360 degrees.

S: It's conjoined with the contents.

AD: Yes, conjoined with the contents because you have to also keep in mind that the Witness can go to other planets and there is associated with the reason principles of those planets so the Witness I acquires an understanding of the reason principles in other places, other planets.

S: But the Venus Witness I, Earth Witness I, Saturn Witness I. . .

S: You're putting the Witness I up in the solar system. Right in this realm up here.

AD: No, **the Witness I is that ability of the mind to send forth from itself a piece of itself. And this consciousness which it sends forth from itself can identify or associate with any of the reason principles anywhere in the universe, in our solar system.** The assimilation of the reason principles that is required of the soul is all over the place, not just Earth.

PB: "Although the aspirant has now awakened to his Witness Self, found his soul and thus lifted himself far above the mass of mankind, he has not yet accomplished the full task that is set him . . . (write in rest of para) . . . and he has to realize that the Witness Self is only a part of the All-Self." 23.6.88

S: And here he's equating Witness Self--"having found his Soul"-- of the quote with the Soul.

AD: That's not what he's saying. In other words when you awaken to this impersonal consciousness you have found your soul.

S: He's saying Witness Self there. Is that what we're calling the Witness I?

AD: Yes. That's a very exalted state. It's an impersonal consciousness. And then he goes on and speaks about from there you go further on and you have to find the All-Self. The Overself would be the All-Self.

S: I don't understand the Witness I . . .

S: It's like not being identified anymore with the apparent subject which in reality, to the Witness I, is just an object. When you identify with the apparent subject, you make it the subject which then makes everything else in the content objective to it as in the dream analysis.

S: I can understand that and I thought I understood the Witness I from that but when you brought in the planets that threw me.

AD: Let's look at it this way. There's a string vibrating at 440 frequencies. I hit a piano key and it vibrates at 440 frequencies and your ear receives or interacts with that frequency, 440. Now who knows that that's the tone A?

S: Not me.

AD: On the one hand you have to have the physical occurrence of a frequency, on the other hand you have the organism which is like interlocked with that. These two things are objective to who? When you say I know that's the tone A, who is this I that knows? You see, you'll say this, you'll say me. But that's obviously not so because this me is part of what's being known. Let's go to the chart. Let's do something like this. In the chart you have the Sun or let's say a planet sitting on a degree and that represents the subjective function. The outward manifestation of that objective functioning is the opposite degree. You apply that to all the planets and their aspects, alright. All this is a content to the I. The I cannot be included in that. So on the one hand you have the ego-organism and the world that he creates but the both of these are objective to this knower which you think you know because you say I know, you point to this here. But this doesn't know anything. It's the mind that knows and that mind is impersonal. Let's go another step further. How come it knows? How come it could have such knowledge? If you think of it as pure consciousness, pure consciousness has no knowledge. It is itself. It isn't anything else. Then what kind of consciousness could be the recipient of this knowledge? It would have to be consciousness which is associated with all the intelligence of the Earth. In other words, the Earth's Ideas is what creates this phenomena so it's the Earth's Ideas which the consciousness is associated with that knows, that is the tone A.

S: So is that the Witness that knows?

AD: Yes, that position is one of expediency from a long point of view. From the highest point of view you get to that position so that you can go on to the position of reaching the summit of the soul. You don't make a leap from what you are to the summit of the soul without going through the Witness I. The Witness I could also be explained another way. A person that is an entirety and highly evolved person in the sense that his willing, feeling, knowing are distinguished one from another and they function in that way so that they cannot create illusion. Then you can say that that person is at the level of the Witness I. Look, let me try this way. The snake and the rope. When you see a snake where there's a rope, there's a confusion of the three functions. One function, the belief in the "thisness", that's coming from the feeling. The idea of the snake is coming from the knowing function. The willing of these two things into perception is coming from the willing function. The three of them confused together gives us an illusion. All you have to do is analyze your experience and you'll see that the confusion of these three functions gives rise to an illusion. Analyze the illusion and you'll separate these three different functions one from the other. Now it is these three functions that PB speaks about that have to be refined, developed and evolved to the highest pitch. And then the three of them together will lead you, when they fuse, they'll lead you to insight.

24. LIGHT OF OVERSELF, EGO IDENTIFICATION LEVELS

FS: No, I have a question. I don't have a quote so I'm just waiting.

AD: All right, what's the question?

FS: At one time we were talking about the emanation from the Overself into manifestation, clear down to right here. And at the higher levels we were thinking of that and looking at that as a mercury principle, the asmita ascending or the--

AD: Yes. (inaudible)

FS: --and I'm just trying to understand it. As that light or ray descends through the various levels it assumes the vehicle of those levels, whatever that is or some knowledge from those levels, and it gets down to the Earth realm, 360, the whole bit, it assumes the vehicles of those levels or some knowledge of those levels and at the Witness-I level (it is the Witness-I, is it not, yes.) Is that light, the ray of the Overself, does it assume the body or that level of the Witness-I and then as it identifies with the 360 degrees, the natal, the subtle, it identifies with the ego body, the psychosomatic organism. I know--

AD: Why don't you ask the question instead of going through all that? Ask the question instead of going through all that.

FS: My question is, does the light of the Overself, is it the consciousness that shines all the way down through to right here and now, this body/mind that I am? (Is that why I distort that light in identifying with the ego?)

AD: It gives your body life, yes.

FS: And the ego claims it as its own life, this is me. At every level perhaps it does that. The Witness-I, that light identifies with the 360 degrees-- I guess my question is does that light descend all the way down to right here and now and it simply gets distorted in terms of what I think it is. Is that a correct way to look at it? It's a real bad way to say it but--

AD: Does the light get distorted? No, not really. Because the principle of awareness which is functioning within you and is the real you, its nature isn't altered in any way.

FS: Its nature is not altered?

AD: Not altered in any way. If its nature was altered in any way, then you couldn't speak about it as being mind or consciousness. You speak about it as becoming something else. But it always remains that. The problem would be something like this, when--

FS: Who distorts it then?

AD: Well, that's what we're trying to understand. You remember we spoke before-- we spoke about the psychosomatic organism functioning with all these various different functions that it has, the sense functions and all that. And we speak about this consciousness coming into the body or identified with this body and working with that body. Now what does the psychosomatic organism provide that consciousness with?

FS: Really, vehicles.

AD: Yes, but more precisely we said that it provided it with the apparent concomitant appearance of a world. As soon as there's any functioning of the sense organs, an appearance arises. Now this appearance we're going to say is the World Idea for that ego. Look at what we're saying. We're saying in a sense that the ego has a mechanism by which it makes its own imaged world. All these images that arise, like for instance if I pinch myself, [a] certain kind of activity takes place in the body, or if I close my ears I'm depriving myself of some kind of sense functioning and the appearance is quite different. In other words any alteration of any of the sense functions and the bodily functions alters the appearance of the world that I perceive. Now this is what--we say this is the ego with its own machinery to evolve an imaged universe, an apparent universe. Now the light or the consciousness which is identified with that body has to work through those appearances. It illuminates those appearances, but it itself does not get altered by those appearances.

FS: Okay, I believe that, but it would seem then that the ego complex has an awful lot of power to take on, as though it were the I.

AD: Now the ego complex that you're speaking of, what is this ego complex? Is it just this projected power of the soul, this power that the mind has to project part of itself? Is that

what we mean by ego? Or do we mean by ego, this power that the mind has to project attention wherever it wishes, into this body or that body; and then identifying with that body and the phylo- and onto-genetic development of that body. It identifies with that. Is that what you mean by ego? Or do you mean a combination of both? Ego is a very difficult thing to understand because I think most of the time what we mean is, sure, the mind has this power of projecting its attention (in)to a body. Now this body is a result of a long phylo- and onto-genetic development. It has its own way of functioning. It produces an appearance of a reality. And the mind is identified with that. On the one hand you could see that that body is part of the World Idea. On the other hand you could see the soul inhabiting that body has proclivities or tendencies that incline it to THAT body rather than another body. In other words the desire nature within the embodying soul has to correspond to the body that it's receiving. So the ego complex is a very complicated thing. It's a combination of these two.

But nonetheless, in the ego complex, the thing you did want to know, is that attention, or that power that the soul has to project itself anywhere, remains unadulterated. If you introspect into your attention, and this is a very simple experiment, if you get to the pure attention which is within you, it's the same as that power of the soul--identical with it, never changed, never altered. But once it's identified with the functioning of the body, it gets confused.

FS: Okay, that's what I don't understand. How is it that each one of those levels get identified with that, in this case the body, mind?

AD: How does it get identified?

FS: Yes. . . .

AD: Let's think about how does it get identified? It comes into the body and in the body, which we said, is an organization of six or seven different instincts. And one of the instincts is that of what you might call the lower intellect. That part of our intellect, or the intellect which is always naming, classifying. The strange thing about that intellect is that it's always got to give a thing a name. If I give a thing a name, I'm making it distinct from myself. The intellect says that's Rumpelstiltskin, that's (inaudible). As soon as it starts doing that, you see what it's doing. Let me try this way. The mind projects the world that we see. When I say the mind, in other words, there's the whiteness of the cloud over there and there's the greenness of the tree here, and there's a . . .

(tape turns, end tape 3, side 1)

TAPE 3, SIDE 2

AD: . . . the mind which is in the body does not identify with the whiteness of the cloud or the greenness of the leaf but it identifies with the sensation of the body. Once it does that, it creates a dualism. "This is I." This part of the mind is identified with the sensation of the

body and says "This is I." Once it does that then that's the OTHER. Once it creates the dualism--you've got to see this; it creates this dualism within perception. It's lost. It'll get confounded in that perception.

Here maybe the dream will be better. You're sleeping, you're looking at a dream. There's this dream where you are in the dream and there's all this scenery. Now you are looking at the dream. YOU don't identify with the green tree, the white cloud. **You identify with that dream body. If you identify with the dream body then you've created a subject.** Everything else is now an object. Now you locate yourself in this dualistic structure and you say, "Why am I confused?" And the thing you have to understand also is that the mind or the tendencies within the mind have this inclination to identify with that body. And that until that is destroyed, the person will not be free. There's a (very?/pretty?) good passage in Plotinus. You ever read that passage about the embodying soul? You read that. Where was it in, the happiness of the sage? I've forgotten where it was. (inaudible) (pause) (Ref.=I.4)

FS: It's like these energy complexes that draw that in the same way, from incarnation to incarnation. There's no self that incarnates or reincarnates. It's tendencies or patterns that tend to gather in vehicles that draw you to them. Then till you break that pattern you just keep incarnating.

AD: Yes. It's true. There's isn't an entity that reincarnates. That's true. Otherwise it's a very animistic notion of what reincarnation is. But on the other hand **we could think of this incarnation, that the soul is incarnating, that there's this steady stream or flow of life coming from the soul.** We could (think) of it that way. We don't have to think of it as an individual entity. If you think of it that way, **that would correspond to the Hindu conception of the sutratma, the THREAD soul.** In other words **there's this flowing of life from the soul which is the thread upon which the beads of all the individual lives are strung. But there is no entity that's reincarnating.** Now the Buddhists, I think, would accept this because it's meaningful for them because that means we're speaking about a karmic continuity of this lifestream--but not of an entity.

MS: The one about the (inaudible) divisible about body? (Ref.=III.4.6)

AD: No. There is just the quote here where he speaks about the sage as the one who is capable of withdrawing. He withdraws this projection. And he speaks about the fact that the sage could take this power of the soul to project itself, he says, he withdraws it. The sage can do that and he doesn't have to reincarnate. When he DOES have to reincarnate, he has to make an effort of will to project that out again. Whereas with us it's always projecting out. It's all right (inaudible) quote. I don't remember.

MS: I remember you talking about it.

ENNEAD 3 TRACTATE 4

5. The answer is that the Soul, to whichever side it inclines, has in some varying degree the power of working the forms of body over to its own temper, since outlying and accidental circumstances cannot overrule the entire decision of a Soul. Where we read that, after the casting of lots, the sample lives are exhibited with the casual circumstances attending them and that the choice is made upon vision, in accordance with the individual temperament, we are given to understand that the real determination lies with the Souls, who adapt the allotted conditions to their own particular quality.

The Timaeus indicates the relation of this guiding spirit to ourselves: it is not entirely outside of ourselves; is not bound up with our nature; is not the agent in our action; it belongs to us as belonging to our Soul, but not in so far as we are particular human beings living a life to which it is superior: take the passage in this sense and it is consistent; understand this Spirit otherwise and there is contradiction. And the description of the Spirit, moreover, as "the power which consummates the chosen life," is, also, in agreement with this interpretation; for while its presidency saves us from falling much deeper into evil, the only direct agent within us is some thing neither above it nor equal to it but under it: Man cannot cease to be characteristically Man.

Section 6

6. What, then, is the achieved Sage?

One whose Act is determined by the higher phase of the Soul.

It does not suffice to perfect virtue to have only this Spirit [equivalent in all men] as cooperator in the life: the acting force in the Sage is the Intellectual Principle [the diviner phase of the human Soul] which therefore is itself his presiding spirit or is guided by a presiding spirit of its own, no other than the very Divinity.

But this exalts the Sage above the Intellectual Principle as possessing for presiding spirit the Prior to the Intellectual Principle: how then does it come about that he was not, from the very beginning, all that he now is?

The failure is due to the disturbance caused by birth- though, before all reasoning, there exists the instinctive movement reaching out towards its own.

On instinct which the Sage finally rectifies in every respect?

Not in every respect: the Soul is so constituted that its life-history and its general tendency will answer not merely to its own nature but also to the conditions among which it acts.

The presiding Spirit, as we read, conducting a Soul to the Underworld ceases to be its guardian- except when the Soul resumes [in its later choice] the former state of life.

But, meanwhile, what happens to it?

From the passage [in the Phaedo] which tells how it presents the Soul to judgement we gather that after the death it resumes the form it had before the birth, but that then, beginning again, it is present to the Souls in their punishment during the period of their renewed life- a time not so much of living as of expiation.

But the Souls that enter into brute bodies, are they controlled by some thing less than this presiding Spirit? No: theirs is still a Spirit, but an evil or a foolish one.

And the Souls that attain to the highest?

Of these higher Souls some live in the world of Sense, some above it: and those in the world of Sense inhabit the Sun or another of the planetary bodies; the others occupy the fixed Sphere [above the planetary] holding the place they have merited through having lived here the superior life of reason.

We must understand that, while our Souls do contain an Intellectual Kosmos they also contain a subordination of various forms like that of the Kosmic Soul. The world Soul is distributed so as to produce the fixed sphere and the planetary circuits corresponding to its graded powers: so with our Souls; they must have their provinces according to their different powers, parallel to those of the World Soul: each must give out its own special act; released, each will inhabit there a star consonant with the temperament and faculty in act within and

constituting the principle of the life; and this star or the next highest power will stand to them as God or more exactly as tutelary spirit.

But here some further precision is needed.

Emancipated Souls, for the whole period of their sojourn there above, have transcended the Spirit-nature and the entire fatality of birth and all that belongs to this visible world, for they have taken up with them that Hypostasis of the Soul in which the desire of earthly life is vested. This Hypostasis may be described as the distributable Soul, for it is what enters bodily forms and multiplies itself by this division among them. But its distribution is not a matter of magnitudes; wherever it is present, there is the same thing present entire; its unity can always be reconstructed: when living things- animal or vegetal- produce their constant succession of new forms, they do so in virtue of the self-distribution of this phase of the Soul, for it must be as much distributed among the new forms as the propagating originals are. In some cases it communicates its force by permanent presence the life principle in plants for instance- in other cases it withdraws after imparting its virtue- for instance where from the putridity of dead animal or vegetable matter a multitudinous birth is produced from one organism.

A power corresponding to this in the All must reach down and co-operate in the life of our world- in fact the very same power.

If the Soul returns to this Sphere it finds itself under the same Spirit or a new, according to the life it is to live. With this Spirit it embarks in the skiff of the universe: the "spindle of Necessity" then takes control and appoints the seat for the voyage, the seat of the lot in life. The Universal circuit is like a breeze, and the voyager, still or stirring, is carried forward by it. He has a hundred varied experiences, fresh sights, changing circumstances, all sorts of events. The vessel itself furnishes incident, tossing as it drives on. And the voyager also acts of himself in virtue of that individuality which he retains because he is on the vessel in his own person and character. Under identical circumstances individuals answer very differently in their movements and acts: hence it comes about that, be the occurrences and conditions of life similar or dissimilar, the result may differ from man to man, as on the other hand a similar result may be produced by dissimilar conditions: this (personal answer to incident) it is that constitutes destiny.

47. SUTRATMA

Now, in a sense this undifferentiated consciousness, this primal germ has to go through something similar by identifying over and over again with various bodies which are organized by ideas. It assimilates these ideas and in that process this undifferentiated consciousness gets differentiated into a self-standing consciousness, a consciousness that abides in itself. I'm trying to make the analogy. The same way the eye organ develops, and the same way that witness consciousness develops in that way, so that this I, this expediency, this expedient I becomes an organ, a function. In that sense. I know that the Egyptians went a lot into the Witness I, but all I find is traces here and there which tell me they knew about this. I think in one of Lubicz or was it his wife, she wrote a book on that. I haven't read it yet but someone told me there's quite a bit on the notion of the Witness I. That there's this intermediary consciousness which benefits by the experiences that we go through in the world and that that's what's getting built up. That the personality as such, the empirical personality perishes after its experiences. So the Witness I can also be thought of as what the Hindus call the "sutrmatma", the thread-soul. The thread on which all the beads, or all the individual lives are strung.

MS: I thought the sutratma was the asmita principle?

AD: Well, alright but then you're using it in a different sense. The sense you're using it is that all manifestation is strung on that. But that wouldn't be the sutratma. That's the purusha that they're talking about. The asmita is a reflection of the purusha. But sutra means thread, atma soul, thread-soul. *[[NOTE: ALSO IN 48]]*

63 EGO AND DWELLER

AD: You know the stories you hear about the threshold, the dweller of the threshold? You've heard stories like that. The dweller of the threshold is supposed to be like an amalgamation of your entire past history. Everything that the ego at one time was. So you can imagine how ugly it is. (AD laughs) Beastly.

FS: Anthony, I remember years ago Ion(?) saying she used to write poetry and when these ideas for a poem would come to her she would inevitably be at the sink, as soon as she got her hands in the water.

AD: She didn't like to wash the dishes. I know, I was the same way. (laughter) (inaudible) No, Ion's(?) a little different.

FS: I thought I was beginning to understand something about the ego, and then you just (blew that away). Tonight as we've been going over and thinking about this, it hit me that what I am, what we all are, IS this soul.

AD: Yes, and also the ego. Even if only one-tenth of your existence is in the body, that's enough.

FS: Okay, that ()

(end tape 5, side 2)

®LS2~®RFA OHIO 6. LIB FOR LISTENING T O pAGE ®PN~

-

THE OHIO TRANSCRIPTS, CONTINUED

(filename = ohio6.lib)

(equivalent to pp. 172 - 205 of MS transcript)

TAPE 6, SIDE 1

S: . . . that his life identifies with . . .

AD: Because it has a proclivity to that identification.

S: Okay, it's drawn to that.

AD: That kind of body. Because you have to remember the moment of a person's birth indicates the basic tendencies that he's identified with.

S: . . . complexes that you can't get rid of. Would you have enough energy and will power built up that you can disidentify with whatever. When you identify and that says this is me, whatever it is, that is the ego and that is egoism.

AD: A conceit that this is I.

68 EGO

S: Sometimes when you're being haunted over a period of time with a concept like gratitude or commitment, just the idea of the concept keeps coming up at strange times. And then you meditate on that and you, the same experience that you had before emotionally, comes in another way. It's almost like giving the ego, I'm asking, it seems like giving the ego its due to a point because it began with the ego and even in the meditation the ego has its share in it, piece of flesh and then it kind of dissipates, it almost runs its course. There's a moment there where it seems like something happens that's a little bit more than the ego.

AD: Don't you see in that process the ego itself is being transformed. It's being enobled. This thief who watched a Sufi and went over to him and said, "I want to be like you." The Sufi said, "Fine, why don't you return all those things you stole, you've got stored in your tent." He said, "Do I have to do that?" "Yeah." In a way what we're saying is that the ego wants to become better, to get enobled. It has to practice these things and in the practice of these things it has to give up lesser things, things that are less important, so that the enoblement of the ego is being carried forth. Its transformation is being worked out. That's a long, long winding process. It goes on and on and on. And one of the points that I think is well taken up by PB, he says fundamentally we have to keep in mind that we are referring to the ego's efforts to achieve enlightenment, to reach that level, so to disparage the ego, criticize it, to do this and that, to deny it its existence, all that is besides the point. The work has to be done on the ego. To the extent that you are prepared through disciplines, both moral disciplines and disciplines of the understanding, to that extent you get illumined. Where there's a deficiency, to that extent you will not get illumined. So the ego has to be put through this. We won't do it ourselves. Necessity, nature will force that upon us.

81 THE EGO [8.1.8]

S: Okay, read it again please.

PB: "Think, what does the I stand for? This single and simple letter is filled with unutterable mystery for apart from the Infinite Void from which it is born and to which it must return, it has no meaning. The Eternal is its hidden core and content." 8.1.8

S: What happens if you use the word 'I' as a silent mantram. I've thought, I've never done it with just the word 'I' but I've often thought about the power of the word and of course, the 'I AM'. The sound of the syllables is very similar to the Om when it's repeated. Sort of the same kind of feeling.

AD: But these are all basically devices or tricks to throw the conscious mind out of gear. That's all they're really meant for. And it will always come down to the basic fact of intensity. Ramana used that formula, you know, I, I, I . . . kept repeating it like a koan but you have to remember, it was done with an intense aspiration. It will always come back to that. The intensity of the desire or aspiration to penetrate into the meaning. And if for a very short time the word 'I' is thrown out the window like all the other concepts and one comes into a feeling-awareness of his own self. That's the important part. Once that's started then he can start investigating into the nature of his I-ness but without any external me(?). Consciousness or awareness itself does that.

Well, we're open for anything. Anything you want to talk about. We'll be leisurely about it today, relax. Ask the right question or else! (sound of a slap)

S: This ought to be discussed, Anthony. There's a contradiction in this, his idea of where the solar plexus is. He has a discussion about it here then he has a statement there. If you would look at that and kind of straighten that out. I found it helpful to keep that by your bed and if you're going to try it, read it each time. The question is, this is where it starts, it says draw your attention down to the point behind the solar plexus which is 1 1/2 inches below the navel. Then you begin, then at a certain point you bring it up to the heart center and it's almost like, maybe he meant for us to start here and then bring it up to the heart center because the heart center is close to the solar plexus. It's almost like a kundalini effect that he's describing. I don't know much about kundalini.

PD: That's the whole sympathetic nervous system, like right here, from the navel up.

S: There's a confusion as where he meant the solar plexus to be and where he meant for the heart center to be, anatomically. I adopted it to my own situation, practiced it the best way I thought I understood it.

AD: Then I raised it up to the heart, then I stayed there. There's no problem in the exercise. I think talking about it makes it sound more complicated than it is.

S: I think so, too. I did essentially what you did, concentrated on the lower and then raised it for a period of weeks.

S: Why do you start with the solar plexus?

AD: It's really what you might call the second brain that you are working with, the parasympathetic nervous system. There's a lot of power in the solar plexus and very often by bringing that power up to the heart, it will evoke an immediate response, if you bring

that power up to the heart. And it has to be intensely imagined so you can aid the process of almost like leading it up to the heart center. Let me limber up and then we'll go through this here. So anything you want to talk about, this is the time. Stockmarket, news reports.

OVERSELF

TAPE 7, SIDE 1

84. OVERSELF: AWARENESS AND FAITH IN HIGHER [22.3.186]

CR: Here's a beautiful quote on the Overself.

AD: Ah, so many on the Overself.

PB: "Although awareness is the first way in which we can regard the soul or Overself, the latter is also that which makes awareness possible and hence a sub- or super-conscious thing. This explains why it is that we do not know our souls, but only our thoughts, our feelings, and our bodies. It is because we [®]MDBR[~]are[®]MDNM[~] the soul and hence we [®]MDBR[~]are[®]MDNM[~] the knower as well as the act of knowing. The eyes see everything outside yet do not see themselves." 22.3.186

AD: Now if you really believe that and a thought, a memory, an association, a dream, a reflection comes up in your mind and you have faith in what he said, what will happen? (pause) That thought will have no admittance. You will not permit it. In other words, a memory arises, "Oh, ten years ago I was in ecstatic pleasure, I was going out with this gentleman." (inaudible) That's cut right off and it won't come in, because you believe in the higher, that you are the soul. You won't pay attention to those memories, IF YOU HAVE FAITH IN THE HIGHER. This is what faith means, that you NO longer pay attention to the lower. Now if you listen to the lower, if you let those enticing images come up and take hold of you, you have no faith. I mention this because very often we'll ask ourselves, "Am I living the higher life?" This is the higher life, when you believe that you ARE that soul, no qualifications, no ifs, no ands, no buts. The thought comes up and "let's steal this nice little gadget." The thought can't come up. It's not allowed.

CR: I think we have to discriminate what our soul is being taught.

AD: But don't you see what I'm saying? What I'm saying is that every qualification of this point of view will never give you the direct and ultimate path.

CR: Every qualification?

AD: Any qualification you make of this statement. As soon as you say, "oh but wait, I've got to find out what experiences I need," you're qualifying the statement that you are pure awareness.

St: (inaudible)

AD: If you have the faith that moves mountains, right then and there, you're free. But we don't have it, right? We don't. We'll go on listening to that chattering idiot. Like what was it Lillian tells me--in a dream, you're listening to this character and you got very distressed.

St: (inaudible)

AD: That's what the lower intellect is.

If something takes time, if you believe that in order to get to God you've got to do this, that, and the other thing, then you've just denied God is eternally (omniscient in/for) you. If you think about it, as soon as you say, "I've got to become a better person and then a better person and a better person, until I've become good enough so that I can reach God," you don't believe in God. You believe in your goal, the projects you have that the ego is conjuring up. "Oh let's have this for a goal" and you start working towards it. So the ego is perpetuating its existence. If you understand metaphysically that God is absolutely eternal and metaphysically infinite at this instant, you're free. But we can't understand that. We intellectually say we understand it, what I mean is we can't perceive that because if you do, right then and there you're free.

CR: I don't think I understand what belief means. I think "this sounds true, this sounds right, I believe this" but in fact I don't believe it.

AD: If this memory comes crawling, tiptoeing into your brain and says "yoo-hoo!" and you turn around and look at it, it's obvious that you don't believe in your higher self, you believe in that thought! That's the point. Whereas a person with a very intense belief in God and God only doesn't even know of the existence of these thoughts. They can't even arouse a suspicion, a little attention. They can't. He just will not turn to them. Remember St. Theresa, she was leaving home, she was going to run away and go to a monastery. So she steals a penny just in case she needed bread. She started walking out, she says, "oh, I put my faith in a penny." She was quite an extraordinary woman. But you see right away she knew, steal a penny, so that just in case of an emergency, I can buy a piece of bread and she thought, oh my God, I put my faith in a penny. As though the higher power won't provide. It'll provide what you need, don't worry. Whether it's good or bad, it'll provide.

CR: I think that's what it's doing. (laughter)

JL: Someone told me that funny joke about the guy that's standing on top of his house, and flood waters are coming up. You know that joke?

AD: No.

JL: He's standing on top and the rowboat comes up and they say "we've come to rescue you." He says "no, I have faith in God."

AD: Yes, well God sent the rowboat.

JL: That's the joke, he goes on and on and he drowns. Three times; the last one is a helicopter, he says "No, my faith is in God, God will save me" and then he drowns! Because he didn't accept the help. And then he gets up to St. Pete and he says "I want in." He says "you all let me down." They say, "well, we sent a boat." (laughter)

AD: That's quite different from this here, there's no analogy here.

JL: There's nothing in saying we have to take the human steps to help ourselves? Mother Teresa, she threw away the penny and said "God will provide" because she was putting her faith in that penny, I understand that.

AD: She had to steal the penny. On the other hand remember Ramana when he left home and he took from his mother enough coins that would buy him a ticket from where he was to Arunachala and he intended to pay her back but he was going to leave home. So he goes to the train station and he buys a ticket and he had enough to buy a ticket all the way but he didn't know that the train went all the way to Arunachala, so he bought a ticket that only got him two-thirds of the way and then he had to walk the rest of the way. God provided for him but he didn't realize it!

87 PART 2 [22.3.4 NO REAL COMMENT]

S: I'd like to end it with one more Overself quote.

PB: "The Overself is always there as man's innermost truest self. It is beginningless and endless in time. If consciousness does not have to be developed as something new but the person's awareness of it begins in time and has to be developed as a new attainment, the ever-presence of the Overself means that anyone may attain it here and now. There is no inner necessity to travel anywhere or to anyone in space or to wait years in time for this to happen. **Anyone for instance who attends carefully and earnestly and carefully to the present exposition may perhaps suddenly and easily get the first stage of insight--a lightning flash which affords a glimpse of reality at any moment. By that glimpse he will have been uplifted to a new dimension of being. The difficulty will consist in retaining the new perception for ancient habits of erroneous thinking will quickly reassert themselves and overwhelm him enough to push it into the background. This is why repeated introspection, reflective study and mystical meditation are needed to weaken those habits and to generate the inner strength which can firmly hold the higher outlook against the aggressive intruders from his own past."** 22.3.4

AD: So you see, you don't need a teacher anymore. You got everything you need right there. As soon as we put out the ten volumes, I'm going to retire. We could disband the guru's union, the lama's union, preceptor's union. The only trouble is nobody will read them.

4 OVERSELF/SOUL

CR: Back to the Overself question. What confuses me is I think of the Overself as the ray . . . the Purusha, the life-force, the life itself (in) the receptacle the Prakriti, the receptacles, the vehicles that are provided by the Universal Soul.

BP?: Isn't there a quote where he gives a definition of the Overself as the ray
®MDBR plus®MDNM the World-Idea . . . so within that Overself are both the ray and the World-Idea. . . .

AD: The Overself, or Soul, PB says in many places, is a particle of the World Mind. What would that mean to you? He speaks about it as having something of the flavor of the Infinite World Mind, he speaks about it as being essentially that which is within you and which makes possible the universe or the world that's manifested to you. **So that means that the Overself is the very summit, the core of your being.** And if we were to ask questions, "well, what is this Overself like?" I would have to refer to some of the notes that you might have picked up when you were studying Plotinus. You remember how he speaks about Soul?

CR: I remember old papers where he speaks about Soul but I don't know what you are referring to.

AD: These are passages which--

CR: One/ Many?

AD: Well, he speaks about the nature of Soul, the nature of your mind. Think of your mind. I'll read a few of these passages. He says something like this:

CR: Are we talking about soul as the Third Hypostasis?

AD: No. We're not talking about soul as the Third Hypostasis. He's speaking about
®MDBR individual®MDNM soul. (inaudible) [] If you use Plotinus' scheme and you say this is the One, and over here you have the Intellectual-Principle [] plus the Absolute Soul []. These three he refers to as the Three Hypostases. Don't get that confused with an individual Overself.

CR: In the Absolute Soul, doesn't he say that within Absolute Soul you have Universal Soul and individual soul?

AD: Yes. But he says that Absolute Soul is the progenitor of the individual soul. And if the individual soul traces its origin it will lapse back into Absolute Soul. But when it lapses back into Absolute Soul, you cannot speak about individual soul anymore. So our preoccupation is with these here. [] In Plotinus you have the One, the Intellectual-Principle and Absolute Soul. Try to remember, this is the same as God-- []

CR: the Void--

AD: The mysterious Void. This they would call the Absolute. But this is the same as God. We are separated off from that. Try to accept it even if I exaggerate it a little bit. Individual soul is on this side now.

CR: And so is Universal Soul?

AD: No. Universal Soul would be here. Do you mean the Demiurge?

CR: Yes. Looking back and looking forward--

AD: Oh, I'll have to go through all of Plotinus then. (laughter) Absolute Soul has following from it the Demiurge, which has two aspects--one contemplating the Ideas, and the other concentrating on producing manifestation, laying the ground plan for the universe. And individual star souls come along and take their place according to the plan he laid out. And then within the individual star souls there would be planetary souls, and then within that there be individual souls. I don't want to go into that. I'm not going to get to those notes. The thing here, because this would hold true of PB, too, up to here [], ignore this, because these are details PB won't go into.

The important thing here is this: these three--the intellectual understanding of these concepts that we're working with--these three are referred to as God, the Mysterious Void, the Absolute--anything you want to--. These are [®]MDBR[™] utterly [®]MDNM[™] utterly distinct from the individual soul. This individual soul has its origin here. It is an emanant from the Intellectual-Principle. It is [®]MDBR[™] similar but not identical [®]MDNM[™]. This here has an eternal value. In other words, it's an Intellectual Being, the nature of Soul is of such a nature, that it has an eternal reality. It is authentic, it has real being, it [®]MDBR[™] is [®]MDNM[™]. And when I say "It Is" it is neither a sophistry nor a tautology. So--you have to make that clear--if you don't understand this division--that they both, [PB and Plotinus], work with this division and if you don't understand this division you'll get a lot of confusion. In a sense what he's saying is, this is the principle, the Lord of our Soul, the God within us, and he calls this the Overself []. Now this is not the same as Absolute Soul but it comes from Absolute Soul. So you could say the Overself is an eternal generation, it's eternally born from this principle. Now working with this principle and only this principle, (keep?) the others above it. He's saying the Overself is a particle, it's within the World Mind. [] There's the Overself within the World-Mind. [] Think of the circumference as being boundless. Now reverse it: the World Mind is also within the Overself because the World-Mind and the World-Idea are going to be manifested through your own mind. Anything that you experience is going to be through your own mind. I won't argue this point. You picked it up in epistemology. When a man like Carl Sagan exalts in the fact he is the result of the structure of molecules, I'm not going to argue with him, I'm not going to talk with him. The most immediate experience you have of anything is your own mind. That is immediate, indubitable and without controversy. Everything else follows upon that. If I have to discuss things like that, I usually

recommend people to do it on their own. I'll have a few arguments with them and then you're on your own.

So we've got to this point. That principle, the Overself, is very difficult to understand and it's not available. You won't find it in any of the texts except perhaps in PB, Plotinus and one or two others you wouldn't know about like Dionysus the Aeropagite. This is a very very difficult concept to understand because--it's like you have to try to understand that the Intellectual-Principle, the World Mind and the World Idea, the Absolute Soul, they produce eternally this Soul. When they say that what they mean is it wasn't born sometime. If you say eternally that means it's in eternal generation, and you dare not speak about events in time when you speak about eternal generation. And our soul or mind is of such a nature. You can't imagine it ever having a beginning and you can't imagine it ever having an ending because it's an immaterial authentic reality and it has essence or it has being because it is its own principle. It generates its own being. Now that is a very difficult concept to understand. But only those things that are ultimately real are the cause of their own existence. So on the one hand you can say that Soul is the cause of its own existence, on the other hand you could say that the Absolute Soul gives it existence. And both statements are correct, because-- (pause) If I took the point of view of the One (in/and) the Intellectual-Principle, we say that it [the One] gives rise to the Intellectual-Principle. But how? Not that the One gives it birth, but insofar that the Intellectual-Principle is an Authentic Existent, as long as there is the One, the Intellectual-Principle arises. If there was no One, it couldn't arise. But if there is the One, the Absolute, then it must arise, by its own inherent necessity. That is what they mean by "self-caused" and that would be true of all real beings, that they generate their own existence. If we go on from here a little bit-- When you try to understand something about the nature of the Overself, the quotes I picked out from Plotinus were very much to the point. Let me point out--IV.2.1--See if you can understand something now--he uses the word "soul" but translate it as "mind".

Plotinus IV.2.1: "In whatsoever bodies it occupies--even the vastest of all, that in which the entire universe is included--it gives itself to the whole without abdicating its unity.

This unity of an Essence is not like that of a body, which is a unity by mode of continuous extension, the mode of distinct parts each occupying its own space. Nor is it such a unity as we have dealt with in the case of quality.

The nature, at once divisible and indivisible, which we affirm to be soul*, has not the unity of an extended thing: it does not consist of separate sections; its divisibility lies in its presence at every point of the recipient, but it is indivisible as dwelling entire in the total and entire in any part.

To have penetrated this idea is to know the greatness of the Soul and its power, the divinity and wonder of its being, as a nature transcending the sphere of things."

Plotinus IV.2.2: "It can be demonstrated that soul* must necessarily be of just this nature, and that there can be no other soul* than such a being, one neither wholly impartible nor whole impartible but both at once."

* above = AD reads "mind" instead of "soul"

AD: You're going to have to squeeze your brain. (pause) So in our own simple English, he's saying (something) to the effect that the mind is of this very strange nature. It is at once capable of being divided among body, not because it itself is divisible but because body has extension. But it will be present at every point in the body and yet it itself retains its unity. So that the nature of the soul, he says, is of such a kind. And if you think that any of the powers that you have, reasoning, memory, or any-- the totality of all of them, the whole of the mind is called forth. If you think of a little pinhead or if you think of the Tower of London you don't need a little piece of the mind to think of the pinhead and a big piece to think of the Tower of London. It's one and the same mind that operates in this way. It is indivisible and yet it can be present at many points at one and the same time. So it's present in your toe and in your head but it itself is not divided the way the body is. You've got to try and keep the nature of the Mind in your mind.

CR: So we're talking about Mind as the Overself?

AD: Yes, yes, the Overself. When you get to the essence of what your mind is, it's impenetrable, it's a mystery because it's of that nature. But then that means that through your mind the whole World Idea can get manifested. Only your mind. Mine will manifest the world for me. When I dream I see a city and I'm looking at the city and my mind is doing it for me, and not for you. Also, similarly the whole World Idea that is given to an individual is given to this individual through his mind. No one else's mind. There may be a greater Mind behind all the little minds, but the fact is that each and every one of us gets his experience through his own mind.

CR: There's you're talking about the ideas, the 360 degrees, coming down through that?

AD: No. (No, I'm saying that all this is going to get manifested down here later on. This is the principle of manifesting all of this here--this is unmanifestable/this is manifestable. The Overself is the point between these two things. [] Now the point he was making was that **ck this** this is the highest a man could reach. You can't go beyond this point.

St: I have to ask. Where does the impetus for all of higher self come if no mortal can ever see beyond the Overself?

AD: He said mortal. He didn't say immortal. (pause) When you become the Overself you're not mortal anymore.

CR: If nobody can ever penetrate beyond the Overself, then how can it be that we know about the doctrine beyond the Overself?

AD: Well, it is possible for a [tape turns]--

TAPE 1, SIDE 2

AD: It is given to these people that are in union with their Overself to receive revelations from above. But a person who is identified with the Overself or or with his mind, completely identified with, you can't say of him he is a mortal anymore. You can't say he's man. He returns out of that trance state or out of that condition, he returns from it and becomes man again, but he will never forget that this is what he really is. It's a very rare stage. It's usually people that you might refer to as sages who achieve this identification with their own soul or with their own mind.

®MDBR There®MDNM, when they are in identification with their mind, or let's say they achieve a complete union with it, there is ®MDBR no longer any man®MDNM. There's no memory of your past, there's no memory of your body, there's no memory of any of these things. There's no appetites, there's no desires, all that's gone. That's why he said "no mortal" can perceive this realm. Now, if we try to answer the question that we were working with. (asks for quote again)

PB: "No mortal may penetrate the mystery of the ultimate in its own nature, which means in its static, inactive Being. . . ." (Persp. p. 343 & 25.1.71)

AD: Now ®MDBR there®MDNM you see he would be speaking about the One. <points> This would be the static, inactive Being. That would be Absolute, that's the Absolute. No one can understand that, no one can ever have any understanding of that. Any man who tells you he knows about this is talking nonsense.

PB: "The Godhead is not only beyond human conception . . . "

AD: Human conception would be in this realm <points> the embodied reason--

PB: ". . . but also beyond mystic perception . . . "

AD: Now what do you make of that? He says it's also beyond "mystic perception."

St: (inaudible)

PB: ". . . . But mind in its . . . found God." (**gt this)

AD: So he's saying that the most we can expect to find in our search for the ultimate is our own soul. But we're saying that our soul ®MDBR is®MDNM a particle of the World Mind. It doesn't have the fullness or the grandeur or anything like that, but nonetheless, something of the flavor of the World Mind is, can we say, tasted through your own individual Overself, through your own soul.

So the remark he's making is something to this effect: When Al-Hallaj went around saying "I am the Ultimate Reality," and you know they put him through the Neronian tortures for doing that, al-Ghazali who was also about at that time, didn't even stand up to support him. Because he knew that this man was wrong. First, he shouldn't have said things like that because people can't understand him. But what Al-Hallaj was saying was "I am That", I am the Ultimate Reality,"-- that's what he was saying. Whereas PB, Plotinus and sages would say "No, this is what you are, you are the Overself, that's as far as you can go. That's the God within you." This is very god-like. It's an authentic Intellectual Being. We spoke about it as having eternal and ultimate authenticity and existence; and that's as far as we can go. When you get that far, you find that your ultimate essence is this pure Intellectuality, pure Mind, pure Being, within which is being reflected something of the principles above it. And also--there's another quotation where he says if you deepen the perception of the Overself, you go into these various levels. Not that you will have permanent union, not that you can become the One, not that you can become the Intellectual-Principle; you are soul and you will always be soul. You won't be these other things. But you can, let's say, taste something of this <points> or even experience the Touch of the Untouchable. But you don't become those things. So that is as far as you go. If you understand this remark, this one note, you'll see what he does with many of these mystics, especially a lot of these people who go around saying "I'm God." He calls that a kind of madness. A person can have this experience of the Overself and think he is God. It doesn't take away from the reality and the authenticity of the experience. Because it's so overwhelming that you actually think you are God. There's no getting away from it. And in order to prevent that, it's necessary that a person understands the philosophic doctrines. If he doesn't then of course he's going to make those kind of mistakes. But if a person is prepared, that is if he's understood the philosophic doctrines, and has labored at the teachings, the metaphysical teachings, has purified himself, humbled himself, he will never make that kind of remark, "I am God". It's a person that's unprepared, who hasn't studied the doctrine, who is going to make these kinds of mistakes.

MS: Tony, does everyone have to become a philosopher and understand that from a rational point of view?

AD: Well, there again, it depends. There's an order he works with, a listing he works with, these different levels. He refers to the philosophical sage as the highest, then the mystical sage and then the prophet, then the mystic. In other words, he has a series of classifications. And for many, it's enough that they find their own soul. That's enough. They don't want to go any further. They are satisfied with that. There are others who want to know the ultimate truth and the ultimate reality and they'll go beyond their own soul, and try to understand the nature of the World Mind and the World Idea which their soul is manifesting. So for these people, it's not enough to experience their soul, the divinity of their soul; but with that experience they must bring it to bear on the nature of the World Idea and understand that, and see that the Ultimate Reality is expressing itself through that idea. And these people have an inclination to become philosophical sages. But we don't have to worry about that.

6 SOUL OVERSELF DOUBLE KNOWER [Persp. p. 382 and 28.1.52 NO COMMENT]

AD: Well, yes. It's been called many things. They call it a godlike being, they call it a Celestial, they call it the progeny of the World Mind. The Overself is beyond even man. Keep this is mind. The very nature of this spiritual principle is beyond even man. Like Plotinus says in one place (AD's paraphrase): "When man develops the highest reasoning phase of his soul, and he gets winged for the flight into the Intellectual, he takes only the highest portion, the highest aspect of soul; and with that, he flings himself over into the Intellectual-Principle and becomes something utterly different than even man."

Plotinus V.3.4: "Thus the self-knower is a double person: there is the one that takes cognizance of the principle of in virtue of which understanding occurs in the soul or mind; and there is the higher, knowing himself by Intellectual-Principle with which he becomes identical: this latter knows the self as no longer man but as a being that has become something other through and through: he has thrown himself as one thing over to a superior order, taking with him only that part of the soul which alone is winged for the Intellectual Act and gives the man, once established There, the power to appropriate what he has seen."

AD: So you see this notion of the Overself is even beyond the conception of man as a spiritual principle because it's soul. If we think of soul as indeterminate life, a life that's not been molded or shaped according to an idea, you'll get the feeling of what soul is. But once the Idea of Man comes into soul, now soul has adopted man as a vehicle, so soul creates for itself this Idea of Man and lives through that Idea of Man, and becomes man. But soul in itself is not man, soul is life. "Psyche" means life. So that's a principle sui generis, in itself. So you have the Idea of Man which comes into soul, and now soul wants to become man. But when soul wants to become Intellectual-Principle, then it has to detach itself even from the Idea of Man, to reach that level.

CR: Can you explain what unit soul is?

AD: We've been explaining--your soul, my soul--

CR: Those are the unit souls that are--

AD: The Absolute Soul in the Intellectual-Principle eternally generates unit souls. []

CR: A whole bunch of Mercuries?

AD: Yes, but if you trace them back here [] they're no more unit souls. They're Absolute Soul . . . You can't speak about individual soul there <points> here, you can only speak about individual souls here. If you restore them back into the Intellectual-Principle, they're no longer unit souls. So you could think of a unit soul or unit mind, as a principle of manifestation, an Intellectual-Principle which can manifest the World Idea, each one for himself.

JL: But that unit soul could be the cosmos?

AD: It isn't the cosmos but the idea of the world comes into it. **did you have a quote where PB speaks about this mysterious aura which emanates from the intellectual, or the World Mind, (inaudible) the Overself?** 28.2.79

CR: Right.

AD: See if you can find it.

CR: At one point one paper was talking about the emanation from the Intellectual-Principle, and that within that all the sun souls interpenetrating one other. And the unit souls were connected to the Sun Soul.

AD: Yes, the Selfhood of the Sun is my soul, but don't go into that.

CR: I want to understand what unit soul is.

AD: It's very hard because you can't think of it as quantitative. It isn't a one thing. For instance--if I put it to you this way--when I am in heaven and you're in heaven, I am going to enjoy your blessedness, and you're going to enjoy my blessedness. Now how many souls are there? (pause) See, it's not one in that sense. What I'm trying to get at is: When you start speaking about a unit soul, you're speaking about this intellectual mind that you are, this spiritual principle that you are. When you say "one" you think of one apple, and then another apple, and it has boundaries. This one has boundaries, that one has boundaries, the other one has boundaries. But when you're speaking about mind, my mind and your mind, or my Overself and your Overself, aren't mutually exclusive of one another. My mind includes your mind and your mind includes my mind, so in heaven I could experience your blessedness and you experience my blessedness, but that doesn't make us two things. You're speaking about intellectual or egoless being. So again when you say unit soul, you have to keep in mind the qualifications I am making.

I'm trying to point out in the realm of Being you cannot apply the logic from the sensible world to that realm. Over here my body excludes your body and vice versa, but in the realm of Being my mind does not exclude your mind and your mind does not exclude my mind. The rapport, yes, or the communication that takes place there doesn't need words.

JL: Are there words to define this? (inaudible) In talking about the fallacy of divine identity, we're trying so hard to get away from the idea of this merger with the One--the impossibility of that. So now it's like we're trying to flip back--I was trying to think of a word like "participation", talking about this heavenly realm. Are you saying you participate in this being? Because we always retain some individuality and yet there's a sameness. Obviously we're not applying logic here, but it's really hard to grasp.

AD: I'm trying to avoid the use of the word "participation". I'm trying to explain in terminology which you're familiar with. And even if the logic that you're used to doesn't work here, that's all right. For a little while. I mean it's only a couple hours and then you go back and you could apply the logic you want. It is difficult to understand but you can follow what I'm saying is that there is such a realm where minds are not exclusive. Bodies are exclusive of one another, this body by definition excludes that body. But if you think of minds which are immaterial, how could you say one mind excludes another mind? Rather, you would say that one mind includes the other mind and that mind includes the former. So there is a mutual reciprocity that wouldn't hold with bodies. In that state of Being the awareness of the other is available to you just as you are available to him. This is not Aristotelian logic but so what. It is an experience that a person can have.

JL: But what about an analogy of feeling? That's the closest I can come to it on this level and I don't know if that's correct or not. That you can get a feeling, there is almost an identity of feeling between two people. Would that be some kind of analogy?

AD: I guess you could use that although later on I would like to, in some of the later quotes, I would have to show you that willing, feeling, and knowing are three very distinct functions. And that the confusion of these functions leads to the arising of illusion or misunderstanding. So if you find it useful, use it, but I don't use it because I know I'm going to say some other things about these functions which is going to be difficult and bring about a lot of confusion. I think of these three functions very specifically. And feeling is a way of knowing that's non-cognitive but still it is a value judgment, and as soon as you have a value judgment you are speaking about a process of ideation, which is not egoless being.

JL: Egoless being? (AD inaudible/aside) Are you saying that feeling has that quality of ego?

AD: Yes.

FS: So we exist as an ideation of this Universal Mind? Is that where our individuality comes from? (inaudible)

AD: You could say that, but you have to remember if the World Mind thinks, its thought is eternal and forever. It doesn't have a thought and then another thought.

FS: I understand that.

AD: And what It thinks has to be forever. (If?) it's a universal mind. If it's an eternal Universal Mind what it thinks is forever. So it thinks the Overself. The Overself is an eternal idea in the Universal Mind, you could put it that way. But you could also say that the nature of the Overself is such that if there's a Universal Mind it causes the Universal Mind to think it into existence. You could put it that way, too. So that would make the Overself an Eternal Being, because as long as there's World Mind and the Overself causes the World Mind to think it into existence and this is forever. You could think the other way. You could say the World Mind thinks the Overself but if the World Mind thinks and its thinking is of an eternal

nature-- In other words it doesn't have a thought of today and tomorrow because the thoughts it has, it's for all time. Another way of putting it would be its vision is a fixed vision of "MDBR" everything "MDNM" that will ever be, has been, and is.

FS: It's happening to us in sequence.

AD: To us it's happening in sequence because we're down here. But up there its vision would be a total fixed moment that lasts forever.

FS: But what I'm really saying is what we perceive in sequence, [a thought one after the other] and as differentiation one from another really has its source (as a thought) somewhere. **ck out

AD: Ultimately you could say that the thoughts you think would be derived from that principle, yes, ultimately. But there is a whole sequence that you have to follow all the way down to get to that. The sequence that I gave to some of the people here was: we have these three principles here: [] the Overself manifests, and here you have the inerratic sphere, and within the inerratic sphere you have the solar system, and within the solar system the planetary system,, within one of them the Earth and on that Earth you have bodies which are fabricated according to the Ideas, which are up here. So it's a long process, it's a winding--in other words--

FS: We're at the bottom of the heap.

AD: Yes, we're at the bottom of the heap, but there's also a way up again. And the thing that we've been doing or at least I've been doing is to show how the Ideas come all the way down and go all the way up. You have to see this like an unbroken circle. In other words, the Idea of Man is originally in the Mind of God, this Idea of Man eventually is going to be fabricated down on Earth. But this Idea of Man isn't only the man we know here, [] (there's) higher and higher versions of what this Idea of Man is. But if we start at the lowest where we are and think of going gradually up the scale of evolution then eventually we should be able to reach something about what those Ideas in the Mind of God are like.

FS: (inaudible)

AD: You didn't find it, did you?

RW: I've got one that's close.

AD: (inaudible) In comparison to some of the entities that are above us we're like slugs.

PB: "The Mind's first expression is the Void. The second and succeeding is the Light, that is, the World-Mind. This is followed by the third, the World-Idea. Finally comes the fourth, manifestation of the world itself." (Persp. p. 382 and 28.1.52)

AD: Let's pick something a little easier. That would be difficult. (RW/AD on which quote to use) Basically, the quote I was looking for went something like this: to the effect that the Overself is the recipient of the World Idea, the World Mind. How it receives this is like a mysterious radiation that comes into the Overself, or into the soul or into the mind, and this later on is going to be unfolded or manifested as the World Idea with your participation in it. Plotinus says the same thing. He says the Soul is the recipient of these Divine Beings, the Ideas, and (they [souls]) will manifest the World Idea according to their prerogative.

(inaudible) Okay. Let's pick an easy quote. I think you'll see that despite the simplicity of the words PB uses and the seeming obvious meaning, as soon as you start scratching the surface you realize it's got treacherous depths to it. So let's work with an easy one.

8 REPRODUCTIVE SOUL AND LEVELS OF KNOWING

AD: . . . the descent all the way down to the Earth. Now Plotinus has an interesting quote. He says as long as the soul remains with the Sun, reasoning phase of the Sun, the God-like reasoning phase of the Sun, all is well, but if it descends, it's in trouble. So what does our soul do? It has to descend. It does to Earth or to one of the planets, let's say it goes to Earth and there it incarnates. Now here's another thing that's very difficult to understand and PB has a some very beautiful quotes on it. He said the Soul has a paradoxical nature. Plotinus also says this. On the one hand it's an eternal Being and there's no such thing as past, present, or future for it; but on the other hand it has the power to project itself anywhere it wishes. So on the one hand the soul is this Eternal Being, magnificent, in a state of serenity and tranquility, as a matter of fact that's what Nirvikalpa Samadhi is. When you get into that state of Nirvikalpa, you experience the serenity and the tranquility of Being without any thoughts and experiencing the bliss of the Soul. But there is a desire on the part of soul to embody and so it sends a part of itself out, projects this part, and you can call it the "reproductive soul", and it projects this part and that part gets embodied. And he speaks about this part, PB has a beautiful quote where he says this part which is projected from the soul and has no beginning and no end. Remember that quote, it's a very long quote. At any rate he speaks about this part of the soul which goes out and it starts out as a germ or as a very primitive kind of consciousness, the level of an amoeba and travels through all the kingdoms of nature until it evolves. The consciousness evolves to the level of man and there's no end for it, it can go on and on, just like there was no beginning. He makes one remark, he says the Buddhists call this the Bodhicitta. He says no this will never be merged, it will not be absorbed, it will not be annihilated, it goes on forever, unless the sage willingly withdraws from manifestation. So it is this entity which as an existence in time travels through the kingdoms of nature, reaches up to the level of human evolution, begins to reason, because it's being taught to reason in this Cosmic Circuit. Circumstances, situations, events, relationships teach you to reason, ultimately and when the entity becomes fully self-conscious then it starts seeking its own origin. In other words, like I'm sitting and thinking about the world or I'm sitting and I'm thinking about all the images in my mind, that's another thing and finally the day dawns when I say, "Well, what about thinking itself? Where did that come from?" Not thinking about outside, not thinking about inside but thinking about thinking. Now you're on the track, now you're going to trace the origin of your own being. So that's the way of the mystic, to trace the core of consciousness within him. Through that he starts evolving. He becomes a person let's say who reasons upon the meaning of life, then starts trying to understand what it means and he gets involved in himself. He becomes a mystic. Now he's go to be concerned about thinking itself or consciousness itself and he penetrates into it. And when he does that he has to leave this realm. Generally we could say over here sense perception takes place and the reasoning phase of the soul is over here, and intellection is over here. So when this person starts reasoning, we're speaking about an embodied person. So we don't think about this as unembodied.

If you take a great thinker, a sage or savant, he reasons, he thinks, he understands, he has all these powers at his disposal and he orders his life so that he could get into the source of

his being. That means he has to penetrate into his mind. But when he does that he'll be leaving this realm and he'll be going into the Undivided Mind of the Earth. When he leaves that realm he'll be going into the Soul of the Sun. When he leaves that realm he'll be going into the realm of the Stars or Intellection.

(aside) I always thought it was very easy to get enlightened, all you have to do is really practice real hard for a few years and you get enlightened. And as a matter of fact one of the strange correlations we made was if you study Patanjali's Yoga Sutras, he has this division of four different kinds of meditation. They would correspond to what we just did over here. The lowest kind is where you stop all sense perception; you leave that. And then there's the next kind where you stop all reasoning; you leave that. Then there's the next kind where you stop the bliss or happiness that comes from knowing yourself; then you stop that. Then you get to Intellection, you get to the Nous itself. And they have that in the Yoga Sutras, but they have it in a very strange way. Do you have the "MDUL Science of Mind" by Taimini? I don't know if Avery ever showed you that diagram in there. If you get a chance, go over that diagram, you'll see what we're talking about.

So far confusion is rampant. You follow this?

S: What did Tim say? "If you understand what I just said, you weren't paying attention."

AD: Let's go to that quote now.

11 GERM OF CONSCIOUSNESS

AD: It is that germ of consciousness which is going to traverse the various realms of nature and as it goes along it's individuated but also at the same time it stands constantly. So the consciousness you have now is as a human being . . . the way your consciousness has experienced the Cosmic Circuit through a human body has individuated this consciousness. Whereas when your consciousness was identified with lower forms of organisms it was not really capable of becoming individuated. Individuation starts when the reasoning principles that constitutes the Earth's intellectuality starts getting assimilated by the soul. Then that process of individuation is on its way.

Not until you're self-conscious is it possible to assimilate the meanings that things may have situations, events. So an animal, let alone plant, mineral kingdom and all that, an animal is locked into his subjectivity, he can't get out of it, whereas a human being can reason and understand the causes that bring about certain events in his own subjectivity. Once you can do that you have an exit. But if you think of an animal, he's locked in.

Let me exaggerate this because it's very important. The body is organized in a certain way. It has the five senses, different functions and all that. Any modification that takes place in the body gives rise to an appearance. So I close my eye and rub it and I see light. The light that I see is the modification or the effect of my bodily sense organ and that would be true of all the senses. These appearances that are concomitant with the arising of the body's

function is what you're going to call the world appearance. No animal can understand that world appearance. All he knows is that he's got to do what he's told to do. His instincts tell him how to operate. But on the level of the human being these appearances arise but there's a reasoning that starts operating on them which is not a part of them. That's why human beings can assimilate the meanings that things have but no animal can do that. I know they speak about smart an orangutan is . . . sometimes I think they're smarter than psychologists.

S: This is why you can say that if you remove the light you don't have an ego but you have a functioning organism.

AD: You have a functioning psycho-somatic organism but there's no one there. And that body, the functioning of the psycho-somatic organism is kept alive by nature or the Soul of the World. It's still in soul. But to speak about an ego there, you're talking about a soul that has projected its consciousness in that body and must operate through that body. That body can only offer these modifications of the sense organs and all that this attention or this light of consciousness will see will be the way these organs function. He's locked into a situation where the only thing he knows is what the bodily functioning will inform him about. If it was like that it would be hopeless. But insofar that the reasoning soul of man comes into operation it can start telling him what those various appearances symbolically represent. So you can look at a wagon wheel and you see there's a circle, the idea of a circle is coming from the soul, but the wagon wheel is something that the bodily organism is showing you.

You see the value of the study of Plotinus. I read a note by PB on Plotinus, he says Plotinus has probably gone back to his star. He probably got tired and said that's enough of this place. Out.

S: What was the quote on burn all the books?

AD: After he read Plotinus he said burn all the other books. This is the book. But he gives you a good background, preparation, forces you to think and try to fight your way to these understandings. When you get to PB he says it is much easier. PB in some places doesn't go into the depth that Plotinus goes into. PB is more concerned with trying to initiate a large number of people into these mystical things rather than getting them involved in metaphysics. As a matter of fact when Tim spoke to him, why don't you say more about these things and PB told him, "That's not my job."

21 SOUL AND WORLD IDEA. SOUL DOUBLE NATURE. NIRVIKALPA. [16.2.71]

FS: Which brings up a question I had--When it says that NATURE is providing us with these experiences which will help our evolution or our development of the soul powers or however you want to put it, so it seems to me in this there was an emphasis on the "what" that is directing us. I see a dichotomy in this nature directing the soul or directing the ego or whatever--

AD: That, of course is implied, sure. And I think that's implied also when we say, for instance, the World Idea, the World Mind, is within the soul. The soul manifests this World Idea. It also is part of what it's manifesting. On the one hand the soul receives the World Idea, manifests the Idea but IT sends a part of itself into that World Idea and evolves WITH that World Idea. So then the World Idea is for the purposes of eliciting or bringing about the soul's understanding of itself. Only the World Idea can be big enough to do that. So the World Idea is actually instructing the soul and guiding it through this vast evolutionary phase.

FS: Okay, that brings up to my mind that there is a dichotomy that I was not aware of . . . that when I pray or when I evoke spiritual feelings toward something, I've always do so towards my own individual Overself, but it seems perhaps it (may be?) to the Soul of the Earth, or the World Idea . . .

AD: But you remember the diagram with the "X"? This one here? [] And we said that was the Overself? And that is the highest that the mortal could ever reach? So, this IS your god; this is YOUR god. [] That doesn't deny that each one of these degrees is a god in its own right. But we're concerned about YOUR god. When I pray to MY god I pray to the--

FS: But that god's not the one that's teaching me, right? It's Nature that's providing me the experience--

AD: That's--

FS: --and there's a certain intelligence in that.

AD: Yes, but remember all that we could know of the World Mind's Idea in the World Mind is above this point. [] In other words we put the World Mind, World Idea (inaudible) okay? We put that up here []. Anything that we could know about this here [] must come to us through the Overself. So it is YOUR mind that is manifesting what's above it. And this [] is the ultimate point that you can reach. You can't know anything about this here [] except through the intermediary of this here [] [the Overself] but it's not an intermediary because it's part and parcel of the World Mind.

FS: The Overself is part and parcel of the World Mind?

AD: Yes. That's again another indication about the paradoxical and dual nature of the soul. On the one hand you could think of the soul as standing in its own nature and on the other hand you could think of the soul as the recipient of the World Idea and manifesting that, so that gives it a dual nature. Now in some states of trance where you cut off all thought and you reach nirvikalpa, there's NO ideas, none at all. So then what do you reach there? Obviously your soul. The soul in its own nature has this serene and tranquil nature, but it isn't knowledge in the sense as knowledge of the World Idea, what's implicit in the World Idea. That's something else. You could reach nirvikalpa samadhi, the way he points out-- like in [®]MDUL[™]The Hidden Teaching[®]MDNM[™] that's one of the things that you become aware of, PB reached this level of nirvikalpa samadhi where he was capable of cutting off all thought and yet he wasn't happy. And people used to say, "Why are you unhappy? You reached the peak." And he knew that that wasn't the peak. Obviously he knew it because there was the-- when he came out of nirvikalpa and he confronted the world, that was still unexplained. What is the meaning of the world? He came to a recognition of what the soul is but not of the world, the World Idea. So he had to come back out of-- from that nirvikalpa in order to understand the nature of the World Idea. Now for him a philosopher is one who, on the one hand, is capable of realizing union with his own soul, nirvikalpa, and also on the other hand to bring that nirvikalpa, that peace of mind, bring it into his understanding, to understand the World Idea. Now if he could do that then you get sahaja. In other words the peace is natural. You don't have to cut thoughts off. The thoughts could remain there. They don't bother you anymore because you recognize that those thoughts are ALSO of the nature of mind. So that's a natural peace. No matter what the thought is, it's not going to disturb that peace. So this paradoxical nature of the soul is something that you'll find in Plotinus as well as PB.

FS: Then he says he discovers in the end that consciousness of this "Mind", which he has capital M, which leads you to wonder, we've already discussed, it would not certainly be the One he's talking about here. He must be talking about--

AD: Consciousness.

FS: --the Overself.

AD: But you see all these things I said do not apply to that quote, because that quote is simply saying--but you know this. For instance, if you take an Australian Bushman, he's preoccupied with facing the rigors of the kind of culture he's caught in. You take a man in a more advanced civilization, there the culture he's caught in, the environment is forcing him to make certain recognitions, adjustments, and all that. Then you go to a more advanced culture where a man is, let's say, in a civilization that's scientifically organized, and dedicated to science, and this man understands more of the World Idea than those two previous men. But he understands nothing about himself. Take the same man and now stick him into a civilization or a culture where the emphasis is on knowing the soul. So now he starts knowing something about himself. And then, if we go on another step, we begin to realize that all this evolution was to lead him to recognize that his mind was the wonder of it all! That's the quote--I mean the quote-- I can't put into that quote, I can't bring in the

dual and paradoxical nature of the soul and bring [in] the World Mind because the quote doesn't ask for that. It's just trying to show this panoramic development of the human mind until it reaches a stage of self-recognition. Otherwise, in that case, every time we read a note we'd have to bring the other ten volumes into it. But there ARE certain notes that are very specific. And they're making a demand on your understanding, what you understand of the doctrine of the metaphysics of truth.

FS: I have a quote that pertains to that, making a distinction between mysticism and philosophical mysticism.

PB: ``The three major progressive goals open to the mystic: to become conscious of the fringe the Overself, his Divine Soul; to penetrate to its serene center and pass into trance into the undifferentiated void of his non-sensed, non-thinged essence. Most stop there. Then you can go on to the third level, the philosophical mysticism, to bring the True Self, the Essential Emptiness and the Universal Manifestation during full normal wakefulness into a harmonious unified experience." (para reference not found, but may be a paraphrase of 16.2.71 which is typed below)

[PB: ``There are three major and progressive goals open to the mystic. The first is to become conscious of the fringe or aura of his divine soul, the Overself. Most mystics, elated by the emotional thrill of its discovery, stop here. The second is to penetrate to its serene centre and pass during trance into the undifferentiated void of its non-sensed, non-thinged essence. The more intelligent and superior mystics, who are naturally much fewer in number than the first kind, are not satisfied until they reach this attainment. It is upon this world-vanishing experience that most Indian yogic metaphysicians base their theory that the universe is an illusion. To the ordinary yogi, this is the summit of achievement and represents for him the goal of human existence. But the trance itself is only temporary. How can a mental self-abstraction, however prolonged, a merely temporary condition, be a final goal for mankind? This is the problem which indeed was stated in ®MDUL`The Hidden Teaching Beyond Yoga®MDNM`. All such theories merely show that such mystics have their limitations, however admirable may be their capacity to enter into and sustain the trance state. The third goal is to bring the true self, the essential emptiness and the universal manifestation, into a harmonious, unified experience during full normal wakefulness. This last is philosophical mysticism. Being a complex and complete attainment, it naturally calls for a complex and complete effort. Careful analytical and historical study of mystical practices and mystical biographies will show that it is these three different goals which have always been pursued or achieved, no matter to what external religion, country, or race individual mystics may themselves have belonged. Thus the ordinary mystic's account of the Overself is true but incomplete, his experience of it authentic but insufficient. He has yet to undergo the whole, the complete experience which mysticism can yield. But then, if he does so, if he refuses to remain satisfied with an incomplete and imperfect attainment, he will no longer remain a mystic. He will become a philosopher."(16.2.71 & Persp.)]

--note to jf: proofread above very carefully

(inaudible)

AD: That's a quote, for instance, where he's showing you the differences between the various levels, that the mystic himself has to become aware of. There is a mysticism which is satisfied. You know, like St John of the Cross represents the ultimate that mysticism could go to. To go beyond that you'll have to become a philosophic mystic. In other words (then), we spoke about going beyond being man and having the kind of knowledge which is in the Nous. That's philosophic mysticism, whereas a person like St John of the Cross who had achieved a very high status, a spiritual status of a very high order, only went as far as mysticism. He not only became aware of the Overself but he penetrated into the Overself and identified with it but he didn't go beyond that step and bring back that knowledge into the world and understand the nature of the world with that.

It's something like this, let's imagine that we're having a dream, I'm dreaming. And I wake up in the dream and I'm trying to understand what's going on because it's all bedlam. But then I get instruction by somebody upstairs telling me that there is a state where I can be awake and be aware of everything and understand everything. So he wakes me up. I wake up, he says, "All right, now you go back to your dream. (Do) not forget what I have taught you." So when now you're back in the dream and you say, "But everything is an IDEA here!" and you've got to vigorously apply that, all the time, in the dream. Now you're a philosophic mystic.

Why do you think they call us sleepwalkers? But you see the logic in that? In other words, this ultimate knowledge that you have, if you think of yourself when you're dreaming and you go through all these excruciating experiences, nightmares and whatnot and then someone tells you, "But that's not really you, the real you is beyond all that!" So he wakes you up, he says, "Now this is really you, you're this mind that's having the dream. Now go back into the dream and when these frightening experiences come, remember they are thoughts in your mind. You are not these thoughts." You've got to apply it. That's the practice. That's the hard part. When someone comes over and says, "Hey, look, I'll give you a million bucks, forget about all your beliefs. I got something for you to do." Now you're applying the doctrine, that's only a thought, a million bucks! (laughter)

40 EVOLUTIONARY JOURNEY OF THE SOUL

AD: It was about three pages long.

S: Was it the Fallacy of Divine Identity?

AD: No. Basically what PB said in that quotation was that it would seem to be a very stupid and senseless thing that the soul which has evolved through the kingdoms of nature, has gone through so much travail and suffering, that finally when it reaches this level of self-recognition should be either annihilated or absorbed. And PB says but isn't that stupid! He says what sense does it make philosophically that the soul should go through all this only to be absorbed or annihilated? And he gives the example--it's like a man banging his head against the wall so that he feels good when he stops. So it just doesn't make sense. It's much more sensible--you know that probably has bothered us who have studied these things a little bit and you say, "Well, if I achieve this great samhadi I become one with the World Mind, I get absorbed. I am no longer." It doesn't make sense. I've done all this work so that I could disappear. Then the other says, "Well, you'll be annihilated. There will be nothing left." And that doesn't make sense. As a matter of fact that used to make me nauseous.

(Q: Anthony is referring above to the long "What is the use" quote in category 26.4.257.)

(Quote is found.)

AD: Alright, let's read it.

PB: "An officer who had lived through and survived the great slaughters of world War I asked me afterwards. "The teaching that we are pure spirits come down from God to live in the mire of earthly life and in misery, earthly suffering only to return afterwards to the heavenly state we started from is like banging one's head against a stone wall in order to enjoy the relief felt after one stops. I do want the meaning of life, but this, how can I believe such an absurdity?"

There are some who accept this doctrine of life, and not only among Orientals as you believe but also among Christians. But there are others, myself included, who hold this to be an oversimplified misconception of a different concept, which is a philosophical one. Each of us started out as a seed, not only physically but also spiritually. We've had to grow and gradually unfold the latent nature within us. But just as the seed of a flower doesn't have the full nature and appearance of the grown plant so the human seed is not more than potentiality conscious of its spiritual origin. But we're moving toward the fullness of development, the fullness which we could not have in the beginning. So your objection, reasonable enough as it is, is not relevant to the philosophic concept."

41 PARADOXICAL NATURE OF SOUL

AD: What's paradoxical is that we said on the one hand there is this emanent, the soul, which is eternally abiding in a state of serene tranquility but on the other hand, there is this other nature that it has. It's a paradoxical thing where it emits a portion of itself or projects itself anywhere it wishes. That quote now, from Plotinus, that we didn't read last night that you said you had. The one about the embodying soul.

Plotinus: "Emancipated souls for the whole period of their sojourn above has transcended the sphere of nature and the entire fatality of birth and all that belongs to this visible world for they have taken up with then that phase of the souls existence in which the desire of earthly life is vested. This phase may be described as that which becomes divisible among bodies for it is what enters bodily forms and multiplies itself by this division among them."
(jf to look up and proof above quote)

AD: You see there you have this paradoxical nature that Plotinus is speaking about. You have the soul, in the sense that it is whole, complete eternally abiding, self-satisfied and all that, but then it also has a nature, it could project a portion of itself, and now we're speaking awkwardly, and this portion of itself, which will traverse all the kingdoms of nature and rise up to the level where it recognizes its own source. This is what he's calling the reembodying soul. In that quote and this one we're asking the question: what's the sense in the soul doing that? If it is that it gets absorbed or annihilated, the whole thing doesn't make sense. But if we understand that this phase of the soul, which is constantly going forth, getting embodied, enriching its understanding of the World Idea and this process goes on ad infinitum, there's no end to it. Otherwise you're going to conceive of the end either as annihilation or absorption.

What's he is saying here is no, once you reach the level of sagehood, then you can withdraw that faculty anytime you wish. So that the sage can withdraw that phase of the soul which seeks embodiment. In the case of the sage when he withdraws that, he will not appear in manifestation. But given that the time is right, then he wants to reappear, whether as a Bodhisattva or a Buddha, you know, it's unimportant. The point is that this here is under his control and he projects it forth again at a certain time and a certain place to do a certain work. So this is forever at his disposal. It wouldn't make sense that after having gone through all this so that it is now trained, that he should get rid of it. So the point that both PB and Plotinus are making is that this long evolutionary process of this germinal consciousness which evolves until it draws out from within itself the potential powers that the soul has and it can use them in manifestation. The whole purpose is so that eventually it will be guided by the World Idea and work with the World Idea. So when it is called upon to make an appearance in manifestation the sage has at his disposal this power to do so. And PB made a remark, too. He said when the sage is ready to incarnate he has to will that into action, into activity. Whereas you and I when we die, we come back willy-nilly because of the nature of our desire, the reembodying soul is so strong that it will bring us back. I don't know if you're experience that, but if you've ever watched the nature of desires, sooner or later it has its way. He's saying that the sage is not subject to that anymore. And

in that quotation when he speaks about the emancipated soul, he's speaking about a jivanmukti.

42 WITNESS I (and 360 degrees)

S: And when he's talking about that's embodied he's talking about the Witness.

AD: Yes, but the Witness is a very specialized terminology. This may be a shortcoming, I don't know. It's the way I understand it. If we think of like in this diagram here, the entity comes down into manifestation, starts out like a protozoa, keeps evolving through the various life forms until it reaches the level of man and its developed the rational consciousness. It develops this rational consciousness. Now what do we mean by rational consciousness? We mean all these ideas which are surrounding the Earth; it has assimilated all these reason principles. It understands them. When it goes to different planets and takes abode up in different planets, it assimilates the reason principles surrounding each one. That's the notion of the `Witness-I' I work with. Now over here it assimilates these there, over here it assimilates different powers or I mean different ideas. So you begin to see in that notion, the `Witness-I' is like an evolving consciousness. It's not restricted to just a solar system, it can go other places. But it does get its training in reasoning because it's subjected to the solar system which is under the guidance of the Solar Logos. So all that it has to learn about, all that it needs to reason about what is going to be provided for by the Solar Logos itself because it gives it the situation and the circumstances that are necessary to develop that reason. So like the `Witness-I' is like an expediency, an evolving consciousness, a developing consciousness. If you think of it starting off as a germinal consciousness and reaching that level of reasoning that we're speaking about as having assimilated the intellectual nature of any and every planetary mind, then you can understand that it's an evolving concept. It is not a static fixed notion. That's the way I understand the `Witness Consciousness.' Let's say it reaches that level then there is no more need to talk about it. That's a Witnessing I.

S: It reaches that level?

AD: Of being in complete subservience to the Overself, to the higher self. Now I don't know how you'll take this but I think there are some quotes in PB and I'm not quite sure yet. I haven't given them the necessary attention--where I get the feeling that he uses the term `ego' all the way up to that level. In other words when he says ego, it could be at the lowest gross level but also at the highest level where it has assimilated all these reason principles. But that's just a . . .

S: Would that be the, whatever the ego is, of a higher developed mind in an incarnation or are you talking about an accumulation of a lifetimes or did I completely misunderstand.

AD: If we think of the ego as an ongoing flow and not reduce it to a fixed static concept then we would have to say that the ego is and isn't. In a sense it's always in a process of constant evolution and in that sense we can say it's not a fixed entity. But insofar as we talk about it as some sort of process that is always going on, in other words, the soul projects

that germinal consciousness and evolving it continuously. We can speak about this as a process, the ego as a process and it's continuous. Now if we speak about the Buddha, for instance, it would be foolish to say there's nobody there, there's no ego; there is an ego there, sure, it's a very highly refined ego. It reached the ultimate development possible but there's still someone there that you would refer to as this and not that. So to that extent I can see the meaning of the ego in its integral sense as extending all the way, that high.

S: But it would have to be in a Buddha or a sage?

AD: We all are in the process of evolving such an ego. The ego is going to evolve, it's going to learn the finest manners, the highest consideration for others. All the noblest ethics that are possible. But it's still an ego that has to go through this. But the ego cannot get enlightened. Enlightenment means the cessation of the ego. Entering into the Void there's no more ego or if the soul withdraws that projection then there's no more projection for that time. **So it's not the ego that gets enlightened.** And yet we're forced, we're constrained to say he's enlightened and not him. So we're referring to a specific soul that projected itself and evolved and reached that high level of development.

What or who is seeking enlightenment? It cannot be the higher Self, for that is itself of the nature of Light. There then only remains the ego! This ego, the object of so many denunciations and denigrations, is the being that, transformed, will win truth and find Reality even though it must surrender itself utterly in the end as the price to be paid.
8.5.435

S: You're really speaking of a human soul that's evolving.

AD: I don't know of any other kind.

S: One of the things that keeps coming up is the confusion, when you get to the point of the 360 degrees and you lose track of the mind of the earth, the difference between the Infinite Mind of the earth and his mind of a human.

AD: This point we haven't emphasized. Let's say that in the development of the organ of sight, insofar that that organ and that function is developed, I don't have to remember all the things I saw in the eons of time that it took me to develop it. There may be traces of that development left behind in the organ of sight but I don't need them anymore. In the same way, The witness consciousness as it assimilates the reason principles and becomes an understanding critical consciousness, it doesn't have to retain the memory of each idea that it assimilated. Insofar that it assimilated the ideas and becomes an organ through which understanding can take place, it doesn't have to have a memory of all the reason principles that it assimilated.

S: I think that's right and it even makes sense that the ego can go all the way up to the Void state.

AD: But it cannot enter the Void.

S: Right. But even the evolution of the ego right here in this life, my sense of I, what I think of as my ego, has changed since I was just a toddler and on up. And yet that sense of I has stayed the same. That's what I identify with as my ego. The ego is the sense of I, sense of self and that changes as I've grown and developed.

AD: No, the sense of I doesn't change. The content changes.

S: That's correct. So in that sense, it's the content that I identify with that's the ego.

AD: So it's this karmic continuity which we tend to identify with.

S: So I can see the same thing in terms of various lifetimes. The content changes but the sense of I stays the same, life after life and so on. In going back up you go through development or perhaps meditation. It would seem that the sense of I, the ego is illusory. Because the content change that is what I identify with as the ego. In that sense the ego is illusory. Once I get to the level of the Witness I, by whatever means, it would seem that that sense of I would still stay the same but the contents would change. The contents would be the ideas, the 360 degrees.

AD: Let's say there would be an expansion; greater comprehension of its own significance.

S: But then as I go higher in approaching the Void, it would seem that that sense of I would stay the same. The contents are what would change.

AD: If you went into the Void, there wouldn't be any change. It would be left outside and you would be entering into what we refer to as your true selfhood.

S: It would be the true I. So in that sense the I which is your true self is the same down and through the lives and life and everything. But it's the contents that I identify with, that gives it the reality and makes it either an ego or the Witness-I or whatever all the way up. I think I'm going to quit right here.

SUTRATMA

Now, in a sense this undifferentiated consciousness, this primal germ has to go through something similar by identifying over and over again with various bodies which are organized by ideas. It assimilates these ideas and in that process this undifferentiated consciousness gets differentiated into a self-standing consciousness, a consciousness that abides in itself. I'm trying to make the analogy. The same way the eye organ develops, and the same way that witness consciousness develops in that way, so that this I, this expediency, this expedient I becomes an organ, a function. In that sense. I know that the Egyptians went a lot into the Witness I, but all I find is traces here and there which tell me they knew about this. I think in one of Lubicz or was it his wife, she wrote a book on that. I haven't read it yet but someone told me there's quite a bit on the notion of the Witness I. That there's this intermediary consciousness which benefits by the experiences that we go

through in the world and that that's what's getting built up. That the personality as such, the empirical personality perishes after its experiences. So the Witness I can also be thought of as what the Hindus call the "sutrātma", the thread-soul. The thread on which all the beads, or all the individual lives are strung.

AS STOPPED HERE 5/7/24

50 THE DOUBLE KNOWER and NONDUALISM

"The double knower is the best expression of the nondual doctrine." [AD]

FS: You may not want to get into that but that was one that I had.

*****note to me//deal with mystery para above.****

AD: You want an explanation? Maybe the analogy of a dream might help. When you have a dream and you are producing a dream and you appear in the dream as the dream character--so there's two knowers. There's the one who's producing the dream and is the spectator (of/in) the dream, and there's the person who is a dream character. These two we can consider as (the/a) double knower, one will produce a dream and is a spectator, and the other one in the dream so to speak, he too knows. Both of these or let's say the dream character is reducible to that knower that is producing the dream, the mind that produces the dream. So although you do have what SEEMS to be a double knower, in actuality there is only ONE there. So when Plotinus speaks about the double knower, or when--even PB speaks about it, and he says the Overself is a particle of the World Mind or a part, a (inaudible) in the World Mind, whichever way. You have really two knowers. You have the World Mind as the ultimate knower and the soul as capable of critical understanding which means reasoning, or sense-perception, etc. But so far that the World Mind produced the soul, it's an eternal offspring of the World Mind [Q:AD said 'soul' but transcribers agree he meant 'World Mind'.], you could reduce the double knower back to the original. It springs up from (him) so in the case of a double knower, when we speak about a double knower you can say that's like an expression of the nondual doctrine. Not TWO but ONE. But they don't say ONE because that leads to monism, but they say NOT-TWO. They're "not-two" different knowers.

FS: Nondual does not necessarily mean monism?

AD: No. It doesn't mean monism. See, nondualism permits you to retain at one and the same time the mind and its expressive act, its thoughts. Now, if we're speaking about nondualism, we mean that we can reduce the thoughts or you can conceive of the thoughts lapsing back into the mind, and that that would be nondualism, because even though you do have thought and you do have mind, they're not different. But when you say monism and you reduce everything to mind then you can't explain the arising of an appearance.

FS: I thought nondual was synonymous with monism. So you're saying that it's Mind with two aspects?

AD: Yes, you could say that, that it has a double aspect. And that it's paradoxical nature or the reality of that is such that it is, on the one hand absolute stillness, and on the other hand absolute activity.

FS: I understand. It's the "nondual" that I don't understand.

AD: And if you are to understand nondualism you do have to understand it in the sense that the activity of Mind, thought, can be reduced to Mind. If it wasn't capable of being reduced to Mind then we don't have a nondual doctrine.

FS: And expression-- Plotinus' (inaudible) would be nondualism. PB's would be nondualism.

AD: Oh yes.

FS: Vedanta would be monism? Is that right?

AD: No. Nondualism.

FS: Oh, they're nondual?

AD: There's wrong interpretations of the Vedanta where they refer to it as monism but that's a misinterpretation. They always characterize their doctrine as nondual.

FS: Who believes in monism?

AD: There are various philosophic schools that believe in monism. I don't know which of the sects but there is one sect of Vedanta that believes in monism. And there's also one of the yoga schools in Buddhism that believes in monism. But monism is just basically the notion of oneness, just oneness. There isn't any variety in the oneness. Whereas we have to maintain and insist upon the variety which is included in Mind.

FS: In monism would they believe that everything is the One and all else is illusion?

AD: Yes.

FS: (inaudible)

AD: If you believe in monism you cannot accept any other reality. In other words, you reduce the Absolute to its static aspect and only that and there is no other aspect. And you've read enough passages where Plotinus points out that the One has a double act.

FS: Yes.

AD: And you can also conceive of the One as including within itself metaphysical infinity and total possibility: one is active and the other is passive. You can conceive of nondualism that way. But basically that's the core or the gist of the argument, that in nondualism it allows for

a person to keep the hierarchy that's there, universal relativity. But it can all be reduced back to the original Mind.

FS: So you couldn't take the double knower all the way up to the One? You couldn't use that terminology. It would be a double act when you talk about the One, like Act and Repose?

AD: Yes, because to think of the One or the Absolute simply as a knower is to ignore the infinity of aspects that it has. It has an infinity of aspects. We may speak about the aspect of being or knowledge or life but those are just to help us, in the sense that our intellect is incapable of conceiving the infinity of aspects that the Absolute is and so we have to give ourselves a little leeway and think of the One and say, "Well, it has unity. It has being. It has power." All these various characterizations of the Absolute are really devices for US to help us understand something about It, but they cannot be applied to It because these aspects do not exist in the One in any distinctive way.

FS: When we talk about a double knower then are we referring simply to the Soul?

AD: Yes.

FS: In the soul, are there--is this a particular soul that is a double knower, like the Demiurge that we used to speak of?

AD: Yes, but here's the problem. If you speak of the soul as a double knower and the lower knower is the one that's capable of critical reflection and understanding, but the higher is that which identifies with the Nous, then the higher is not, so to speak, soul. So it's only a kind of metaphor to speak about the soul as a double knower because one part of it IS soul, yes, but the other part is soul as identified with the Nous and appropriates the knowledge that the Nous operates with, and to that extent we call it a double knower. Try to understand that when it is identified with the Nous and considers itself as the Nous, then it is not soul. So, to speak about the soul as a double knower is really more a poetical metaphor than an actuality.

FS: Are we speaking of the Overself as being a double knower?

AD: Yes.

80 BETWEEN LIVES

There's one consolation I was telling someone that PB says (I don't know if it's a consolation, but for me it is.) When a quester dies it's not like an ordinary person. He gets a chance to see that the soul, glimpse that soul. Whereas the ordinary person doesn't get that. The quester has that opportunity when he dies to recognize the soul. He is given the opportunity. It's presented to him. He dies and this is presented to him whereas the other people, no such thing happens. So the dying of an ordinary person and a person on the quest is quite different.

S: The next incarnation it carries . . .

AD: Yes, if the person in the postmortem state recognizes the reality of this glimpse, it carries right through, the remembrance of that is in his next incarnation. He knows that. And you have to remember that many of our experiences are out of the body, many of the great experiences are out of the body. But he also pointed out in his early writings, he made it sound like it's something very simple to get. You sit down, you meditate, you get enlightened and he had to correct that attitude somewhat.

S: What did you mean by those experiences are out of the body?

AD: You have to remember that we're more in an unembodied state than in an embodied state. More learning takes place out of the body than in the body.

S: Do you mean between lives?

AD: Yes, it could be in between lives.

S: Or off in the sleep state?

AD: No, you're still embodied. When you're dead. You know you're attached to an ego and you have to work through that ego. (in the sleep state)

S: Maybe one concern sometimes is the rapid growth, effective growth is in wakeful consciousness embodied.

AD: You remember he tells you you don't make dogmas out of any of these things. Some people will reincarnate after a few years and others after a lifetime. It varies with the individual and the experiences he's had. So some individuals have say a short life and a minimum of experience and there's enough vitality left that it almost forces him back into incarnation within a few years. The person who's lived out his life, takes a rest, mull over the things that happened, understand. So he can take a little longer. But the Buddhists insist that everybody comes back within 49 days.

S: Everybody? 49 days?

S: Does it matter if the body is dissolved or cremated?

AD: They don't speak about that.]]]]

93 EVOLUTION OF CONSCIOUSNESS

We could think of it in this way, in the evolution of mankind we could think of a very early phase of consciousness which we can call the primitive or something like that, and then the next phase of mankind is what we might call the magical consciousness and then in the next phase of mankind we might call it symbolical or mythological consciousness, and then in the next phase or evolution of mankind is what we might call a conceptual or mental development is taking place. Now for some students there is no longer any need for a

mythological description of philosophical principles. You have to give it to them in the form of the mentality they work with so that means you've got to give it to them in concepts. Now you go to another person, he can receive it much more readily with a mythological consciousness, he can understand it much more easily, so if you present him with the notion of the Eucharist or some dogma of that nature, symbolically he can receive that and so you have to give it to him that way. If you go to a society where the shaman is the chief instructor then you have to deliver this teaching with magical connotations. It has to be basically embedded in a magical consciousness. So we have to keep in mind the person we're addressing and the means that would be appropriate to that person. So from this point of view it's not that Jung is wrong, we're just saying it's not longer adequate to the advancing mentality of contemporary man. Now if you take some religious people, that wouldn't hold. You've got to give it to them in mythological form. They've got to feel that they're participating in Christ through the Eucharist. In those symbols they live a symbolical life and it becomes a meaningful life for them and if you deprive them of that you'd be doing them harm. But there will come a time when either they'll go direct to the conceptual understanding of what these things are about or to the experience of what these things are about but in either case they have to get beyond the symbolical life. That's why I don't particularly care for the terminology that the hindus employ. They're using the mythological concepts which were evolved in the first thousand years A.D. They're still employing them. But if you read some of the more contemporary Hindus like Das, Murti, and K.C.B. and people like that you can see this highly technical conceptual language that they're working with. And you can see that they're creative, they're independent, they put that aside, not that they disbelieve or call it hokum, they know that it has it's value but this is 1984. We got 47,684 nuclear warheads. Let's hurry up. Shove this stuff out.